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ABSTRACT

By 2065 Latinos will approximately comprise 25% of the United States’ population (Pew Hispanic Center, 2015). Among this racially diverse ethnic group are increasing numbers of Latinos who identify as White. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 53% of Latinos identified as White alone. Yet little is known about White skin color among Latinos and whether McIntosh’s (1988) discussion of White privilege, including attitudes and beliefs, applies to Latinos. Through use of the Feminist Ecological Model (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002), the sociocultural factors that impact the awareness of White privilege among Latinos were explored. A correlational research design was utilized to examine the existence of White privilege, colorblind attitudes, and internalized racism among Latinos. Results revealed that Latinos who identify as White and whose skin ranges from 1-3 on the NIS did not report benefiting from White Privilege. Additionally, results revealed that Latinos, irrespective of skin color or racial identification, endorse moderate colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS, 2000). High endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes related to higher rates of internalized racism. These findings suggest that there is an urgent need to further explore skin color and racial identity and its ramifications on mental health, educational attainment, and self-concept. Clinicians are encouraged to acknowledge within group differences among Latinos and provide clients with the tools needed to cope with discrimination.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Topic Overview

The United States is diverse and said to be the land of opportunity for all, regardless of background, color, or creed. Despite this belief, the land of opportunity has not always been fair to its inhabitants. Inequalities that have been baked in, yet which have changed over time, include discrimination towards those who are not perceived as White. In the past, this included Irish and Italian immigrants (Ignatiev, 1995). At present, Latinos, who are quite a diverse population, are often seen as non-White by the majority of Americans, the U.S. government, and the U.S. media (Calderón, 1992; Tafoya, 2005; Etzioni, 2006; Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009), and are designated under a single U.S. census category. Although this ethnic group may share a similar language (Spanish) and history of colonization, in most other significant ways the sheer diversity among Latinos far outweights their common characteristics. The colonization of the “New World” by the Spanish resulted in the brutal conquest and rape of Native Americans and African slaves by the European Spaniards. The intermixing of these three groups resulted in a riot of skin colors and wider range of physical characteristics, clearly not a single “race.” In addition, the language and culture of the Spanish, and in some cases the Portuguese, permeated and blended with native and African cultures, creating large ethnic and racial differences across the geography of what is now Central and South America and the Caribbean.

For the purpose of this dissertation, Latino “…refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin
regardless of race” (U.S. Census, 2010). It is important to note, however, that other agencies including the Hispanic Congressional Caucus, Hispanic Society of America, U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, and the United States Department of Labor categorize the Portuguese, or those who can trace their ancestry back to Portugal, as Hispanic/Latino. However, the U.S. Census has not added the Portuguese to the designated Hispanic/Latino category due to Portuguese Americans’ desire to not be categorized under this group (Latino Voices, 2013). Thus, in the United States, the Latino identity is fluid, contingent, dynamic, and contextual.

Although the U.S. Census identifies Latinos as an ethnic group with distinct racial categories, American society views Latinos as a homogenous racial group (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009; Tafoya, 2005). This perception of racial homogeneity has ignored racial diversity among Latinos. For example, Chileans, Argentines, and Cubans often identify themselves as White Latino and adopt the attitudes and privileges of non-Latino Whites (Bonilla-Silva, 2006) including negative attitudes towards darker skinned or Black individuals, and are more likely to live near non-Latino Whites and experience less residential segregation.

Although 53% of Latinos identify their race as White alone (U.S. Census, 2010) little is known about their attitudes towards, or awareness or experiences of Whiteness and White privilege (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014). For example, Latino racial identity research has looked at how Latinos view themselves and their ethnic group in comparison to that of non-Latino Whites (Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001). However, Ferdman’s and Gallegos’ (2001) framework did not take into account the racial identification of the Latinos (i.e., White Latino, Asian Latino, Black Latino, etc.) as well as their skin tone
and how this could impact identity development, including self-awareness of White privilege. If Latinos are otherwise non-White, that is, their physical features do not allow them to pass for White, does White privilege still apply to them if they racially identify as White? Does a White Argentine’s racial identity development differ from an Afro-Caribbean Latino or a multiracial non-White Latino? By grouping this diverse ethnic group into a single category and using the pan-ethnic Latino label, are within group differences being obscured (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016)?

This dissertation proposes that the pan-ethnic label of Latino may not take into account the racial diversity, including diversity in skin tone and racial identification, throughout the Latino community. Specifically, it posits that Latinos who are lighter-skinned or racially identify as White, irrespective of skin color, may be more likely to experience racial privilege, similar to their non-Latino White counterparts. Currently, the preponderance of psychological literature uses the pan-ethnic labels of Hispanic and/or Latino that gloss over within group differences including the diverse experience of Latinos across national, generational, socioeconomic, religious, and racial/skin color lines (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). A number of studies have explored the impacts of colorism among Latinos (Darity, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005; Espino & Franz, 2002; Fernandes & Hojjat, 2010; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009), yet the impact of Latinos’ racial identity and/or skin color on their perceptions of privilege has not been examined with much frequency. For example, Chavez-Dueñas and colleagues (2014) provide a theoretical and historical overview of colorism among Latinos, including an overview of the colorblind legacy of mestizaje “… a strategy to minimize and deny the
racial privilege of lighter skinned and European featured Latinos/as” (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014, p. 4). However, the authors’ theoretical and historical overview did not provide an empirical investigation of perceptions of privilege based on skin color, phenotype, or racial identification. Additionally, the authors did not take into account how Latinos, including lighter skinned Latinos, experience discrimination due to ethnicity, national origin, accentedness, and socioeconomic status. This study explores racial and skin tone diversity in terms of several concepts that have been constructively used to develop new insights into identity and colorism among Latinos, and White privilege and Latinos in the United States. These insights have implications for the field of counseling psychology such as further developing racial identity for lighter skinned or Latinos who racially identify as White, despite their skin color, as well as expanding cross-cultural competencies for counseling Latinos residing in the United States.

**Latinos and Race**

As defined earlier, the term Latino “refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race” (U.S. Census, 2010a, p. 2). Since the 2000 U.S. Census, the Latino community has increased by 43%, indicating that it is one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the U.S. As of 2010, approximately, 16% of individuals residing in the United States are of Latino descent, and of this 16%, 53% identify their race as White alone. The remaining 47% identified their race as Black (2.5%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (1.4%), Asian (0.4%), Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (0.1%), some “other race” (36.7%) and two or more races (6%) (U.S. Census, 2010b).
Although Latinos are racially diverse, they are often thought of as one pan-ethnic/racial group (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). The categorizing of, for instance, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Latin American groups under the term “Latino” or “Hispanic” seems to have arisen from external forces, including the use of the term by the American media, the U.S. Census Bureau and other government agencies, and politicians on the federal level, rather than from any cohesion among the groups themselves (Calderón, 1992).

However, Latinos themselves may use the term to seek political leverage for the group. Although Latinos cannot be considered a homogenous group with a distinct identity, community leaders have popularized the term “Latino” to represent the collective concerns of the Spanish-speaking population in response to common structural conditions in the areas of education, politics, and economics. According to these community leaders, Latinos can be grouped together by their common language, an awareness that they are different from other social groups within the United States, a low standard of living, and a common desire to eliminate the inequalities created for the Spanish-speaking by society at large (Calderón, 1992).

Thus, Latino pan-ethnicity, when found, is situational and highly contingent on political, economic, and social arrangements and hierarchies (Betancur, 1996; Bonilla-Silva, 2004; Denton & Massey, 1989; and Enchautegui, 1997, cited by Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). Situational Latino pan-ethnicity can be traced to two factors: (1) cultural (such as language and religious commonalities) and (2) structural commonalities (such as geography, class, race, discrimination, economic marginalization, and political exclusion). For example, a cultural commonality for the majority of Latinos is the
Spanish language. This commonality among Spanish speaking Latinos (excluding Brazilians who speak Portuguese) allows individuals to bond with one another. An example of a structural commonality is that of race. White Latinos are less likely to live near Black Latinos suggesting that phenotype among Latinos is an important factor in determining financial and social outcomes (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). Situational Latino pan-ethnicity may lead to some level of pan-ethnic identification among members of different Latino subgroups; however differences in structural commonalities (race, ethnicity, class) influence Latino identity development (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). In other words, Latino pan-ethnicity is contextual; therefore, Latino consciousness and solidarity should never be presumed for all the subgroups all the time (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009).

What does the term Latino mean in the United States? Although the U.S. Census treats Latino as an ethnic category, the majority of Americans use Latino to mean race (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). Latinos of European ancestry are lumped into the same category as Latinos of African, Native American, Asian, and Multiracial ancestries. Salsa singer Celia Cruz (who is Black) and politician Marco Rubio (who is White) are both Cubans; yet they share different racial experiences. By assuming that they share the same racial experiences because of their Cuban ancestry minimizes skin color privilege including social and political arrangements that may benefit lighter skinned or White identified Latinos.

