



Consensus and consistency: Exposure to multiple discrimination claims shapes Whites' intergroup attitudes[☆]



Evelyn R. Carter^{*}, Mary C. Murphy

Indiana University, Dept. Psychological and Brain Sciences, 1101 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, IN 47405, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Bias detection
Subtle bias
Consensus
Consistency
Social cognition

ABSTRACT

Research suggests that intergroup disagreement about the prevalence of subtle racial bias in America occurs because Whites are not often exposed to minorities' experiences with this type of discrimination, due to housing, school, workplace, and friendship segregation. Although the objective of social movements (e.g., “I, too, am Harvard”) is to illuminate a consistent pattern of bias and to spur social action, it is possible that these movements may exacerbate the derogatory judgments (i.e., as complainers) found in previous research when a single claimant describes experiences with bias. Five studies are the first to draw on the consensus and consistency principles of Kelley's Covariation Model (1973) to investigate how exposure to *multiple* experiences of subtle bias brought by Black or White claimants affects Whites' perceptions of subsequent discrimination claimants and racial bias prevalence. The results supported the *consensus and consistency hypothesis* for Black claimants, as increased exposure to Blacks' discrimination experiences mitigated Whites' derogation of Black discrimination claimants as complainers and increased perceptions of the prevalence of anti-Black bias. Conversely, increased exposure to Whites' discrimination experiences supported the *derogation hypothesis*: exposure exacerbated complainer attributions for those claimants and had no effect on the perceived prevalence of anti-White bias. These results suggest increased exposure may be an effective tool for changing Whites' perceptions of and attitudes toward minorities' subtle bias experiences. We also discuss the contribution of these studies to our understanding of differences between intergroup and intragroup perceptions of discrimination.

“Oh I heard her say she was going to Harvard. I just assumed she mis-spoke.”

“Don't you wish you were White like the rest of us?”

“Our voices often go unheard on this campus, our experiences are devalued, our presence is questioned—this project is our way of speaking back, of standing up to say: We are here.”

—itooamharvard.tumblr.com

“Put yourself in someone else's shoes” we are often told as children. Though good advice, it is notoriously difficult to understand experiences that we have not personally had. Nowhere is this more apparent than in current intergroup conversations about racial bias—and, in particular, subtle racial bias—where Black and White Americans' different perspectives (see Carter & Murphy, 2015 for a review) can elicit accusations of playing the “race card” when racial/ethnic minorities attribute their experiences to racial bias. Some have suggested that these accusations arise because Whites are less aware of minorities' experiences with subtle bias. Indeed, modern racism tends to take a

subtler form than old-fashioned blatant racism, and Whites are less likely to detect and describe these subtler instances as biased (Sommers & Norton, 2006). In fact, Whites perceive that anti-Black bias is less prevalent than anti-White bias in modern society (Norton & Sommers, 2011), in spite of the persistent structural racism Black Americans still encounter (Robertson, Dewan, & Apuzzo, 2015). As such, a White person with limited knowledge about minorities' subtle discrimination experiences may dismiss minority discrimination claims and derogate the claimant (e.g., Kaiser & Miller, 2001). With this in mind, a main goal of social movements like Black Lives Matter and campus protests (e.g., “I, too, am Harvard”) has been to illuminate different individuals' experiences in order to establish a pattern that is undeniable and increase majority group members' awareness of the prevalence and persistence of minorities' experiences with discrimination. Yet, this objective assumes that White perceivers will conclude from multiple discrimination claims that bias is, indeed, prevalent (instead of dismissing the claims and responding defensively). This is an untested empirical question that the present research investigates.

[☆] Portions of this research were included in a doctoral dissertation submitted to Indiana University by the first author, and were presented at the 2016 and 2017 conferences of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology.

^{*} Corresponding author at: UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, 3134 Murphy Hall, Box 951405, Los Angeles, CA 90095, United States.
E-mail addresses: ecarter@equity.ucla.edu (E.R. Carter), mcpsych@indiana.edu (M.C. Murphy).

1. How will exposure to multiple discrimination claims shape Whites' perceptions?

Previous research reveals that Whites derogate minority discrimination claimants as oversensitive complainers who are unlikable and unhirable (Diebels & Czopp, 2011; Eliezer & Major, 2012; Unzueta, Everly, & Gutiérrez, 2014). Will exposure to multiple discrimination claims—each made by different individuals—provide a context that differentially shapes attitudes about subsequent discrimination claimants and influences people's judgments about the prevalence of racial bias in society? We investigated competing hypotheses.

1.1. Consensus and consistency hypothesis

One hypothesis is that exposure to multiple discrimination claims would reduce derogation of a subsequent discrimination claimant as a complainer. Kelley's Covariation Model (Kelley, 1973) demonstrates that consensus (i.e., agreement by others about the attribution) and consistency (i.e., observing the same stimulus multiple times) help perceivers draw conclusions about a target's behavior. Kelley's model also describes the role that distinctiveness (i.e., the extent to which the same person reacts differently to different stimuli) plays in person perception, though this construct is less relevant for the current research question that explores how exposure to multiple discrimination claims made by different individuals shapes people's downstream attitudes. The consensus and consistency hypothesis focuses on how these two social cognitive principles of person perception may apply to perceptions of discrimination claimants.

Specifically, one discrimination claim provides little information about whether others would agree that an experience is due to bias (low consensus) and about how frequently similar incidents occur (low consistency). In this case, a perceiver might dismiss the discrimination claim and subtype the claimant as a complainer (as in previous research; Kaiser & Miller, 2001). However, multiple discrimination claims from different individuals—all describing similar patterns of subtly-biased behavior such as being overlooked, negatively stereotyped, and treated worse than others—provide consensus and consistency information that may reduce derogatory attributions of subsequent discrimination claimants. Thus, the consensus and consistency hypothesis predicts that exposure to multiple discrimination claims will mitigate complainer attributions otherwise made for single discrimination claimants. That is, when consensus is high about the kinds of incidents people consider to be biased, and there is consistent information demonstrating that multiple people experience these kinds of incidents, exposure to multiple discrimination claims may create a context in which perceivers derogate a discrimination claimant less than when consensus and consistency information is low (i.e., exposure to only one discrimination claim).

1.2. Derogation hypothesis

Alternatively, exposure to multiple discrimination claims may backfire, yielding more negative attitudes about subsequent discrimination claimants. Indeed, past research shows that single discrimination claimants are derogated, and exposure to multiple discrimination claimants may exacerbate these effects. In this case, high consensus and consistency among discrimination claimants' experiences may not communicate a pattern of discrimination, but rather a tendency of group members to complain or play the victim. Thus, the derogation hypothesis predicts that perceivers may derogate discrimination claimants more when consensus and consistency information is high (vs. low).

2. Will exposure shape judgments of racial bias prevalence?

In addition to examining whether exposure to multiple

discrimination claims shapes Whites' perceptions of subsequent claimants as complainers, the present research investigates whether this exposure also shapes Whites' perceptions of the prevalence of racial bias in society. Is bias still a problem in today's society? Majority and minority individuals often disagree about this (Norton & Sommers, 2011), yet a central goal of voicing discrimination claims *en masse*, as done with campaigns such as “I, too, am Harvard,” is that these multiple experiences will raise awareness of the prevalence and form of anti-Black bias in society with the hope of motivating change or action. The effects of exposure to multiple discrimination claims may generalize beyond perceptions of claimants and shape perceivers' more general beliefs about the prevalence of bias. However, this is an empirical question that has not yet been tested.