Among people who may be seen by others as Latino research studies suggest that group identification is low across different Latino ethnic groups. A publication by the National Research Council reveals "the majority of Hispanic-adults…prefer identity labels linked to their country of origin" (National Research Council, 2006, p.117; Taylor,
Hugo-Lopez, Hamar Martinez, & Velasco, 2012). Nevertheless, there is a public discourse that consistently reinforces the social processes that shape the Latino construct (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009).

“Latinos are not equal nor do they have the same access to institutional urban opportunities” (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009, p. 75). For example, darker skinned Latinos are less likely to be educated, have access to social and economic resources, and are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted, and incarcerated (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Espino & Franz, 2002; Fernandes & Hojjat, 2010; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009). Additionally, Latino men are less likely to marry darker skinned Latinas for fear that their African features may surface in upcoming generations (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016; Comas-Diaz, 1996). The idea of Latino “universality” does actual damage, by negating within-group differences and encouraging colorblindness (the belief modern racial inequality is not a result of racism; rather, it is a result of cultural limitations of minority groups) and inaccurate stereotypes (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). In other words, grouping all Latinos together glosses over within group differences including the impact of skin color, phenotype, and colorism among Latinos (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). Moreover, the pan-ethnicity of Latinos may contribute to the limited preparation for racial bias among Latinos and can be of great detriment to darker skinned Latinas as well as lighter skinned Latinas (Araujo, Dawson, & Quiros, 2014).

It is important to note, that although darker-skinned individuals are more likely to have poorer social outcomes (Espino & Franz, 2002; Fernandes & Hojjat, 2010; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer &
Vazquez-Garcia, 2009), light complexioned people of Color also experience instances of discrimination by both in and out-group members. Colorism, for example, can be used a devise mechanism “…to ridicule, shame, and create divisions between children and adults of different skin color hues” (Ward, Robinson-Wood, & Boadi, 2016, p.14). In a longitudinal study conducted by Landor, Simons, Simons, Brody, Bryant, and colleagues (2013) of nearly 800 African American families, darker skinned children were less likely to receive quality parenting in comparison to their lighter skinned counterparts. Interestingly, Landor and colleagues (2013) also concluded that parents might have internalized gendered colorism as a result displaying higher quality of parenting to their lighter skinned daughters and darker skinned sons. Preferences for lighter skin are also documented within the Latino community, with lighter skin being children perceived as more attractive (Chavez Dueñas et al., 2014). The preference for Whiteness, including the preference for lighter skin and European features (Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009) can result in jealousy and sibling rivalry among siblings of different skin color hues (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). People of Color with lighter skin are often times questioned about their group membership including their ethnic loyalty (Hunter, 2008). For example, a lighter skinned Latina may be thought of as less Latina because of her lighter skin (Quiros & Dawson, 2013). She may find herself trying to prove her Latinaness to members both within and outside of her community. The experiences around colorism, including trying to prove one’s ethnic membership, can be taxing for lighter skinned people of Color and can lead to difficulties in racial and ethnic identification (Gonzales-Taylor & Umaña-Taylor, 2011).
Racism

Racism, in general, is prejudice toward or discrimination against someone or some group because of their assumed race. Within this definition, the term “race” refers to groups of people defined by inherited somatic characteristics, descent relations, and continental origins (Shelby, 2009). It is important to note, however, that the concept of race is a social, not a biological, construction often used to justify the maltreatment of groups of people. For example, during the Spanish Inquisition both the Spaniards and the Portuguese introduced the concept “limpieza de sangre” (cleansing of blood) which purported that Jews, Muslims, and gypsies were genetically inferior based on their ethnicity (Sussman, 2014). This belief of European genetic superiority was then later implemented in the Latin American continent and became the launching board for a racial hierarchy that placed European Whites biologically and culturally superior to all others (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014).

Because Latinos are an ethnic and not a racial group, colorism also plays a role on how individuals are treated by members in and out of their community. Colorism is a form of discrimination by which people are treated differently because of their skin tone or color alone (Marira & Mitra, 2013), regardless of other racial markers. However, the term Latino, in the United States, is typically used as a wider racial and not an ethnic marker (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009) despite the variety of phenotypes among Latinos (Sullivan, 2000). Etzioni (2007) described how the media has used Latino as a racial marker, versus an ethnic marker, pointing out how, when describing the economic status of racial groups in the United States, the term Latino is viewed as a category that excludes the racial categories within the Latino group. The racialization of Latinos has
also led to the idea that Latinos look racially mixed, thus excluding Latinos who do not racially fit this stereotype. For example, a lighter-skinned Dominican woman shared how she is often thought of as White American because she was not darker skinned like the majority of Dominicans (Quiros & Dawson, 2013). Racialization of Latinos is falsely homogeneous, which ignores within group differences based on skin tone and phenotype (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). Moreover, the grouping of Latinos “…may superimpose expectations about racialization experiences on that individual that do not necessarily apply” (Burton, Bonilla-Silva, Ray, Buckelew, & Freeman, 2010, p. 445). For example, in a qualitative study of Latinas’ racial identity, Latina women of diverse nationalities expressed “…ambivalence over their racial identity” (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014, p. 208) given that Latinos’ racial socialization focuses more on ethnic and cultural pride.

Because of these social issues and constructions of the Latino identity in the United States, Latinos can experience both episodes of racism and of colorism. This dissertation explores the relationships between racism and colorism, by looking at colorblind racial attitudes, internalized racism, White privilege, and skin color hue among Latinos in the United States.

For the purpose of this dissertation, *racism* is defined as “a negative value or set of values projected as an essential or non-contingent attribute onto a group whose members are defined through genealogical connection—that is, as sharing some origin—and who are demarcated on the basis of some visible phenotypic features” (Shelby, 2009, p. 130-131). Racism can operate within at least four distinct axes: (1) skin color; (2) visible, physical features other than skin color; (3) cultural attributes; and (4) native
origin (Alcoff, 2009). Studies on the impacts of colorism, defined above, have found that individuals who are darker are more likely to have negative life and health outcomes (Espino & Franz, 2002; Fernandes & Hojjat, 2010; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009).

Racism is not always blatant, and includes more subtle forms of discrimination such as ethnic microaggressions, a covert form of everyday, interpersonal discrimination that is somewhat ambiguous and difficult to recognize, but that sends messages about group status and devaluation that can evoke powerful emotional reactions, and even affect mental health (Pierce, 1988; Sue et al., 2007). Often disguised as innocuous, ethnic microaggressions have induced higher levels of anxiety, anger and stress that may increase victims’ feelings of depression and physical sickness (Huynh, 2012). One such example is simply asking from where someone is, as it denotes noticeable differences, whether physical or auditory, that demarcates someone as foreign (Huynh, 2012).

Because racism, including its more subtle forms, is pervasive in American society, understanding how minorities and dominant group members cope with “subtle discrimination,” also referred to as “modern racism” (Mc Conahay, 1986), “symbolic racism” (Sears &Henry, 2003), and “aversive racism,” is critical in conceptualizing the experience of ethnic and racial minorities (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998).

**White Privilege**

Discussing Whiteness, specifically White privilege, and its relation to racism is a critical line of inquiry toward developing multicultural competencies in the field of counseling psychology. Lensmire, McManiom, Tierny, Lee-Nichols, Casey, Lensmire, and Davis (2013) highlighted McIntosh’s (1988) discussion of White privilege, which
shaped our early understanding of what it is and how it functions in our society. McIntosh described White privilege as “an invisible package of unearned assets which [White people] can count on cashing in each day, but about which [White people were] 'meant' to remain oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 2). McIntosh listed forty-six privileges that she associates with being White; specifically, she named concrete ways in which the social, legal, and economic constructions of race benefits White people in their daily lives, such as seeing Whites represented positively in the media and school curricula, and not targeted or marginalized in social settings because of race (Lensmire et al., 2013).

Understanding White privilege is central to further developing Whites’ self-awareness, worldview, and interactions with others, including people of Color (Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, & Harps-Logan, 2012). Boatright-Horowitz and colleagues (2012) postulate that understanding one’s own White privilege means learning about the experiences of others’ who encounter discrimination or racism in their day to day lives as a result of their designated racial category.

While this enumeration of White privilege to forty-six concrete privileges may be over-simplistic, McIntosh’s discussion highlights one main aspect of the denial of White privilege: it entails the denial (passive as well as active) and minimization of racial privilege, constituting a form of modern day racism, and quietly asserting that discrimination is no longer an issue and that equal opportunity exists for all regardless of skin color or ethnicity (Poteat & Spanierman, 2012). Poteat and Spanierman (2012) found the denial of White privilege to be especially true among right wing authoritarian White participants who value conformity and social dominance. Individuals with this profile
are more likely to believe in a meritocracy-based system and hold negative attitudes toward racial minorities who challenge institutions that perpetuate racial inequality. Although some socially dominant and authoritarian individuals recognize that current societal hierarchies are unfair, this did not decrease endorsement of negative attitudes towards racial minorities (Poteat & Spanierman, 2012). Boatright-Horowitz and colleagues (2012) found a similar trend of minimization of White privilege with college students who believed in a fair and just meritocracy and that race does not impact social, or economic outcomes. McIntosh (1988) also stated that Whites might empathize with people of Color and recognize that discrimination exists and that it is impactful. However, accepting that White privilege is beneficial for Whites may elicit feelings of discomfort, anxiety or guilt (Gillespie, Ashbaugh, & Defiore, 2002). For example, when learning about White privilege, Whites may become defensive and will highlight how they too have not had privilege based on other aspects of their identity (Boatright-Horowitz, et al., 2012). Whites may also position themselves as victimized enabling them “…to avoid responsibility for their racial power and privileges they wield” (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 64).