Kelley's Covariation Model may be extended to predict how perceivers form group-based judgments about the prevalence of bias. Consensus and consistency information has been shown influence normative judgments of groups (Hewstone & Jaspars, 1983; Nook, Ong, Morelli, Mitchell, & Zaki, 2016). Based on this work, we expected that exposure to multiple discrimination claims would similarly shape descriptive norms about the prevalence of racial bias against that group. Specifically, the consensus and consistency hypothesis predicts that multiple discrimination claims would communicate a widely held and consistent pattern of discrimination (a descriptive norm regarding prevalence), increasing perceivers' beliefs about the prevalence of bias relative to when this information is low (i.e., exposure to only one discrimination claim). However, it is possible that perceivers may not generalize from multiple discrimination claims at all (showing no difference between high and low exposure conditions). Finally, it is also possible that perceivers may show reactance (reporting that bias is less prevalent when consensus and consistency information is high), as predicted by the derogation hypothesis.

3. Same process for perceptions of White and Black claimants?

While our main research question explores whether exposure to multiple (vs. single) discrimination claims by Black claimants affects White perceivers' subsequent judgments, the present research also explored whether Whites' perceptions of discrimination claimants differed in an intragroup (vs. intergroup) context. If multiple exposure reflects a benefit of providing consensus and consistency information that shapes both intergroup and intragroup perceptions, we would expect to find support for the consensus and consistency hypothesis for Whites' perceptions of *both* Black and White claimants. If multiple exposure exacerbates complainer attributions because *any group* (Black or White) who claims discrimination is perceived negatively, we would expect to find support for the derogation hypothesis, again for Whites' perceptions of Black and White claimants. However, we hypothesize that the effects of exposure will differ as a function of claimant race, reflecting an intergroup process.

Previous work shows that intergroup contexts are more likely to elicit group-level judgments (e.g., that group is friendly), while intragroup contexts are more likely to elicit individualized judgments (e.g., those individuals are friendly; Frey & Tropp, 2006). According to this argument, when Whites are exposed to multiple Black discrimination claimants (an intergroup context), they should be more likely to categorize them as a group and may determine that those discrimination experiences are representative of the group's experiences. Conversely, Whites may be more likely to perceive White discrimination claimants (an intragroup context) as individuals, impeding the group aggregation and consensus-consistency judgments afforded to claimants in the intergroup context. In this intragroup context, White discrimination claimants' experiences may not communicate a representative group experience in the way that Black claimants' experiences might. Moreover, while multiple discrimination claims from Blacks align with the pervasive structural and individual racism experienced by Black Americans, multiple discrimination claims from

Whites may seem inconsistent with the relatively more privileged lived experience of White Americans (McIntosh, 1989), for whom these experiences are simply less pervasive. For these reasons, exposure to multiple discrimination experiences from White claimants may not convey consensus and consistency information in the same way that exposure to multiple discrimination experiences from Black claimants does. The present research investigated this role of claimant race in Whites' perceptions of discrimination.

4. The present research

Five experiments examine how exposure to multiple subtle discrimination experiences shapes Whites' perceptions of subsequent claimants. Moreover, this investigation extends theory by examining whether exposure to multiple claims influences Whites' broader beliefs about the prevalence of racial bias in society. Finally, this work explores potential differences between Whites' perceptions of Black (i.e., an intergroup context) and White (i.e., an intragroup context) discrimination claimants.

5. Study 1

Study 1 examined competing hypotheses for how varying levels of consensus and consistency information might affect Whites' perceptions. The derogation hypothesis predicts that when consensus and consistency information is high (vs. low) perceivers will derogate a subsequent claimant more and report that bias against the claimant's group is less prevalent. Conversely, the consensus and consistency hypothesis predicts that when consensus and consistency information is high (vs. low) perceivers will derogate a subsequent claimant less and report that bias against the claimant's group is more prevalent.

5.1. Study 1 method

5.1.1. Participants & design

Power analysis based on previous research (Kaiser & Miller, 2001) revealed an N_{minimum} of 125 participants to detect a medium-sized effect with 80% power. 161 self-identified White undergraduate students (75% female) participated in this 2 (Exposure: low, high) \times 2 (Claimant Race: Black, White) between-subjects study for course credit. For this, and all subsequent studies, all analyses were conducted only after the full sample was collected and included all participants, unless otherwise noted. All measures and manipulations are reported below (see Supplementary materials for the full text of all manipulations and measures across all studies).

5.1.2. Procedure

Participants came to the lab for a study on perceiving others' experiences. A White experimenter explained that participants would read short essays by other students and answer questions about at least one of the essays, and then report their general attitudes about a range of topics.

5.1.2.1. Exposure manipulation. The essays were drawn from a previous study about students' life experiences (Carter & Murphy, 2014). All participants in the current study read five essays presented from a bank of five negative experience essays and five subtle discrimination experiences. Negative essays were included to equate both the amount of essays participants read and the affective experiences of participants across conditions. Indeed, a separate sample ($N = 73$) of participants determined that the discrimination and negative experience essays did not significantly differ in perceived negativity (all $ps > 0.09$); however, consistent with the goal of the manipulation, participants attributed the author's treatment to bias more in the discrimination essays than in the negative essays (all $ps < 0.05$).

Consensus and consistency information was manipulated based on

the number of discrimination essays participants read. Participants randomly assigned to the high exposure condition read subtle discrimination essays from five different individuals (5 discrimination essays total). These essays communicated high consensus and consistency information, as all described subtly biased acts and that were attributable to racial discrimination. Participants in the low exposure condition read one individual's subtle discrimination essay and—to match the affective valence of the high exposure condition—four essays describing different individuals' negative experiences (randomly drawn from the respective banks). Together, these five essays (1 discrimination and 4 negative essays) communicated low consensus and consistency, as the experiences varied in the kinds of treatment they described and only one was attributed to discrimination. Thus, in both conditions, participants were exposed to 5 essays that matched in valence, but differed in the amount of exposure to people's experiences with subtle discrimination.

5.1.2.2. Claimant race manipulation. Each essay included information about the author (i.e., gender, race, age, year in school) and only claimant race differed by condition; all participants read essays ostensibly written by Black or White women. The present study compared the effects of exposure to Black and White women who described race discrimination. Female claimants were used because a large literature shows significant intergroup biases when perceiving Black and White men that are sometimes attenuated when perceiving women (e.g., Eagly & Kite, 1987). Thus, the present study compared the effects of exposure to Black women and White women, both describing race discrimination, as a stricter test of the derogation vs. consensus and consistency hypotheses. **Study 2**, however, includes both male and female claimants to assess whether the effects found in this study generalize beyond the **Study 1** manipulation.

After reading the five essays, all participants read the same final essay. In this essay, the author (i.e., the target claimant) described not being contacted about a job for which she applied and learning that some on the hiring committee had a reputation for being discriminatory. The relatively ambiguous nature of the situation—is the reason that she was not contacted an example of bias? Or is there another non-discriminatory reason she was not contacted?—makes it an example of subtle bias (Crocker & Major, 1989). The essay read,

I heard an announcement a while ago that a local company was hiring an intern...I put together my application and submitted it well before the deadline. I still haven't heard anything, and it's been quite a while since they stopped taking applications...come to find out that a couple of people who are in charge of making hiring decisions are known for being discriminatory...I have a feeling I won't be hearing from that company.

5.1.2.3. Perceptions of the target claimant. All participants answered 18 questions (adapted from Kaiser & Miller, 2001) about this target on a 5-point scale (*never* to *almost always*). Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation produced a three-factor solution. Six complainer items (e.g., complainer and emotional) loaded onto the first factor, explaining 44.66% of the variance ($\alpha = 0.86$). Seven negative trait items (e.g., unkind and rude) loaded onto the second factor, explaining 8.06% of the variance ($\alpha = 0.83$). The third factor represented positive traits (e.g., sociable and has a positive outlook on life), explaining 7.04% of the variance ($\alpha = 0.80$). Higher average scores indicate the claimant was perceived to possess more of the traits.

Our primary variables of interest were perceptions of the target as a complainer and participants' perceptions of the prevalence of racial bias against the target's group. The more general negative and positive perception results are provided in the Supplementary materials.

5.1.2.4. Prevalence of racial bias. Eight items assessed participants' perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black and anti-White bias in

society. The questions were presented in random order with a 6-point (*strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*) scale. Four items assessed perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black bias. These questions were comprised of 1 item from the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986) scale: “Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States” (reverse-scored) and three others created for the current study including, “American society still has a long way to go before Blacks will achieve equal status compared to Whites” ($\alpha = 0.74$).

Four items assessed perceptions about the prevalence of anti-White bias. Two items were from past research (Wilkins & Kaiser, 2014; e.g., “Prejudice and discrimination against Whites are on the rise”) and two were created for the current study, such as, “Reverse racism (acts of racism by Blacks against Whites) is prevalent in today’s society” ($\alpha = 0.73$).

5.2. Study 1 results

5.2.1. Perceptions of the target claimant

5.2.1.1. *Complainer perceptions.* A 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) ANOVA revealed no main effects of exposure ($p = 0.94$) or claimant race ($p = 0.30$); however, there was a significant interaction, $F(1, 157) = 6.07, p = 0.02, \eta_p^2 = 0.04$.

Simple effects tests within claimant race revealed a marginal effect, such that participants perceived the Black claimant as less of a complainer when exposure to discrimination claims was high, compared to when it was low, $F(1, 157) = 3.41, p = 0.07, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$ (Table 1 includes descriptive statistics for perceptions of the Black claimant and anti-Black bias). However, a marginal effect obtained in the opposite direction for the White claimant, who was perceived as more of a complainer when exposure to discrimination claims was high, compared to when it was low, $F(1, 157) = 2.71, p = 0.10, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$

Table 1

Mean ratings (and standard deviations) of participants’ perceptions of the Black claimant and Anti-Black racial bias.

	Exposure condition						<i>p</i>
	No info.		Low exposure		High exposure		
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	
Study 1							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	3.02 (0.80) _a	41	2.76 (0.43) _a	44	0.067
Anti-Black bias	–	–	3.87 (0.88) _a	41	4.11 (0.82) _a	44	0.193
Study 2							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	2.69 (0.62) _a	76	2.49 (0.56) _b	78	0.047
Anti-Black bias	–	–	3.85 (1.29) _a	76	4.46 (1.03) _b	78	0.001
Study 3							
Complainer perceptions	2.99 (0.79) _a	53	3.15 (0.92) _a	67	2.72 (0.82) _b	61	0.011
anti-black bias	3.96 (1.16) _a	53	3.95 (1.38) _a	67	4.42 (1.15) _a	61	0.059
Study 4							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	1.56 (0.63) _a	62	1.38 (0.46) _a	66	0.085
Anti-Black bias	–	–	3.75 (0.99) _a	62	4.35 (0.92) _b	66	0.001
Study 5							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	3.25 (0.70) _a	64	2.79 (0.74) _b	52	0.001
Anti-Black bias	–	–	3.94 (1.34) _a	64	4.39 (1.14) _a	52	0.056

Note. Nonshared subscripts denote statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between means.

Table 2

Mean ratings (and standard deviations) of participants’ perceptions of the White claimant and anti-White racial bias.

	Exposure condition						<i>p</i>
	No info.		Low exposure		High exposure		
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>	
Study 1							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	2.87 (0.56) _a	40	3.12 (0.76) _a	36	0.102
Anti-White bias	–	–	3.81 (0.58) _a	40	4.17 (0.97) _a	36	0.058
Study 2							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	2.77 (0.70) _a	80	2.93 (0.69) _a	58	0.164
Anti-White bias	–	–	3.64 (1.35) _a	80	3.97 (1.17) _a	58	0.133
Study 3							
Complainer perceptions	3.45 (0.76) _a	44	3.15 (0.84) _a	45	3.32 (0.70) _a	58	0.213
Anti-White bias	3.77 (1.32) _a	44	3.82 (1.23) _a	45	3.99 (1.21) _a	58	0.637
Study 4							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	1.67 (0.69) _a	66	1.81 (0.58) _a	60	0.199
Anti-White bias	–	–	3.78 (0.87) _a	66	3.64 (0.94) _a	60	0.380
Study 5							
Complainer perceptions	–	–	3.17 (0.66) _a	51	3.17 (0.78) _a	61	0.977
Anti-White bias	–	–	4.07 (0.99) _a	51	3.66 (1.07) _b	61	0.043

Note. Nonshared subscripts denote statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between means.

(Table 2 includes descriptive statistics for perceptions of the White claimant and anti-White bias).

5.2.2. Prevalence of racial bias

One-way ANOVAs examined whether exposure to a group’s subtle discrimination experiences affected participants’ perceptions about the prevalence of bias against that same group. That is, we investigated whether perceptions of anti-Black bias differed among those with high (vs. low) exposure to claims made by Black claimants. Another test examined whether participants’ perceptions of anti-White bias differed among those with high (vs. low) exposure to claims made by White claimants. Norton and Sommers (2011) suggests perceptions of anti-Black and anti-White bias are linked. Thus, an interesting question is whether high (vs. low) exposure to claims by one group (e.g., Blacks) shapes people’s perceptions of bias against *another* group (e.g., Whites). This is a different research question than the one examined here: whether high (vs. low) exposure to claims by one group (e.g., Blacks) shapes participants’ perceptions of the prevalence of bias against that *same* group (e.g., Blacks).

5.2.2.1. *Anti-Black bias.* Participants reported that anti-Black bias was similarly prevalent, regardless of exposure to Blacks’ discrimination claims, $F(1, 83) = 1.72, p = 0.19, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

5.2.2.2. *Anti-White bias.* Participants perceived that anti-White bias was marginally more prevalent when exposure to Whites’ discrimination claims was high than when it was low, $F(1, 74) = 3.94, p = 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.05$.