Fitzgerald conducted an in-depth analysis of the five best selling race and ethnicity textbooks and found that the concept of White privilege was rarely mentioned, and the few that have done so have usually adopted the use of the passive voice in accounting for racism (Fitzgerald, 2012). For example the passive voice is utilized by writers in their discussion of racism is often times found among the historical accounts of oppression against marginalized groups. Fitzgerald (2012) points out how racial history is distorted and the actions of Whites against groups of color go unacknowledged thus,
reinforcing White privilege. This history of racial distortion is especially present among the discussions of racial segregation of racial minorities, the minimization of African Americans hard labor during slavery, infection of Native Americans by Europeans, deportation of Mexicans, and the progress of other groups through “hard work” (Fitzgerald, 2012). By utilizing the passive voice in their discussion of racism in the United States, researchers often fail to implicate the perpetrators of racism; reinforcing the dominant ideology that American society exhibits "racism without racists" (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee and Browne (2000) stated that “color-blind racial attitudes refer to the belief that race should not and does not matter” (p. 60). Because this ideology emphasizes sameness across racial groups, it downplays the influence of racism on the economic, social and personal outcomes for people of Color.

Gallagher (2003) conducted a series of interviews and focus groups among White students across the United States and found that White college students are more likely to embrace post-racial colorblindness and perceive society as race neutral by decoupling past historical practices and social conditions from contemporary racial inequality. Stated differently, “…Whites are able to think about contemporary race relations as a clean slate where the crimes of slavery, Jim Crow, institutional racism, and White privilege have been ended and the racist sins of their grandparents have been erased” (Gallagher, 2003, p. 583). Gallagher (2003) argues that colorblind racial attitudes maintain White privilege by denying the impact of institutional racism on the social and economic standing of people of Color. What is more, Whites who are unaware of their White privilege are more likely to deny the inequities and unfair prejudices that impact people of Color (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001).
Latinos and White Privilege

Up to now, the concept of White privilege among Latinos has not been addressed to any significant degree. The existence of White privilege becomes far more complex when analyzed outside of the traditional White-or-Black vein of racism. Although many scholars have discussed White privilege among Anglo-Saxon Whites (Gordon, 2005; Jensen, 2005; Kivel, 2002; Marraccini & Harps-Logan, 2012; McIntosh, 1988; Pineterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; Tatum, 2002; Tochluk, 2008), very few have discussed whether this phenomenon manifests within the Latino community. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 53% of Latinos identified as White. Darity, Dietrich, and Hamilton (2005) explored Latinos’ pattern of racial identification according to skin color and found that Latinos are more likely to racially identify as White regardless of skin color hue and that race, for Latinos, may be an endogenous variable. Despite Latinos’ racial identification as White, little is known how White privilege attitudes and beliefs manifest themselves among Latinos residing in the United States.

Bonilla-Silva (2002) proposed a three tier racial construct that divides groups of people into three separate categories: White, honorary White, and collective Black. According to his analysis of income, White Latinos, as well as lighter skinned Latinos, are more likely to have social and economic privileges such as earn a higher income and intermarry with non-Latino Whites. Bonilla-Silva (2002) reports how light-skinned Latinos’ “nearly White” status allots them some unearned systemic privileges, and that assimilated White Latinos may even be considered non-Latino White in the future. However, Bonilla-Silva (2003) does not discuss the hues of these light-skinned Latinos, and whether they are also phenotypically European with regards to facial features, hair
texture, and body proportions. He also does not discuss whether these light-skinned Latinos are aware of their skin color privilege, or whether they identify as Latino, either because they are not treated as such, or because it is socially advantageous to ignore their heritage altogether. He also argues that darker skinned Latinos will not benefit from White privilege because of their darker skin color; yet he did not discuss their racial identification. For example, if a darker skinned Latino identifies as White, is he able to benefit from White privilege because of his identification as White, despite his appearance? Is White privilege, for Latinos, solely related to lighter skin color and European phenotype, or can it simply be a mindset?

Ethnic self-identification, as illustrated by the example above, may be influenced by the external social construction of an ethnic group. That is, labels associated with an ethnic group can impact how individuals self-identify. As described earlier, the tendency to use Latino as a racial and not an ethnic marker appears to impact how individuals racially identify. For example, adolescents with lighter skin and European phenotype were more likely to racially identify as non-Latino White than their darker skinned counterparts (Golash-Boza & Darity, 2007). On the other hand, Lopez (2008) found that lighter skinned women, with a weak versus a strong ethnic identity, were more likely to have lower self-esteem than their darker skinned counterparts. In the context of Lopez’s (2008) study, ethnic identity including Spanish fluency and cultural contacts, not skin color alone, is a predictor of self-esteem. Therefore, ethnic and racial identification may be influenced by a number of factors including skin color, ethnic identity, and association with culture.
The present study seeks to address these issues of White privilege, skin color, colorblind racial attitudes, and internalized racism which have not been addressed by researchers who have looked at Latino ethnic self-identification, such as Bonilla-Silva (2003) and many others (Gordon, 2005; Jensen, 2005; Kivel, 2002; Marraccini & Harps-Logan, 2012; McIntosh, 1988; Pineterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; Tatum, 2002; Tochluk, 2008). Specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is to conduct a preliminary investigation of White privilege among lighter skinned or Latinos who identify as White regardless of skin color. Given that Latinos are a diverse racial ethnic group, this dissertation seeks to explore lighter skinned or Latinos who identify as White regardless of skin color, perceptions and attitudes of White privilege. Additionally, this dissertation will explore perceptions of White privilege among darker skinned Latinos who do not identify as White.

A number of psychological studies have explored the effects of skin color on socioeconomic status, education, dating, racial identity development and overall wellbeing among Latinos (Darity, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005; Espino & Franz, 2002; Fernandes & Hojjat, 2010; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009). These studies have demonstrated that, compared with their lighter-skinned counterparts, darker Latinos are more likely to experience negative conditions such as being of a lower socioeconomic status, having less educational attainment, experiencing higher rates of unfair treatment (racial discrimination) and being more likely to be fired. However, little is known about these individuals’ racial and cultural identification. In other words, is light skin color, for Latinos, the best indicator of White privilege? Is identifying as White, regardless of
phenotype or skin color, the only predictor that is necessary for a Latino to benefit from White privilege? Scholars have yet to explore these questions among Latinos who reflect diversity across skin color hue, income, ethnicity, nationality, education, political affiliation, and citizenship.

For purposes of this dissertation, White privilege within the Latino community is defined as the set of unearned advantages afforded to lighter skinned Latinos and Latinos who self-identify as White, regardless of the actual color of their skin or physical phenotype. The primary research question is whether lighter skin or self-identification as White affords Latinos social and political advantages similar to individuals who identify as non-Latino White. Additionally, perspectives of White privilege of darker skinned Latinos who do not identify, as White will also be explored. The White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS) will be used to gather attitudes related to White privilege (Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009). Moreover, other psychometric scales such as the Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scales (Neville et al., 2000), New Immigrant Survey Skin Color Scale (Massey & Martin, 2003), and the Mochihua Tepehuani Scale (Hipolito-Delgado, 2010) will also be used to investigate whether or not colorblind racial attitudes, skin color, and internalized racism impact awareness of White privilege among Latinos. The Feminist Ecological Model (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) is used to explore and understand the factors that contribute to Latinos’ perceptions of White privilege among Latinos. This discussion shall provide a stepping-stone for other researchers and counseling psychologists to further develop the topic by, for instance, examining the racial identity of lighter skinned or Latinos who identify as White in our society.
Theoretical Perspective

Feminist Ecological Model

The Feminist Ecological Model (FEM) (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) will be used as the guiding theoretical perspective for this study. This multilayered theoretical framework will determine which data to collect and analyze. The FEM draws from multiple layers of influence and theories including ecological theory, feminist theory, multicultural theory, liberation, and critical theory. Not only does the FEM provide a detailed and multidimensional explanation of peoples’ functioning in their day to day lives, it also challenges the oppressive and dominant ideologies that permeate the field of psychology and encourages, a challenge to the cycle of injustice that affect stigmatized groups (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002). These varied theories are interconnected and describe individuals’ experiences from different angles and viewpoints. The model looks at external factors and how these interact with each other and the individual. These factors are not ranked in any particular order of importance.