5.3. Study 1 discussion

Supporting the consensus and consistency hypothesis, Study 1

demonstrated that Whites perceived a Black claimant as marginally less of a complainer after exposure to multiple discrimination claims by other Black claimants. Conversely, in the intragroup context, Whites perceived a White claimant as marginally more of a complainer after exposure to multiple discrimination claims. Whites' perceptions about the prevalence of racial bias followed a different pattern: whereas exposure to Black discrimination claims did not shape perceptions of anti-Black bias, exposure did shape perceptions of anti-White bias, such that anti-White bias was perceived as marginally more prevalent when exposure to White discrimination claims was high (vs. low). These findings offer partial support for the consensus and consistency hypothesis for both Black and White claimants as well as support for the derogation hypothesis for White claimants. In *Study 2*, we increased our statistical power by recruiting a larger sample and conducted a conceptual replication of exposure with a different manipulation.

6. Study 2

Study 2 replicated and extended the results of *Study 1* with a different manipulation of discrimination exposure. In *Study 2*, online participants read a brief article describing the results of an ostensible survey of Black or White Americans' daily experiences. The survey results either revealed that 90% (i.e., high exposure) or 10% (i.e., low exposure) of participants experienced discrimination based on their race or ethnicity within the past month. Then, as in *Study 1*, participants read and rated the experience of an individual discrimination claimant and provided their perceptions of the prevalence of racial bias in society. We examined whether high (v. low) exposure would mitigate derogation of the subsequent discrimination claimant and increase perceivers' perceptions of the prevalence of racial bias, consistent with the consensus and consistency hypothesis and the results of *Study 1*.

6.1. Study 2 method

6.1.1. Participants & design

Power analysis based on *Study 1* effect sizes ($\eta_p^2 = 0.02$) revealed an N_{minimum} of 387 participants to detect effects with 80% power. 430 self-identified White Amazon Mechanical Turk (58% female) workers participated in this 2 (Exposure: low, high) \times 2 (Claimant Race: Black, White) between-subjects study. Participants who passed both manipulation checks (87%) and those who found the article to be at least somewhat plausible (80%) were retained for analyses, leaving a final sample of 292 participants.

6.1.2. Procedure

MTurk workers were invited to participate in a study in which they would read a short article, followed by a brief scenario and several questions regarding their general attitudes.

6.1.2.1. Exposure manipulation. Participants read an article describing the results of an ostensible survey about the everyday experiences of Americans. In the low exposure condition, participants learned that within the past month, few respondents described experiences with discrimination while most described dealing with “daily hassles like health concerns; problems with technology like cell phones, computers, or the internet; or difficult traffic on their commute to work.” Thus, this article conveyed low consensus and consistency information about discrimination experiences. Conversely, the high exposure condition conveyed high consensus and consistency information, as it reported that most respondents described “being looked over, ignored, or otherwise treated badly in the past month, while at the same time, people from other racial groups were treated more favorably.” The article included an accompanying infographic to emphasize consensus—in the low exposure condition participants learned that 10% of respondents dealt with discrimination and 90% dealt with daily hassles, and in the high exposure condition participants learned that

90% of respondents dealt with discrimination—as well as a few excerpts from survey respondents to emphasize the consistency of people's subtly biased (or negative) experiences.

We explored two framings of the article as an exploratory condition in the present research, modeled from previous manipulations of consensus and consistency (Hewstone & Jaspars, 1983; Nook et al., 2016). When article framing is included as a factor in the analyses on the dependent variables, it does not interact with exposure or claimant race (nor are there any framing main effects). Thus, all subsequent analyses collapse across article framing into the 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) design (see Supplementary materials for article framings and analyses regarding this factor).

6.1.2.2. Claimant race manipulation. After reading the article, participants were told that they were going to read a scenario described in a Facebook post. As in *Study 1*, this scenario was the target claimant's experience. Participants randomly-assigned to the Black claimant race condition read an article in which all survey respondents were Black, followed by the Black target claimant's experience; participants assigned to the White claimant race condition read an article in which all survey respondents were White, followed by the White target claimant's experience from *Study 1*.

Next, all participants answered two manipulation check questions (described below), and answered the same items from *Study 1* about their perceptions of the target claimant as a complainer ($\alpha = 0.88$), as well as their perceptions of the prevalence of anti-Black ($\alpha = 0.87$) and anti-White ($\alpha = 0.85$).

6.1.2.3. Manipulation checks. To assess whether participants correctly perceived the manipulations of exposure and claimant race, participants answered two manipulation checks following the article. The exposure manipulation check read: “In the article you just read, how many respondents described experiencing discrimination—being looked over, ignored, or otherwise treated badly because of their race—in their everyday life?” Response options ranged from 1 (*all respondents [100%]*) to 6 (*no respondents [0%]*). Participants in the high exposure condition who selected “90%” (5 on the scale) were coded “correct,” and participants in the low exposure condition who selected “10%” (2 on the scale) were coded “correct”; all other responses were coded “incorrect”. The claimant race manipulation check read: “In the study described in the article you just read, what race were the respondents (the people who answered questions about their everyday life experiences)?” Participants were marked “correct” if they correctly reported the claimant race to which they were randomly assigned.

6.1.2.4. Article plausibility. Finally, participants answered questions to ensure that all versions of the article were equally believable. Four questions assessed how believable, credible, persuasive, and convincing participants found the article to be on a 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*) scale. Higher average scores indicate that participants were more persuaded by the article ($\alpha = 0.87$).

6.2. Study 2 results

6.2.1. Manipulation checks

6.2.1.1. Article plausibility. Overall, participants were moderately persuaded by the article ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 1.19$). Participants who did not find the article to be plausible at all, averaging 1.00 on the article plausibility composite and participants who chose not to answer these questions were excluded from analyses (20%).

6.2.1.2. Claimant race. Most participants correctly recalled the race of the survey respondents. In the White claimant race condition, 95% of participants correctly reported that the survey respondents in the article were White; in the Black claimant race condition, 97% of participants

correctly reported that the survey respondents in the article were Black.

6.2.1.3. Discrimination exposure. Overall, most participants correctly recalled the content of the article that served as the exposure manipulation. In the high exposure condition, 86% of participants correctly reported that 90% of the survey respondents described experiencing discrimination. In the low exposure condition, 89% of participants correctly reported that 10% of the survey respondents described experiencing discrimination.

6.2.2. Perceptions of the target claimant

6.2.2.1. Complainer perceptions. A 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of claimant race such that overall, Whites perceived the Black claimant to be less of a complainer ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.60$) than the White claimant ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.70$), $F(1, 288) = 11.82$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$. The main effect of exposure was not significant, $F(1, 288) = 0.12$, $p = 0.73$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.00$, but a significant interaction obtained, $F(1, 288) = 5.67$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

Simple effects tests within claimant race revealed that Whites perceived the Black claimant as less of a complainer when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 288) = 3.97$, $p = 0.047$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$. However, Whites perceived the White claimant similarly regardless of exposure, $F(1, 288) = 1.95$, $p = 0.16$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$.

6.2.3. Prevalence of racial bias

6.2.3.1. Anti-Black bias. Participants reported that anti-Black bias was significantly more prevalent when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 152) = 10.68$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.07$.