The FEM offers a detailed framework for examining content and gaps in the literature regarding individuals’ lived experiences. Chapter two explores how researchers have addressed the multiple layers that affect Latinos’ experience with White privilege. Other layers of identity such as class and gender are also explored as these play an indispensable role in identity development. Furthermore, the literature review provides information on how skin color intersects with other identities such as gender and social class (Espino & Franz, 2002; Gómez, 2000; Murguia & Saenz, 2002).

Because prejudice and discrimination are still problems in American society, understanding the perpetuation of biases and reducing these race-based disparities is
important in improving social and psychological outcomes for ethnic minorities (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Molina & Wittig, 2006; Nagda, Tropp, & Paluck, 2006; Stewart, et al., 2012). Helms (1995) postulated that understanding one’s White privilege is a critical component of achieving a non-racist White identity. Thus, exploring White privilege awareness among lighter skinned or Latinos who identify as White may help us gain a greater understanding about the systems of inequality and marginalization that impact those who do not possess a privileged identity. The current study will explore Latinos’ perceptions of White privilege, colorblind racial attitudes, and internalized racism. Other variables of interest include gender, education level, and age of arrival for Latinos who migrated to the United States. The study used previously psychometric tools to explore White privilege among Latinos who identify as White or lighter skinned Latinos. Other psychological phenomena (Colorblind racial attitudes, Internalized racism) will also be gathered and analyzed in its relation to White privilege.

As described earlier, the FEM is a complex and multifaceted framework that provides an understanding of the human experience and the factors that shape peoples’ realities. The FEM is made up of four distinct spheres (macro, exo, micro, and individual) and other elements (planetary/climatic conditions and history). Other elements of identity such as age, race, social class, and gender are coordinates in the model and intersect across all of the aforementioned elements.

At the center of the feminist ecological model is the individual. The individual is made up of a number of interactive dimensions. The dimensions of biology, intellect, emotionality, cognition, and spirituality are believed to interact with age, race, gender, and social class. The latter four factors are identified as coordinates and are thought to
have consistent influence across all levels and historical contexts. These coordinates impact individuals’ experiences and the interpretations of their daily lives (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002). Race, class, age, and gender help explain the uneven distribution of resources, power, and the cycle of oppression.

Embedded within the race coordinate of this model is the idea of White privilege (McIntosh, 1988). McIntosh describes the experiences, and to a certain extent processes, that White people face when thinking about their racial status. She described how White people are often unaware that their skin tone allots them unearned privileges as well as the difficulties associated with recognizing these benefits. Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, and Harps-Logan (2012) state that recognizing White privilege means recognizing that individuals of Color may feel resentment towards Whites. This may make it difficult for Whites to engage in an open and honest dialogue about Whiteness and the benefits associated with it. For example, when instructors attempt to situate White privilege class discussions, White students may resist learning about their privilege resulting in negative classroom interactions and harsher student evaluations of instructor competency (Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, & Harps-Logan 2012; Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009; Williams & Evans-Winters, 2005). Therefore, in the context of the Feminist Ecological Model, Whiteness is a coordinate that impacts how Whites perceive and interact with others including those within and outside of their own racial group.

The microsystem is the first ring outside of the individual described in the Feminist Ecological Model. This sphere is made up of lived interactions with others, community, family, friends, peers, and religious organizations. Once again, the coordinates influence how an individual interacts with all of the factors within this
sphere. For example, a Latina may find it difficult to maintain a balance between her family and academic life. She may place more value on her interpersonal relationships. She may miss class because of a family member’s birthday, as a result affecting her academic performance. This example demonstrates how cultural clashes may have a detrimental effect on individuals and their wellbeing within the dominant culture and vice versa. These forces (i.e., lived interactions with others, community, family, friends, peers, and religious organizations) within the first sphere may shape and impact Latinos’ racial identification. Moreover, White privilege attitudes, color-blind attitudes, and internalized racism may also be impacted and shaped by these forces.

The exosystem is the second level of influence of the Feminist Ecological Model. This system is made up of a number of institutions within the regional, state, and national levels. Some of these institutions include “…the legal system, governments, educational systems, religious institutions, professional groups, and academic disciplines” (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002, p. 125). The purpose of these establishments is to oversee societal concerns and address them in a way that they find fit. Unfortunately, individuals who are not part of the dominant group are often times affected in a negative way. Because of the power that these institutions hold, they can further marginalize and oppress minority groups. The next sphere, the macrosystem, is the final sphere outside of the individual. This is made up of a number of global facets. These facets include “…values, worldviews, human rights, global distribution of resources, politics, and the economy” (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002, p. 127). Both of these spheres demonstrate how public policies, institutions, society, as well as specific points of time influence an individual.
Statement of the Problem

This study focuses on the racial identification of Latinos, and particularly on those Latinos who identify as White. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 53% of Latinos identified as White, irrespective of skin color. Yet little is known about the psychological implications of Whiteness and White privilege among Latinos residing in the United States. For many Latinos, the idea of Whiteness, including the racial identification of Latinos as White, may represent unexplored territory. Although the U.S. Census recognizes the various racial differences among Latinos, which the Census considers to be an ethnic group, the term Latino is commonly used as a racial category within society as well as by researchers (Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009). Through the use of the Feminist Ecological Model (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) and the research instruments that have been used to test awareness and attitudes of White privilege among Latinos and its relation to colorblind racial attitudes, skin color, and internalized racism will be analyzed. Other psychosocial factors such as gender, skin color, and age of arrival to the United States are also explored. Historical context, including the development of both las castas (the caste system) and the American pan-ethnic label of Latino, are explored as critical factors that have contributed to and fueled racial colorblindness among Latinos.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to provide a preliminary examination of White privilege among Latinos. This study aims to provide future researchers and clinicians with a greater understanding of self-identification of Whiteness among Latinos while acting as a stepping-stone for potential racial identity models for lighter skinned or those who identify as White, regardless of skin color hue. The Feminist Ecological Model
(Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) and McIntosh’s (1988) essay on White privilege have been selected to provide the theoretical lenses for critically reviewing the existing literature on racial identification among Latinos. Colorblind racial attitudes and internalized racism were explored in relation to Latinos’ awareness of White privilege. Although the main focus of interest in this work is White privilege among Latinos, other relevant factors that comprise self-identification and identity, including gender, socioeconomic status, and skin color were also analyzed. A correlational research design utilizing surveys was used to gather data on White privilege, colorblind racial attitudes, and internalized racism. Counseling psychologists and researchers can use the results from the current study to further develop and explore the topic of White privilege among Latinos. Additionally, the work from this study can be used to further understand the fluidity of race and ethnicity among Latinos. Also, clinical implications for working with Latinos are provided.

**Primary Research Questions**

Latinos are typically viewed in the U.S. as a single pan-racial/ethnic group (Calderón, 1992; Tafoya, 2005; Etzioni, 2006; Sandoval & Ortiz, 2009), yet there are large differences in the lives and social status of individuals within this group that are not yet well understood. One source of these differences is how some Latinos are able to access White privilege in the dominant culture, while others face discrimination in many arenas. Although many Latinos experience oppression and discrimination because of culture, class, immigration, gender, and language acquisition, lighter skinned Latinos with European features may benefit from racial privilege (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014). Latinos, regardless of skin color, in the United States identify as White irrespective of
skin color/hue (Darity, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005). Are Latinos who identify as White, irrespective of color and phenotype, more likely to benefit from White privilege, and if they do benefit from White privilege, are they aware of this privilege? Or is lighter skin color the only predictor of White privilege for Latinos? Research has highlighted the impact of skin color on ethnic identity development and discrimination as well as overall well being and success; however, the concept of White privilege among Latinos has not been examined with much frequency (Espino & Franz, 2002; Gómez, 2000; Gonzales-Backen & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Telzer & Vazquez-Garcia, 2009) and how this impacts race relations, power, and privilege. Therefore, the following research questions will be explored:

**Research Questions**

1. Does endorsement of White privilege attitudes exist among lighter skinned Latinos/as?

2. Are lighter skinned Latinas versus lighter skinned Latinos more likely to endorse White privilege attitudes?

3. Are Latinos, regardless of skin color and racial identification, more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes? Is the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes impacted by age of arrival for immigrant Latinos?

4. Does awareness of White privilege a subscale on the WPAS and colorblind racial attitudes impact whether or not a Latino, regardless of skin color, internalize racism?

5. Is there a difference in internalized racism scores (Mochihua Tepephuani Scale), among Latinos according to skin color as measured by the New
Immigrant Scale? Does the endorsement of White privilege attitudes (WPAS) and colorblind attitudes (CoBRAS) further contribute to the difference in internalized racism scores (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale)?

6. Does racial identification and education level predict White privilege attitudes and internalized racism?

**Definition of Terms**

Throughout this paper a number of terms will be used in order to describe people, their experiences, as well as other sociological/psychological phenomena. These definitions are socially constructed and, as such, biased. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, these terms are used as a guide for the reader and researcher.

*Latino.* As described earlier, the U.S. Census (2010) defines Latino as “…a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.” Although the U.S. Census identifies Latinos as belonging to Spanish speaking culture, it is important to note that in Latin America, Brazilians are also thought of as Latino. Moreover, the U.S. Hispanic Congressional Caucus, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Small Business Administration, as well as the Hispanic Society of America view Brazilians as well as individuals of Portuguese descent as Latino/Hispanic. This demonstrates how context plays a role on how an individual and others identify and categorize people. It is important to note that the term Latino is an *ethnic* category. Often Latinos and non-Latinos use the term Latino to describe individuals’ racial background, as a result fueling the colorblind idea of *mestizaje*. Latinos can be of any racial category including Black, White, Asian, Native
American, and multiracial. For the purpose of this study, the US Census definition of Latino will be used to describe individuals who identify with Spanish speaking countries.

**Race** is a pseudo-biological concept that was created in order to justify the unfair treatment of groups of people based on skin color, skin-deep properties, body shape, or hair texture (Zachery & Faucet, 2005). These categories were created by individuals in power, typically European Whites, and were used to maintain power and control over people of Color. This bias is observed over a number of cultures and has detrimental effects on darker people. In the United States, race has been used as a way to categorize people, which, as a result causes inter- and intra-group division, conflict, coercion, violence, and in its most extreme form, genocide (Kivisito & Croll, 2012).

**Ethnicity.** Many sociologists have attempted to define ethnicity. According to Kivisito and Croll (2012), ethnicity refers to “a form of collective identity based on a subjective belief in a shared culture—which can include a shared language, religion, values, and practices—and a common history” (p. 161). Therefore, Dominicans, regardless of race, are ethnically similar because of their shared history and culture. This is not to say that ethnic differences do not exist among Dominicans; rather, this example highlights within-group differences that can exist in an ethnic group.

**Colorism** is a form of discrimination by which an individual is treated differently because of his or her skin tone (Marira & Mitra, 2013). Individuals can experience this form of discrimination by people within and outside of their own racial group. For example, a Black woman with lighter skin is often perceived by individuals within and outside of her racial group as more beautiful than her darker counterparts (Hill, 2002). Studies have shown how discrimination negatively impacts darker as well as lighter
individuals and their psychological and physiological wellbeing (Gómez, 2000; Hall, 2011; Murguia & Saenz, 2002; Robinson & Ward, 1995).

**Racism** is “a negative value or set of values projected as an essential or non-contingent attribute onto a group whose members are defined through genealogical connection—that is, as sharing some origin—and who are demarcated on the basis of some visible phenotypic features” (Shelby, 2009, p. 130-131). Racism can operate within at least four distinct axes: (1) skin color; (2) visible, physical features other than skin color; (3) cultural attributes; and (4) native origin (Alcoff, 2009).

**White privilege** is defined as “an invisible package of unearned assets which a White person (I) can count on cashing in each day, but about which a White person (I) was “meant” to be oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, guides, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear, and blank checks” (McIntosh, 1988, pp. 1-2).

**Whiteness** is related to power, privilege, and societal advantage; it is a set of cultural practices and beliefs by which White people judge themselves and others, including racial and ethnic minorities (Altman, 2003; Castagno, 2013; Wallis & Singh, 2012). Early in United States history, Whiteness was related to whether or not an individual was able to govern himself or herself: “…originally only people of Anglo-Saxon origin were considered fit to govern themselves” (Altman, 2003, p. 96). Although Whiteness is related to cultural practices, it is typically associated with White skin color and a White racial identity (Hardy & Laszloffy, 1994).

**Colorblindness** is a modern type of racism which asserts that that there are equal opportunities for everyone, racial grouping is natural, cultural beliefs are at the core of
racial disparities, and finally, that racism is no longer an issue (Bonilla-Silva, 2001; Neville, 2011). Similar to the Spanish word, individuals who are colorblind believe that racial differences are insignificant and do not impact social outcomes.

**Internalized racism** refers to when an individual judges himself or herself to be inferior to others based on his or her racial/ethnic background. This phenomenon is observed in people of Color and has detrimental effects on both psychological and physiological wellbeing. Padilla (2001) defined internalized racism as “the turning upon ourselves, our families and our people---the distressed patterns of behavior that result from the racism and oppression of the majority society” (p. 1).

**Summary**

Chapter One introduces the reader to facts and issues regarding Latinos and their racial identification in the United States. A brief overview is also provided of the problem statement, theoretical framework, definitions of the terms used throughout the body of the paper, primary research questions, and primary method of inquiry.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to explore whether or not some Latinos have White privilege similar to what McIntosh described in her 1988 account, *White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack*, and how this affects relations within the Latino population, and relations between lighter skinned Latinos or White-identifying Latinos, regardless of skin color hue, and the dominant White culture in the United States. This chapter will highlight the following concepts: historical accounts of race in Latin America and in the United States, racial identification among Latinos, theories regarding White privilege among non-Latino Whites, racial colorblindness, gender, racism, colorism, and internalized racism play a role on Latinos’ racial identification including the awareness or lack thereof White privilege. The Feminist Ecological Model (Ballou, Wagner, & Matsumoto, 2002) will be used as the guiding theory to explore how factors such as racial identification and skin tone contribute to perceptions of White privilege among Latinos.

Race in Latin America

In his poem “Angelitos Negros,” Andrés Eloy Blanco, a White Venezuelan, wrote:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si queda un pintor de santos,} & \quad \text{If there is a painter of saints} \\
\text{si queda un pintor de cielos,} & \quad \text{if there is a painter of the heavens} \\
\text{que haga el cielo de mi tierra,} & \quad \text{he can do the heavens of my land} \\
\text{con los tonos de mi pueblo,} & \quad \text{with the [skin] tones of my people} \\
\text{con su ángel de perla fina,} & \quad \text{with its rich angel}
\end{align*}
\]
con su ángel de medio pelo, with its poor angel
con sus ángeles catires, with its blonde angels
con sus ángeles morenos, with its tan/brunette angels
con sus angelitos blancos, with its little White angels
con sus angelitos indios, with its little Indian (native) angels
con sus angelitos negros with its little Black angels

In this excerpt, Blanco describes the internalized racism that exists in Venezuela.

By describing church painters’ tendencies to ignore the racial diversity that exists within Latin America, he shows how internalized racism affects Venezuelans and their perceptions on beauty and holiness. His poem highlights how Venezuelans can be of any racial background, a diversity that exists across other Latin American countries as well. “Angelitos Negros” demonstrates how Latinos are an ethnic, not a racial group with diversity across skin color and race.

According to social constructionists, race is a pseudo-biological concept that was created in order to justify the unfair treatment of groups of people based on skin color, skin-deep properties, body shape, or hair texture (Machery & Faucher, 2005). These categories were created by individuals in power, typically European Whites, and were used to maintain power and control over people of Color. This bias is observed over a number of cultures and has detrimental effects on darker people. In Latin America, definitions of Whiteness and color vary from the North American construct (Telles & Flores, 2013). For example, the North American Anglo-Saxon definition of Whiteness has been more rigid and less inclusive than that of the Ibero-Caribbean (countries colonized by the Portuguese and Spanish) definition (England, 2009). The Iberians
(Portuguese and Spanish) have been more likely to observe a continuum of racial mixing, with more fluid definitions of race (England, 2010). Nonetheless, both have regarded European/White as better and ideal, and darker-skinned individuals have been treated as inferior and as second-class citizens. Moreover, darker Latinos have been more likely and continue to emphasize and value their Iberian ancestry (Montalvo & Codina, 2001).

The brutal conquest of the Latin American countries resulted in the deaths and enslavement of indigenous peoples (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014; Liv-Bacci, 2008; Soler Castillo & Pardo Abril, 2009). During the Latin American colonial period (15th to 19th centuries), the Spaniards constructed “las castas,” which means the caste system (Montalvo & Codina, 2001). Las castas was a White, male-dominated racially stratified system that ensured the unfair treatment of darker skinned people. The Spanish Conquistadores along with the Portuguese viewed the caste system as a way to dominate and oppress the indigenous and African slaves. Las castas ensured the free labor of indigenous and African people. In addition, by imposing a White-dominated racial system, the Europeans were able to conserve and dictate their cultural beliefs as well as demean non-White traditions and customs (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). The new world became a place where Europeans flourished while the dark-other suffered.

Las castas is also known as the Latin American Social Caste Pyramid (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). The hierarchical caste system was as follows: Peninsulares, Criollos, Mestizos, Mulatos, Zambos, Indios, and Negros. Both the Peninsulares and Criollos shared Spanish blood, with the latter being born in Latin America. Although these two groups shared similar roots, the Spanish-born Peninsulares held higher-level political positions and had more power and privilege than the Criollos (Buckman, 2014).
Despite this difference, these two groups together had more political, social, and economic power than the indigenous and African people (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014; Ogbu, 1994; Organista, 2007a; Soler Castillo & Pardo Abril, 2009). For example, Venezuelan liberator, Simón Bolívar, was able to lead the Latin American revolution because of his privileged status as a White Criollo.