6.2.3.2. Anti-White bias. Whites' perceptions of the prevalence of anti-White bias were not significantly influenced by the exposure manipulation, $F(1, 136) = 2.28$, $p = 0.13$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

6.3. Study 2 discussion

Study 2 provides a conceptual replication of Study 1, using a different manipulation to convey high (vs. low) consensus and consistency information regarding people's experiences with subtle discrimination. Consistent with the previous findings and with the consensus and consistency hypothesis, learning that many Black Americans experience discrimination yielded less derogation of a subsequent Black claimant and greater perceived prevalence of anti-Black bias. Thus, the results of Study 2 support the consensus and consistency hypothesis in the intergroup context—when perceivers are White and discrimination claimants are Black. However, in the intragroup context, high (vs. low) exposure to Whites' experiences with discrimination did not impact Whites' perceptions of a subsequent White claimant or their perceptions of the prevalence of anti-White bias.

Although the article provided a conceptual replication of the consensus and consistency manipulation, a limitation of this design was that a number of participants did not find the article sufficiently plausible. Indeed, reflecting the current climate of media skepticism, one participant commented, "This is a great example of the fake news we hear about recently." As a result, the final sample of 292 participants fell short of the N_{minimum} of 387 participants criterion established by the power analysis. Thus, for subsequent studies we returned to the exposure manipulation used in Study 1, exposing participants to essays about people's lived experiences.

7. Study 3

Studies 1 and 2 compared participants' perceptions of a subsequent claimant when exposure to previous discrimination claimants was high or low. A limitation of this design is that participants are always exposed to at least one discrimination claim before the target claimant,

making it difficult to (a) comparatively situate this work with previous studies that have examined people's perceptions of single discrimination claimants (e.g., Kaiser & Miller, 2001) and (b) ascertain how high exposure affects people's complainer attributions and prevalence perceptions relative to a no previous exposure context. Study 3 was designed to directly address this issue by comparing participants' perceptions of a target's discrimination experience when consensus and consistency information was high (exposure to five previous claimants), when consensus and consistency information was low (exposure to one previous claimant), and when there was no consensus and consistency information at all (exposure to zero previous claimants). We predicted that perceivers' perceptions would be similar when there was no exposure and when exposure was low, while high exposure would reduce derogation of the target claimant and increase perceptions about the prevalence of bias (consistent with the findings of Studies 1–2 and with the consensus and consistency hypothesis). In this way, we expected high exposure to differ from the other two conditions.

7.1. Study 3 method

7.1.1. Participants & design

Power analysis based on Study 1 effect sizes ($\eta_p^2 = 0.03$) and 80% power revealed an N_{minimum} of 315 participants. 328 self-identified White Amazon Mechanical Turk (69% female) workers participated in this 3 (Exposure: none, low, high) \times 2 (Claimant Race: Black, White) between-subjects study.

7.1.2. Procedure

Study 1's cover story was modified for the online sample. Participants were still told that the study was about perceiving others' experiences and answering questions about at least one of the experiences, followed by general attitude questions; however, in this study the short essays from Study 1 were described as Facebook statuses. Participants were randomly assigned to the high, low, or no exposure condition where they read essays by five, one, or zero individuals, respectively. Afterward, all participants read the target claimant's experience and answered the same questions from the previous studies about their perceptions of the target claimant as a complainer ($\alpha = 0.91$), and their perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black ($\alpha = 0.88$) and anti-White ($\alpha = 0.86$) bias.

7.2. Study 3 results

7.2.1. Perceptions of the target claimant

7.2.1.1. Complainer perceptions. A 3 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) ANOVA revealed that, overall, participants perceived the Black claimant ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 0.87$) as less of a complainer than the White claimant ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.76$), $F(1, 322) = 15.19$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$. The main effect of exposure was not significant, $F(2, 322) = 1.74$, $p = 0.18$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$; however, the interaction was significant, $F(2, 322) = 4.14$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$.

Simple effects tests within claimant race revealed significant differences in the Black claimant condition, $F(2, 322) = 4.56$, $p = 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$. Specifically, perceptions of the Black claimant as a complainer did not differ in the no exposure and low exposure conditions ($p = 0.29$). However, participants perceived the Black claimant as marginally less of a complainer when exposure was high compared to when there was no exposure ($p = 0.08$) and as significantly less of a complainer when exposure was high vs. low ($p = 0.003$). Thus, greater exposure to discrimination experiences decreased derogation of the Black claimant relative to both the low and no exposure conditions.

Simple effects tests among participants in the White claimant condition revealed no significant differences, $F(2, 322) = 1.56$, $p = 0.21$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$.

7.2.2. Perceptions of racial bias

7.2.2.1. Anti-Black bias. Among participants exposed to Black claimants, a one-way ANOVA revealed that exposure had a marginal effect on perceptions of anti-Black bias, $F(2, 178) = 2.88, p = 0.06, \eta_p^2 = 0.03$. LSD contrasts indicated that participants perceived anti-Black bias to be similarly prevalent in the no and low exposure conditions ($p = 0.95$). When exposure was high, participants perceived that anti-Black bias was marginally more prevalent than when there was no exposure ($p = 0.05$) and significantly so when there was low exposure ($p = 0.03$). Thus, greater exposure increased people's perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black bias in society.

7.2.2.2. Anti-White bias. Among participants exposed to White claimants, exposure had no significant effect on perceptions of anti-White bias, $F(2, 145) = 0.45, p = 0.64, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$.

7.3. Study 3 discussion

Study 3 added a no exposure condition to situate our findings within the literature regarding people's perceptions of single discrimination claims. Results revealed that Whites' perceptions of a Black claimant with no preceding information (i.e., no exposure) are similar to their perceptions of a claimant when previous exposure is low. Indeed, the findings in both of these conditions are consistent with research on Whites' (relatively low) beliefs about the prevalence of anti-Black bias in society and their derogatory judgments of single minority discrimination claimants (e.g., Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Norton & Sommers, 2011). However, as predicted by the consensus and consistency hypothesis, greater exposure changed Whites' perceptions—significantly decreasing complainer attributions and marginally increasing the perceived prevalence of anti-Black bias.

Study 3 reveals that the context surrounding minority discrimination claims is critical for understanding how White perceivers are likely to respond to minority claimants—previous exposure to multiple discrimination claims by Blacks improves Whites' perceptions of subsequent Black claimants and their beliefs about the prevalence of anti-Black bias in society. The same effects do not emerge for White claimants. White perceivers' judgments of White claimants and of anti-White bias were unaffected by exposure condition. We consider these null effects in the General Discussion below.

8. Study 4

The findings of Studies 1–3 support the consensus and consistency hypothesis when Whites are exposed to Black claimants: Whites derogate a subsequent Black claimant as a complainer less when exposure is high (vs. low). However, the effects of exposure on Whites' perceptions about the prevalence of bias in society have been mixed. In Study 1, participants perceived that anti-White bias was more prevalent when exposure to White discrimination claimants was high (vs. low); in Studies 2 and 3 participants perceived that anti-Black bias was more prevalent when exposure to Black discrimination claimants was high (vs. low). Given these mixed findings, we return to the simpler 2×2 design and conduct a replication to provide another estimate of these effects.