Below the Spaniards were the racially mixed mestizos, mulatos, and zambos. Mestizos were of European and Indigenous ancestries, mulatos were of European and Black ancestries, while zambos were of indigenous and Black ancestries. Individuals who were of mixed European descent had more power and privilege over non-mixed Native or Black people. This caste system was formally used in the 17th and 19th centuries during the colonial era; however, it remains a strong social construct throughout Latin America in the present day.

Because of the Spanish descendants’ desire to promote their European culture and Whiteness in Latin America, they engaged in practices, which favored individuals of European descent and shunned darker skinned non-White individuals, specifically those of Indigenous and African descent. For example, the Spaniards encouraged “blanqueamiento” (Whitening) between non-White individuals and Whites through intermarriage with lighter individuals (Hall, 2011; Montalvo & Codina, 2001). The Spanish believed that they could “Whiten” the Latin American population and dilute Indigenous and African roots through intermarriage with Whites with the hope that the indigenous and African cultures would permanently disappear from Latin American culture. Non-White Latinos later adapted this belief and practice of marrying lighter skinned partners in order to appear like the Spaniards. For example, indigenous people
were forced to adopt Spanish cultural norms as their own, including beliefs about White racial superiority and practices that were transmitted generationally among the mixed Spanish and Indigenous peoples (Garcia-Martinez, 2010; Liv-Bacci, 2008; Soler Castillo & Pardo Abril, 2009). The practice of marrying lighter skinned partners allowed individuals to hide their African or Amerindian bloodlines and produce lighter offspring (Montalvo & Codina, 2001). Individuals of African descent were less preferred because their traits were more likely to manifest itself in later generations (Comas-Díaz, 1994). By appearing like the Spaniards, “individuals strove for acceptance and higher status and to distance themselves from the rest” (Montalvo & Codina, 2001, p. 324).

The White Spanish elites believed that intermarriage with White individuals would “mejorar la raza” (improve the race) and dilute the African and Indigenous genes from Latin American people and society (Castellanos Guerrero, Gomez Izquierdo, & Pineda, 2009; Soler Castillo & Pardo Abril, 2009). The strong preference for Whiteness permeates Latin American society (Darity, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005) and it is associated with beauty, status, and power (Telles & Flores, 2013). The Spanish believed that intermarriage with lighter skinned individuals would eventually erase all traces of Indigenous and African customs thus promoting a Spanish dominated society where the White elite flourished and the dark other suffered. The belief of “mejorar la raza” led to the “Whitening policies” which were supported by the Latin American governments (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). As a result, European emigration as well as the shipment of White prostitutes to heavily populated indigenous and African areas were encouraged by the government in Latin America (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). Venezuelan citizens, for example, hoped to dilute their darker non-White ancestry by mixing with Whites as
much as possible (Wright, 1990). Because of this desire Whiten their ancestry, Venezuela became home to a number of European immigrants from Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, German, French, and English ancestries. In countries like Argentina and Costa Rica the preference for White skin is so strong that people strived to Whiten out any African or Indigenous roots (Telles & Flores, 2013). Encouraging intermarriage, the Spanish promoted and implemented the ideology of *mestizaje* deemed that everyone, regardless of race or ethnicity, was of a mixed, multiracial descent (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014; Soler Castillo & Pardo Abril, 2009). For individuals of African and indigenous descent, subscribing to the ideology of *mestizaje* was their way of regaining their humanity and rejecting the racial stratification system established by the Spanish which deemed them inferior (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). This system of ideas and ideals led Vicente Guerrero, an Afro-descendant and second president of Mexico, to eliminate racial categories from Mexico’s national census prompting a colorblind racial society (Chavez et. al, 2014). As a result of this political and social movement, individuals of Spanish, African, and Amerindian descent subscribed to this idea of colorblindness, believing that it would erase inequality.

Unfortunately, this color-blind attitude minimized recognition, and even awareness, by lighter-skinned Latinos of the effects of oppression and discrimination on darker-skinned Latinos (Montalvo & Codina, 2001; Chavez et al., 2001). The legacy of *mestizaje* denied the racial privilege of lighter and Spanish-looking Latinos (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). Negative stereotypes about indigenous and African people were still present despite the indoctrination of *mestizaje* in Latin American society (Soler & Castillo & Pardo, 2009). Moreover, Afro-descendants and indigenous peoples were and
are still more likely to suffer disproportionately from poverty and lack of resources such as education and health care (Hooker, 2005). Latinos who are currently residing in the United States may view race in a similar fashion, and thus desire a White identity. Because of these historical factors and the legacy of *mestizaje*, lighter Latinos may believe that their racial experience is similar to that of a darker skinned Latino.

**Latinos in the United States**

By the year 2065 it is predicted that approximately 24% of the population will be Latino (Pew Hispanic, 2015). The changing face of America demonstrates how ethnic minorities will soon become the majority and outnumber non-Latino Whites. Despite this predicted increase of Latinos in the United States, their racial diversity is rarely discussed and discussed in the psychological literature (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). In other words, researchers have not tried to predict if the one in four Latinos in the United States will identify as White, Native American, Black, Asian, or Multiracial ancestry. Because Latinos are a diverse ethnic group, exploring the impact of Whiteness on inequality is of great importance in addressing issues related to prejudice, discrimination, and racism in American society.

Although a great deal of research has been conducted on the detrimental effects of racism, scholars have given little attention to identifying the effects of privilege (Hastie & Rimmington, 2014). Individuals who possess privileged identities are less likely to be aware of their privilege and how it affects those who do not have access to such advantages (Hastie & Rimmington, 2014). White Latinos, because of their privileged identity, may be less aware of how their White skin has allotted them a number of “uneearned assets” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1-2). For example, lighter skinned or White-identified Latinos are
more likely to possess professional versus menial, labor-intensive jobs (Bonilla-Silva, 2002). Pratto and Stewart (2012) coined the term “half-blindedness of privilege” which explains how Whites are less likely to acknowledge their privilege if they have other disadvantaged identities. As described earlier, Latinos may experience half-blindedness of privilege because consciousness of their ethnic minority status blinds them to the privileges their Whiteness endows.

The racial identification of Latinos in the United States has been characterized by much controversy and debate. Sanchez (2002) describes how young Latinos have difficulties choosing a racial category when describing themselves (see also Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2002). According to Sanchez (2002), racial identification can vary even within a family. For example, brothers and sisters sharing the same two biological parents may racially identify themselves based on skin color rather than on racial ancestry. Thus, a lighter skinned Latina may identify her race as White while her darker skinned brother may identify his race as Native American and White.

Darity, Dietrich, and Hamilton (2005) highlight Latinos’ tendencies to avoid identification with Blackness and to embrace definitions of Whiteness. Their analysis found social and racial identification may vary according to self-classification of skin color. The authors conclude that Latinos who are lighter in skin color may be more likely to benefit from Whiteness and be considered White in ways that African Americans can not. However, it is important to note that for non-multipractal Latinos this difficulty to racially identify may come from the Latin American ideal of mestizaje (Chavez-Dueñas et al., 2014). Mestizaje, as described earlier, postulates that all Latinos, regardless of their
background, are racially mixed. The idea of *mestizaje* may impact how all Latinos view their racial self-classification.

The 19th century brought a number of changes to Latin America and the United States. The Monroe Doctrine of 1820, the Texas Rebellion of 1836, the Mexican American war of 1848-1850 and the Spanish American War of 1898 increased the United States’ influence in Mexico, Cuba, and Puerto Rico (Sanchez, 2002; Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2002). As a result of this influence, Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans were the first groups of Latinos to settle in the United States. Other events in the 20th century that increased Latino immigration to the United States included Mexican emigration to the United States due to economic hardships in Mexico, Cuban refugees fleeing the repressive regime of Fidel Castro, and finally, the granting of U.S. citizenship status for Puerto Ricans (Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2002). As a result, Latinos have been participants in American society for generations. Yet Latinos have reported more discrimination than their European and Asian counterparts (Healey & O’Brien, 2015).

Skin color in many circumstances overrides common Latino ethnicity in self-identification and social status. Grillo (2000), in his memoir of Cubans residing in the United States, describes how Black Cubans and White Cubans (during the Castro revolution) were less likely to intermingle and form relationships with one another because of their racial differences. Black Cubans, similar to non-Latino Blacks in the United States, experienced episodes of discrimination based on their skin color. Grillo (2000) goes on to state that, “…Black Cubans did not share recreational activities with White Cubans. They were not hired as clerks, or even as menial help in the restaurants” (p. 9). Grillo’s (2000) memoir describes how Black Cubans were more likely to identify
with Black culture and not with their Latino ancestry. This tendency to identify with their Blackness was likely influenced by U.S. discriminatory laws and because of stereotypes of Latinos’ phenotypic appearance. Cepeda (2013) found that Dominicans, by contrast, are less likely to identify with their Black heritage and more likely to deny their Blackness although 90% of the Dominican population is made up of mulattoes and Black people (Torres-Saillant, 2010). Dominicans, for example, are more likely to embrace the Eurocentric definition of Dominicanness and have partaken in activities to minimize the influence of African heritage in their national culture (Torres-Saillant, 2010).