8.1. Study 4 method

8.1.1. Participants & design

Power analysis based on Study 1 effect sizes ($\eta_p^2 = 0.03$) and 80% power revealed an N_{minimum} of 256 participants. 270 self-identified White undergraduate students participated in a 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) between-subjects study for course credit. Data from 16 participants were lost to computer malfunction, leaving a final sample of 254 participants (62% female).

8.1.2. Procedure

Because the sample consisted of undergraduates in a lab setting, we used the same cover story as in Study 1. Immediately following the exposure manipulation, participants completed a single-category implicit association test (SC-IAT) to assess whether exposure to multiple Black (or White) discrimination claimants increased the salience of the “Whites-as-racist” stereotype (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008). We hypothesized that high exposure to Black discrimination experiences might increase Whites' experiences of identity threat by making the “Whites as racist” stereotype more salient. Conversely, White discrimination experiences may not create the same threat because, in those scenarios, White ingroup members are the *targets*, not *perpetrators*, of discrimination. Thus, the SC-IAT was included to test whether high (vs. low) exposure to Black vs. White discrimination experiences differentially activated negative stereotypes about White racists, and whether this activation varied with exposure. No condition effects were obtained on the SC-IAT (all $ps > 0.47$)—suggesting that the “White-racist” stereotype was equally salient across conditions. After the SC-IAT, participants read the target claimant's essay and proceeded to provide their perceptions of the target claimant as a complainer ($\alpha = 0.82$), and their perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black ($\alpha = 0.77$) and anti-White ($\alpha = 0.78$) bias as in previous studies.

8.2. Study 4 results

8.2.1. Perceptions of the target claimant

8.2.1.1. Complainer perceptions. A 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) ANOVA revealed that overall, participants perceived the White claimant ($M = 1.73, SD = 0.64$) as more of a complainer than the Black claimant ($M = 1.47, SD = 0.55$), $F(1, 250) = 13.02, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.05$; the main effect of exposure was not significant, $F(1, 250) = 0.09, p = 0.76, \eta_p^2 = 0.000$; however, the interaction was significant, $F(1, 250) = 4.55, p = 0.03, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

Simple effects tests revealed that Whites perceived the Black claimant as marginally less of a complainer when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 250) = 3.00, p = 0.09, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$. The White claimant was perceived similarly by Whites regardless of exposure condition, $F(1, 250) = 1.66, p = 0.20, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$.

8.2.2. Prevalence of racial bias

8.2.2.1. Anti-Black bias. Among those exposed to discrimination claims by Blacks, Whites perceived that anti-Black bias was more prevalent when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 125) = 12.75, p = 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.09$.

8.2.2.2. Anti-White bias. Among those exposed to discrimination claims by Whites, Whites' perceptions of anti-White bias did not differ by exposure condition, $F(1, 124) = 0.78, p = 0.38, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$.

8.3. Study 4 discussion

Supporting the consensus and consistency hypothesis and replicating the results of the previous studies, Study 4 provides another estimate of the exposure effects. In the intergroup context, greater exposure to Blacks' discrimination claims marginally decreased Whites' derogation of the Black target claimant as a complainer and increased Whites' perceived prevalence of anti-Black bias. In the intragroup context (and similar to Studies 2–3), neither the derogation nor the consensus and consistency hypothesis bore out. Exposure did not affect Whites' perceptions of the White claimant nor the prevalence of bias against Whites.

9. Study 5

Thus far, the present research suggests that previous exposure to people's discrimination claims shapes Whites' perceptions of subsequent

discrimination claimants and the prevalence of societal bias in the *intergroup* context, but not so in the *intragroup* context. Study 5 examined one process by which this intergroup effect may occur. Specifically, participants may perceive greater anti-Black bias in society *because* they are less likely to dismiss and derogate Black claimants when exposure suggests that discrimination is commonly experienced by this group. Indeed, the consensus and consistency hypothesis predicts that information shapes how perceivers judge the validity of a person's experience (Kelley, 1973); thus, exposure may increase the validity of the claimant's experience (resulting in less derogation of the claimant), which may in turn relate to less defensive responding regarding the prevalence of racial bias against the claimants' group. We examine this process in the final study.

9.1. Study 5 method

9.1.1. Participants & design

Power analysis based on Study 1 effect sizes ($\eta_p^2 = 0.03$) and 80% power revealed an N_{minimum} of 256 participants. 228 self-identified White Amazon Mechanical Turk (56% female) workers were paid 40 cents for participation this 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) between-subjects study.

9.1.2. Procedure

As in Study 3, participants were told that the study was about perceiving others' experiences shared on Facebook. Following the exposure manipulation, participants rated the extent to which they perceived the target claimant as a complainer ($\alpha = 0.89$), and provided their perceptions of the prevalence of anti-Black ($\alpha = 0.88$) and anti-White ($\alpha = 0.81$) bias.

9.2. Study 5 results

9.2.1. Perceptions of the target claimant

9.2.1.1. *Complainer perceptions.* Overall, a 2 (Exposure) \times 2 (Claimant Race) ANOVA revealed that participants perceived the target claimant as less of a complainer when exposure was high ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.78$) compared to when it was low ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.68$), $F(1, 224) = 5.72$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$. The main effect of claimant race was not significant, $F(1, 224) = 2.44$, $p = 0.12$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$. The interaction was significant, $F(1, 224) = 5.53$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

Simple effect tests demonstrated that Whites perceived the Black target claimant as less of a complainer when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 224) = 11.44$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$. Exposure did not affect Whites' perceptions of the White target claimant, $F(1, 224) = 0.001$, $p = 0.98$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.000$.

9.2.2. Perceptions of Racial Bias

9.2.2.1. *Anti-Black bias.* Among participants exposed to Black claimants, a marginally significant effect revealed that Whites perceived that anti-Black bias was more prevalent when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 114) = 3.74$, $p = 0.06$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$.

9.2.2.2. *Anti-White bias.* Among participants exposed to White claimants, Whites perceived that anti-White bias was less prevalent when exposure was high than when it was low, $F(1, 110) = 4.44$, $p = 0.04$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$.

9.2.3. Mediation analyses

Mediation analyses using 10,000 bootstrapped resamples (PROCESS Model 4; Hayes, 2013) explored the indirect effect of whether Whites' perception of the target claimant as a complainer mediated the effect of exposure (dummy coded; 0 = low and 1 = high) on Whites' perceptions of bias prevalence.

As previously reported, Whites perceived the Black claimant as less of a complainer when exposure was high (than when it was low). This,

in turn, predicted participants' perceptions of anti-Black bias as more prevalent (indirect effect = 0.28, $SE = 0.10$, 95% CI [0.11, 0.53]). This finding suggests that participants' perceptions of anti-Black bias were influenced in part by their perceptions of the Black claimant's discrimination experience. However, a similar pattern in the *intragroup* context—examining Whites' perceptions of the White claimant and anti-White bias prevalence—did not emerge (indirect effect = -0.0002 , $SE = 0.02$, 95% CI [-0.06 , 0.5]).