White Latinos’ racial experiences and identification are also influenced by Latin America’s and the United States’ definition of Whiteness. Sue and Sue (2008) conducted interviews with Whites and their experience related to Whiteness. They found that the majority of participants responded to the questions about their Whiteness with hostility demonstrating a limited understanding of their Whiteness (Malott & Paone, 2011). For example Sue (2004) concluded that Whites, who are uncomfortable discussing their Whiteness and White privilege, will often times deny the importance of racial differences in their social standing and will often make statements such as “we are all Americans” when discussing their White identity. As Sue and Sue (2008) suggest, European Whites have difficulties associating with their Whiteness and talking about their White privilege because of the negative feelings that it elicits prompting them to deny cultural differences and focus on sameness. Sue and Sue propose that Whites’ hesitation to racially identify or talk about their Whiteness safeguards their White privilege and denies racial discrimination. Because Whiteness is invisible, “…White privilege is seen as a source of strength, and it provides Euro Americans with the permission to deny its existence and
use it to treat persons of color unfairly” (Sue, 2004, p. 764). Similarly, White Latinos, similar to non-Latino Whites, may also have difficulties talking about their skin color privilege because of the negative feelings that it elicits (i.e., guilt, shame, etc.).

**Latinos’ Racial Identification in the United States.** As noted earlier, Latinos are one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States. Because of this rapid increase in the Latino population, it is important to explore certain aspects of their identity, including their racial identification. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, 53% of Latinos identified their race as White alone. Despite this number, the majority of Latinos do not feel that the United States’ definitions of race fit them well (Rodriguez, 2000, as cited by Frank, Akresh, & Lu, 2010). This feeling may come from an interaction between Latin America’s and the United States’ definition of race. For example, Tafoya’s (2005) “Shades of Belonging: Latinos and Racial Identity” stated that United States’ policies on the federal level, as well as social scientists, do not view Latinos as a racial group. Latinos are viewed as an ethnic group and can be of any racial background, including of a multiracial background. Dariety, Dietrich, and Hamilton (2005) explored Latinos’ racial identification by skin color and rating by interviewers. Latinos, including individuals with dark and very dark skin, were likely to racially identify as White (Dariety, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005). During the 1880-1940, lighter skinned African Americans with Eurocentric features identified and passed for White as it “….was positively correlated with social and political-economics for being White” (Nix & Qian, 2015, p. 37). Arguably, Latinos’ racial self-identification may be influenced by a number of sociopolitical factors such as racism on the personal and institutional level. Exploring
the intersection of race and ethnicity for Latinos who identify as White may be beneficial in understanding Latinos’ view on race.

Frank, Akresh, and Lu (2010) reported that racial identification, for Latinos, is dependent on a number of demographic variables such as country of origin, marital status, acculturation, and socioeconomic status. Tafoya (2005) explored racial identification among Latinos and concluded that Latinos who identified as White had greater educational attainment, income, and higher rates of assimilation. As a Mexican-American woman from Texas stated, “They call Hispanic people brown, right? But we are White…Ignorance is the only thing that would cause anybody to check anything else but White, because that’s what we are…There is no such thing as brown…We’ve been here too long. We’re just American” (Dowling, 2002, p. 92).

This quote demonstrates that Latinos who have a stronger American identity may be more likely to identify as White, regardless of their racial background or skin color. Also, it can be an example of how internalized racism may impact ethnic minorities. In other words, they may be more likely to align with Whiteness because of the societal power that it allots. Montalvo and Codina (2001) described this similar phenomenon in Latin America as blanqueamiento (Whitening). Latinos of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to identify as White since Whiteness is associated with power and privilege and vice versa (Telles & Flores, 2013). Therefore, Latinos’ current racial identification may be influenced by Latin America and America’s cultural and social preference for Whiteness.
Other studies have found that racial self-identification appears to impact life outcomes. As demonstrated in Frank, Akresh, and Lu (2010), Latinos who identify as Black are more likely to suffer from health problems such as hypertension, experience higher rates of discriminatory acts such as segregation, and have lower incomes (Alba, Logan, & Stults, 2000; Borrell, 2005; Borrell, 2006; Borrell & Crawford, 2006; Denton & Massey, 1989). Frank and colleagues (2010) conducted an analysis of the data from the New Immigrant Survey (2003) and investigated trends in Latinos’ racial identification and life outcomes of Latinos according to skin color and racial identification. Latinos who are of Cuban and South American descent are more likely to identify as White while their Dominican counterparts are less likely to racially identify as Black and are more likely to not identify with the any U.S. Census racial categories (Frank, Akresh, & Lu, 2010). Latinos who identify as White are also more likely to have lighter skin. However, Latinos who had darker skin, but were from a higher socioeconomic status, were not married, and who spoke English fluently were less likely to choose a racial identity suggesting that these individuals are less likely to choose a racial identity that does not describe them well or an identity that is stigmatized (Frank, Akresh, & Lu, 2010). It is important to note, however, that skin color, not racial identification, is a strong predictor of economic success with darker skinned individuals earning less than their lighter skinned compatriots. These findings demonstrate how racial identification, especially in the case of darker Latinos, may be influenced by historical factors including mestizaje and stigma associated with certain racial categories.
White Privilege

As noted above, McIntosh (1988) first defined White privilege as “an invisible package of unearned assets which a White person (I) can count on cashing in each day, but about which a White person (I) was “meant” to be oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, guides, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear, and blank checks” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1-2). Throughout her account, McIntosh describes the experiences, and to a certain extent processes, that Whites face when thinking about their racial status. She described how Whites are unaware that their skin tone allots them unearned privileges and the difficulties associated with recognizing these benefits. Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, and Harps-Logan (2012) state that recognizing White privilege means recognizing individuals of color may feel resentment towards Whites. This may make it difficult for Whites to engage in an open and honest dialogue about White privilege. For example, studies have shown that White students may resist learning about their privilege, and, as a result, may influence classroom interactions and student evaluations of instructor competency (Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini, & Harps-Logan, 2012; Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009; Williams & Evans-Winters, 2005).

Jane Elliot’s (2014) brown eyes, blue eyes exercise demonstrates this unawareness and resistance towards White privilege. During this classroom exercise, White students were placed in a situation in which they became part of a minority group. Students were given a taste of the discrimination and prejudicial treatment that minorities encounter daily. Some Whites found it difficult to accept their minority status and the maltreatment associated with being a person of color. In other words, White students had
a difficult time accepting their minority status and reacted with disbelief, surprise, anger, and disagreement. The students had a difficult time believing that race was associated with social inequality and being treated unfairly. The brown eyes, blue eyes exercise commonly elicits a number of other reactions including fear, guilt, shame, and anger (Goodman, 2001; Gordon, 2005; Jensen, 2005; Kivel, 2002; McIntosh, 1988; Pineterits et al., 2009; Tatum, 2002; Tochluk, 2008). For example, in Elliot’s (2014) classroom exercise in which females had to take on the role of lower-status students, one of the female students reacted with fear and anger. Specifically, this White female student stated that the unfair treatment of people of Color is not associated with race. The student’s reaction and minimization of racism demonstrated how Whites often feel when discussing their privilege in a racially stratified society. Moreover, it highlighted how an individual may be part of a disadvantaged group (in this case gender) and still have a difficult time recognizing how race plays a role in privilege.

In Pineterits et al. (2009), Neville and Spanierman (2001) discuss the affective dimension of White privilege and conclude that apprehension or fear might be associated with the loss of resources, power, and race-based privileges. Whites may fear that discussing or recognizing these social inequalities may interfere with their own well-being. Recognizing and subsequently undermining White privilege may inevitably affect Whites’ livelihood and to certain extent, future success. Sue and Sue (2008) found that Whites, regardless of ethnic background, find it difficult to discuss their Whiteness and their privilege. They also react negatively to being labeled as “White,” negate how Whiteness affects their lives, and seem to believe that they are unjustifiably classified as
bigoted by the virtue of being White. Some of the examples provided in their research are filled with anger, frustration, and apprehension.

On the other hand, other authors argue that the recognition of White privilege is needed in order to decrease racist beliefs. For example, Powel and colleagues (2005) found that awareness of White privilege reduced racist beliefs about African Americans, suggesting that awareness may be important in decreasing racist attitudes towards minority groups. Leach, Iyer, and Pederson (2006) believe that negative feelings associated with White privilege may motivate Whites to fight societal racism (see also Pineterits et al., 2009). However, this is dependent on their awareness of their unearned privileges at the expense of people of Color (Pineterits, et al., 2009).