The reverse model (that exposure influences Whites' perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black bias, which in turn shapes perceptions of a subsequent Black claimant) is consistent with the theory that people who report greater awareness about the prevalence of racial bias are more likely to detect discrimination (Pinel, 1999); and indeed, this model is also statistically supported: effect = -0.09 , $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI [-0.22 , -0.01]. However, the indirect effect found in the first mediation model reflects the more bottom-up process that our study design afforded—that exposure to others' discrimination experiences shapes perceivers' judgments of subsequent discrimination claimants, which in turn shapes attitudes about bias prevalence against those claimants' group.

9.3. Study 5 discussion

Study 5 replicated the results of the previous studies: when exposure was high, Whites derogated the Black claimant less than when exposure was low; and greater exposure marginally increased Whites' perceptions about the prevalence of anti-Black bias. Mediation analyses indicated that Whites' perceptions of the Black claimant influenced their beliefs about the prevalence of anti-Black bias. In the *intragroup* context, exposure did not influence Whites' perceptions of the White claimant; however, this time, when exposure was high, participants believed that anti-White bias was less prevalent than when exposure was low.

10. Meta-analysis

In five studies with two populations (undergraduates and adult MTurkers) and two different exposure manipulations, we tested whether exposure to multiple discrimination claims influenced Whites' subsequent judgments of a target claimant and their beliefs about the prevalence of racial bias in society. Exposure consistently shaped perceptions of the Black (but not White) claimant as a complainer, yet the effect of exposure on anti-Black and anti-White bias prevalence was relatively inconsistent across studies. Recent calls for meta-analysis highlight the benefit of aggregating estimates across studies to provide a more precise and robust understanding of the findings (Cumming, 2014). Thus, we meta-analyzed the data using the ESCI macro in MS Excel (Cumming, 2012). All studies that we ran are included in this report and in the meta-analysis; thus, it is an unbiased test of all known effects of our exposure manipulations.

Among participants exposed to Black claimants, the meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant effect of exposure on Whites' perceptions of the Black claimant as a complainer ($d = -0.43$; 95% CI [-0.59 , -0.27]). Specifically, Whites perceived the Black claimant as less of a complainer when exposure was high than when exposure was low. Additionally, Whites also perceived that bias against Blacks was more prevalent when exposure was high than when it was low ($d = 0.44$; 95% CI [0.28, 0.60]). Taken together, these results provide strong support for the consensus and consistency hypothesis in the *intergroup* context.

Among participants exposed to White claimants, the meta-analysis revealed a statistically significant effect of exposure on perceptions of the White claimant as a complainer ($d = 0.19$; 95% CI [0.03, 0.36]). Supporting the derogation hypothesis, Whites perceived a subsequent White claimant as more of a complainer when exposure to previous discrimination claims by White individuals was high than when exposure was low. Exposure did not reliably influence Whites' beliefs

about the prevalence of anti-White bias in society ($d = 0.05$; 95% CI $[-0.24, 0.33]$). Thus, the results of the meta-analysis, aggregated across five studies, evidenced some support for the derogation hypothesis in the intragroup context.

11. General discussion

Five studies and a meta-analysis examined whether exposing Whites to multiple discrimination experiences by different individuals would shape their perceptions of a subsequent discrimination claimant and ultimately go on to influence their broader perceptions about the prevalence of bias against that group. We tested competing hypotheses of whether—as suggested by the consensus and consistency principles of Kelley's Covariation Model—exposure to multiple discrimination experiences would mitigate derogation of subsequent claimants and increase the perceived prevalence of bias (the consensus and consistency hypothesis) or, instead, whether such exposure would exacerbate claimant derogation and decrease the perceived prevalence of bias (the derogation hypothesis). The present studies investigated this question in the intergroup context of Whites' perceptions of Black claimants and the intragroup context of Whites' perceptions of White claimants. The studies revealed a combination of marginal and statistically significant findings; a meta-analysis provided a more robust understanding of the effects. The consensus and consistency hypothesis was supported in the intergroup context when Whites were exposed to Black claimants. That is, providing more information about Blacks' subtle discrimination experiences decreased Whites' derogation of subsequent Black claimants and increased the perceived prevalence of anti-Black bias. However, these patterns did not obtain in the intragroup context.

The present research deepens our understanding of the intergroup processes regarding Whites' perceptions of minority discrimination claimants. While single discrimination claimants are derogated and their claims dismissed as invalid (Kaiser, Dyrenforth, & Hagiwara, 2006), we suggest that multiple discrimination claims provide a context of consensus (i.e., multiple individuals from a group) and consistency of experience (regarding subtle/ambiguous incidents) that shapes Whites' subsequent judgments. Whereas one claim provides little information about whether the claimant's experience is representative of others' experiences, multiple claims provide perceivers with a pattern of behavior that becomes the benchmark against which subsequent situations are judged (Chaiken, Liberman, & Eagly, 1989; Kelley, 1973; Todorov, Chaiken, & Henderson, 2002). Until now, research has revealed that perceptions of discrimination claimants are relatively resistant to preceding information about the probability of whether discrimination occurred (e.g., Kaiser & Miller, 2001). However, in those studies, participants learned about the probability of discrimination occurring in the particular instance that they read about. Our research complements those findings by highlighting the role that information about *others'* varied experiences with instances of subtle discrimination (both when brought by multiple claimants and when communicated via a survey/article) can play in shaping perceptions of a *subsequent* individual. Our work indicates that providing greater consensus about how many group members experience discrimination, and greater consistency about the defining features of those subtle discrimination incidents, may be an effective tool for changing the attitudes of those who may otherwise not be as likely to perceive discrimination in minorities' experiences.

These studies also contribute to our understanding of the distinctions between intergroup and intragroup perceptions of discrimination claimants. Although Whites' perceptions of Black claimants followed the consensus and consistency pattern, Whites' perceptions of White discrimination claimants were more consistent with the derogation hypothesis. This finding is consistent with research demonstrating that Whites derogate White discrimination claimants, though not necessarily as complainers. For example, in Blodorn and O'Brien (2013), White perceivers regarded a White person who attributed being denied a job

to discrimination as more prejudiced than a White person who attributed the job denial to unknown causes. In the intragroup context of the present research, exposure may have activated social norms against Whites claiming discrimination, eliciting derogation of the White target claimant. These intragroup norms and their influence on exposure should be investigated in future research.

Taken together, it appears that multiple discrimination claims may be communicating different norms in intergroup and intragroup contexts. In the intergroup context, exposure to multiple discrimination claims by Black individuals (which Whites may be less familiar with; Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2013) seems to shift descriptive norms about the overall prevalence of anti-Black bias. Yet, there are likely factors that moderate these effects. For example, social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and system-justifying beliefs (SJBs; Jost & Hunyady, 2005; O'Brien & Major, 2005) moderate people's reactions toward individual Black discrimination claimants (Kaiser et al., 2006; Unzueta et al., 2014). It is possible that those high in SDO or SJBs may be more resistant to accumulating evidence of bias (that multiple minorities' discrimination claims provide), resulting in derogation following greater exposure. Another possibility is that consensus and consistency information may make salient the unfairness within the system. If so, this may decrease system-justifying beliefs, which may in turn result in more favorable evaluations of Black claimants. Finally, it is possible that it may require even greater exposure than that used in the present research for the consensus and consistency information to change the views of high SDO or SJB perceivers. These future directions could inform how those most motivated to dismiss them perceive minorities' discrimination claims.

Another interesting question for future research is how exposure might shape racial/ethnic minorities' perceptions of White and Black claimants. The present research was motivated by a desire to further understand how Whites—who currently comprise the racial/ethnic majority in the U.S.—perceive claims of bias by racial minorities, especially given research suggesting Whites are less knowledgeable than racial/ethnic minorities about the prevalence of modern, more subtle racism (Nelson et al., 2013). Moreover, a recent national survey by the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI) demonstrated that 75% of Whites have all-White friendship networks (PRRI, 2013); thus, for many Whites, there are few opportunities to learn about Blacks' discrimination experiences. Conversely, racial/ethnic minorities are more likely than Whites to believe that there is still progress to be made toward racial equality (Eibach & Ehrlinger, 2006) and 71% of Black Americans report being the personal target of discriminatory acts (Pew Research Center, 2016); thus, exposure to multiple discrimination claims by racial minorities may not be as novel or surprising for minority perceivers as it is for Whites. Furthermore, multiple claims of discrimination from Whites may be perceived as disingenuous, prompting the derogation patterns evidenced in past research (Blodorn & O'Brien, 2013). Thus, we would predict no effect of exposure on Blacks' perceptions of Black discrimination claimants and patterns supporting the derogation hypothesis for Blacks' perceptions of White discrimination claimants.

The present research is among the first to draw on Kelley's Covariation Model as a theoretical framework to examine how the consensus and consistency principles of person perception apply differently in the intergroup (vs. intragroup) domain. Future work could identify necessary and sufficient elements of consensus and consistency information that influences inter- and intragroup perceptions. For example, a key tenet of Kelley's Covariation Model is that information from different sources communicates consensus and consistency; thus, participants in the present studies were exposed to five different individuals who claimed discrimination. But, what if multiple discrimination claims come from a single individual? This scenario provides perceivers with consistency, but not consensus, information. In that case, perceivers may be more likely to conclude that the individual

was a complainer, which could have negative consequences for how subsequent claimants are judged. Investigations such as these would help identify when increased exposure may be beneficial or backfire against minority and majority claimants.

12. Conclusion

Our work suggests that social movements, like “I, too, am Harvard” and Black Lives Matter, may be effective in changing attitudes because multiple messages by different individuals convey consensus and consistency information. Indeed, recent survey data noted that Whites' attitudes during a period of heightened activism across the country showed a 36% increase in agreement with the statement that “the U.S. needs to continue making changes to give Blacks equal rights with Whites” (Pew Research Center, 2015). Mirroring the findings of our experiments, exposure to minorities' discrimination experiences (in a year marked by activism throughout American cities) seems to be inspiring attitude change among Whites. Thus, as we continue to investigate how Whites perceive and understand minorities' discrimination experiences, it is equally imperative to facilitate more intergroup conversations about discrimination. Though these conversations may, at first, be difficult, the new perspective and information relayed may be crucial to building common ground for Whites' and minorities' attitudes about modern racial bias.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Materials for all experiments are available in the Supplementary materials and online at https://osf.io/h7dnq/?view_only=179bd52b21614bcb9ec732a5c03b728d. Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.001>.

References

- Blodorn, A., & O'Brien, L. T. (2013). Evaluations of White American versus Black American discrimination claimants' political views and prejudicial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*, 211–216.
- Carter, E. R., & Murphy, M. C. (2014). *Intra- and intergroup conversations about experiences with discrimination*. (Unpublished data).
- Carter, E. R., & Murphy, M. C. (2015). Group-based differences in perceptions of racism: What counts, to whom, and why? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*, 269–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12181>.
- Chaiken, S., Liberman, A., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Heuristic and systematic information processing within and beyond the persuasion context. In J. S. Uleman, & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 212–252). New York: Guilford Press.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96*, 608–630.
- Cumming, G. (2012). *Understanding the new statistics: Effect sizes, confidence intervals, and meta-analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Cumming, G. (2014). The new statistics: Why and how. *Psychological Science, 25*, 7–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613504966>.
- Diebels, K. J., & Czopp, A. M. (2011). Complaining about a compliment: Evaluating attributions of positive outcomes to discrimination. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 14*, 217–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2011.01343.x>.
- Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 451–462.
- Eibach, R. P., & Ehrlinger, J. (2006). “Keep your eyes on the prize”: Reference points and racial differences in assessing progress toward equality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 66–77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167205279585>.
- Eliezer, D., & Major, B. (2012). It's not your fault: The social costs of claiming discrimination on behalf of someone else. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*, 487–502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430211432894>.
- Frey, F. E., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). Being seen as individuals versus as group members: Extending research on metaperceptions to intergroup contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 265–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_5.
- Goff, P. A., Steele, C. M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 91–107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.91>.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hewstone, M., & Jaspars, J. (1983). A re-examination of the roles of consensus, consistency and distinctiveness: Kelley's cube revisited. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 22*, 41–50.
- Just, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 260–265.
- Kaiser, C. R., Dyrenforth, P. S., & Hagiwara, N. (2006). Why are attributions to discrimination interpersonally costly? A test of system- and group-justifying motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(11), 1523–1536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167206291475>.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 254–263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>.
- Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist, 28*, 107–128.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom Magazine, 10*–12.
- Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological Science, 24*, 213–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451466>.
- Nook, E. C., Ong, D. C., Morelli, S. A., Mitchell, J. P., & Zaki, J. (2016). Prosocial conformity: Prosocial norms generalize across behavior and empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*, 1045–1062.
- Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*, 215–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691611406922>.
- O'Brien, L. T., & Major, B. (2005). System-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being: The role of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1718–1729.
- Pew Research Center (2015). Across racial lines, more say nation needs to make changes to achieve racial equality. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/files/2015/08/08-05-2015-Race-release.pdf>.
- Pew Research Center (2016). On views of race and inequality, Blacks and Whites are worlds apart. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2016/06/27/on-views-of-race-and-inequality-blacks-and-whites-are-worlds-apart/>.
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of societal stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 114–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.114>.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741–763.
- Public Religion Research Institute (2013). Race and Americans' social networks. Retrieved from <http://publicreligion.org/research/2014/08/analysis-social-network/#.VTmjK61Vikp>.
- Robertson, C., Dewan, S., & Apuzzo, M. (2015). Ferguson became symbol, but bias knows no border. *The New York Times* (March 7th).
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2006). Lay theories about white racists: What constitutes racism (and what doesn't). *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9*, 117–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430206059881>.
- Todorov, A., Chaiken, S., & Henderson, M. D. (2002). The heuristic-systematic model of social information processing. In J. P. Dillard, & M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 195–211). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Unzueta, M. M., Everly, B. A., & Gutiérrez, A. S. (2014). Social dominance orientation moderates reactions to Black and White discrimination claimants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 54*, 81–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.04.005>.
- Wilkins, C. L., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Racial progress as threat to the status hierarchy: Implications for perceptions of anti-White bias. *Psychological Science, 25*, 439–446. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613508412>.