Although Helms’ (1995) racial identity model may help explain the cognitive dimension of White racial identity, it does not explore the various dimensions of White privilege. Pineterits and colleagues (2009) concluded that awareness of White privilege consists of affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions. These dimensions consist of four distinct, yet related, constructs. They are: (1) willingness to confront White privilege, (2) anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, (3) White privilege awareness, and (4) White privilege remorse. These constructs facilitate a greater comprehension towards racial attitudes and encourage the development of a nonracist and multicultural identity. Because Latinos are a racially diverse group, it may be useful to understand if White privilege exists within part of this ethnic group and whether or not it plays a role in their interpersonal interactions, self and worldview.
Whiteness

The main purpose of this study is to explore whether or not some Latinos have White privilege similar to what McIntosh described in her 1988 account, White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. Because White privilege among Latinos is the study’s main focus, it is important to explore the idea of Whiteness and its role in American society. A number of scholars have described how Whiteness is related to power, privilege, societal advantage, and how it is a set of cultural practices and beliefs by which Whites judge themselves and others, including racial and ethnic minorities (Altman, 2003; Castagno, 2013; Wallis & Singh, 2012). Simply put, Whiteness is a primary standard by which people are judged and treated.

The ideology of Whiteness justifies Whites’ unfair dominance over groups of color and maintains systems of power, privilege, and oppression (Castagno, 2013). Economically, Whiteness operates as a racial standard that provides advantages to White individuals (Lee, 2004). Because Whiteness is seen as the norm, people who deviate from this are more likely to suffer negative economic outcomes. Lee (2004) argues that Whiteness encompasses a number of linguistic, cultural, and behavioral dimensions. As such, employers are more likely to hire White individuals with the assumption that they are more likely to interact appropriately with other White employees, customers, etc. If they do hire individuals of color, they are “…well advised not to try to stand out by emphasizing their racial differences” (Lee, p. 1271, 2004). Moreover, Whiteness is related to skin color and physical characteristics that influence access to social privilege and power (Hardy & Laszloffy, 1994). People with Eurocentric features and lighter skin color may have unearned societal privileges based on their physical appearance. Also,
people who identify as White may be more likely to benefit from certain societal
privileges because of their identification with Whiteness.

Arab Americans provide an example of intersectionality between ethnicity and
race. Arab Americans, a diverse ethnic group, are considered part of the White U.S. racial
category (U.S. Census, 2010). Yet Arabs vary widely in skin color, and Arabs who
identify as non-White because of their darker skin color, associate with their ethnicity and
Islam are more likely to suffer from discrimination. (Abdulrahim, James, Yamout, &
Baker, 2012). Although Arabs who racially identify as White are less likely to
experience episodes of discrimination, they are more negatively affected by
discrimination when it does occur (Abdulrahim, James, Yamout, & Baker, 2012).
Therefore, shades of Whiteness (i.e., people who are perceived to be Whiter than others)
can play a role in privilege (Wallis & Singh, 2012). Arguably, “…White people can
choose whether culture or other differences seem more relevant than color. The privilege
of being able to choose which differences to highlight in the multiple layers of identity
may reflect the powerful positioning of Whites as the norm” (Wallis & Singh, 2012 p.
49). Thus, when discussing White privilege for Latinos, it is important to keep in mind
the choices available to White Latinos that are not available to non-White Latinos.

Whiteness has its historical roots in many parts of the colonized Western World,
including the United States. Ignatiev (1995) describes how the Irish became White after
moving to the United States during the eighteenth century. Prior to aligning with the
White culture and subscribing to the ideology of Whiteness, the Irish were mistreated,
paid less, and lived in impoverished cities (Ignatiev, 1995). They were more likely to
relate to the struggle of the Black slaves because of their own history with oppression.
Despite this, over time, the Irish adopted a White identity, which allotted them a number of unearned privileges including: job opportunities, voting rights, be in a jury, and live freely. Other groups of immigrants followed a similar trajectory suggesting that the definition of Whiteness is fluid and constantly changing. In sum, Whiteness is a multifaceted concept and influences how people discuss race. It also shapes how they view themselves and others, and how people are judged and treated.

**Colorblindness**

Recent research in social beliefs about race and racism has proposed the concept of colorblindness. Colorblindness, similar to multiculturalism, was proposed as an assertion that racism has decreased and explains this as a result of a growing social focus on things people have in common (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). This theory suggests that racial/ethnic membership should not affect people’s life outcomes in any way, whether positive or negative (Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010; Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009). An example of a colorblind belief is that race is no longer an issue and that people, regardless of their background, are treated fairly, have the same opportunities, and access to resources. A number of studies have indicated that majority group members are more likely to endorse colorblindness and believe that adopting such a perspective will increase positive intergroup relations (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007).

Apfelbaum, Sommers, and Norton (2008) conducted a series of four experiments where White participants’ strategic colorblindness and avoidance of race related topics were explored. In the first experiment, White undergraduate students (n = 101) were paired with a White or Black confederate and were asked to complete a photo
identification task. The role of the participant and the confederate varied according to the conditions they were placed in (i.e., control, race acknowledged, or colorblind). For example, if the Black or White confederate was given the role of the questioner, she would ask yes or no questions regarding the appearance of the individuals in the photo identification task (i.e., if the individuals in the photo identification task were either Black or White). After completing the tasks, the participants were asked about demographics as well questions regarding the study’s stimuli, their partner, and nature of the study (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). Participants were asked to complete the 10-item Internal and External Motivations to Respond Without Prejudice Scales (Plant & Devine, 1998). The interactions between participant and confederate were visually recorded and coded according to the participants’ non-verbal behaviors. The results indicated that colorblind strategies (avoidance of race) occurred the most according to the norm established by the confederate (i.e., if the condition was colorblind). Avoidance of identifying the target photos’ race was especially apparent when the White participants were paired with a Black confederate, especially in the colorblind condition. Two White women who were blind to the study’s purpose coded the White participants’ non-verbal behaviors. White participants were rated as less friendly towards the Black confederates, particularly when placed in the colorblind condition. Results seem to indicate that White participants’ tendency to avoid race when paired with a Black confederate produced less friendly interactions.

The second experiment explored the link between non-verbal friendliness and avoidance of discussing race. Similar to the first experiment, White participants (n = 48) were paired with a White or Black confederate and were asked to complete the photo
task. However, in this experiment the White participants asked questions versus answering them. Upon completing the photo task, the participants were asked to complete a brief anxiety measure (Plant & Devine, 2003) and the Stroop color-naming task. Results indicated that the participants were less likely to ask about the target photo’s race when paired with a Black as opposed to a White confederate \( t(45) = 2.13, p = .04 \).

Additionally, White participants who were paired with a Black confederate and who avoided mentioning race were more likely to display non-verbal friendly behaviors. Performance on the Stroop test indicated that White participants who used colorblind strategies decreased participants’ exhibitory control, which in turn led to non-friendly, non-verbal behaviors.

The third and fourth experiments both Black \( n = 34 \) and White \( n = 40 \) participants were asked to observe and rate 6 video clips of White actors’ in two conditions (colorblind condition or race acknowledge condition). Participants were asked to complete the 10-item Internal and External Motivations to Respond Without Prejudice Scales (Plant & Devine, 1998) meanwhile Black participants were given he Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997). Results indicated that White participants’ higher scores on the EMS predicted warmer attitudes towards actors who were in the colorblind conditions versus those who were in the race acknowledged condition. Additionally, White participants were more likely to rate colorblind behaviors (i.e., not acknowledging differences in race) as less prejudiced. Conversely, the Black participants were more likely to view colorblind behaviors as prejudiced. These findings seem to suggest that Whites, who want to appear less biased and implement colorblind strategies, are more likely to be
perceived as biased by their African American counterparts. Experiment 4 consisted of 33 Black participants and 45 White participants. Similar to study 3, the participants were asked to rate the white actors’ behaviors in two separate conditions (colorblind and race acknowledged. However, in this experiment, race was not a central feature of the video clips presented. Results indicated that when race is not a central feature, Black participants were more likely to positively rate colorblind actors. Similarly, White participants who were concerned with self-presentation were more likely to favorably rate actors who are in a colorblind condition. In this experiment both White and Black participants viewed actors in colorblind conditions as less biased. These findings highlight how colorblindness strategies vary according to context. Most importantly, these findings highlight the detrimental and sometimes unconscious impacts of colorblindness on people of Color.

Correll, Park, and Smith (2008) conducted a series of studies where the efficacy of colorblind and multicultural strategies was assessed. Experiment one consisted of 117 White undergraduate students residing in the Midwest. In this experiment, the participants were to one of the three conditions (control, colorblind ideology, and multicultural ideology). Participants in the colorblind and multicultural conditions were persuaded of the importance of adapting either a colorblind ideology or a multicultural ideology (Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008). Participants were asked to read falsified article, which presented both low conflict and how conflict scenarios between members of the majority and minority groups. Results revealed that both the multicultural and colorblind strategies were effective in reducing biases when conflict was low. However, when
conflict was high, colorblind strategies were found to be less biased or prejudicial towards ethnic minorities.

The second experiment explored if individuals who endorse colorblind strategies are more likely to demonstrate implicit biases towards marginalized groups. One hundred and fourteen participants participated in this study were assigned to similar conditions in the first study. However, in this experiment, participants were given measures of implicit (Extrinsic Affective Simon Task (EAST; De Houwer, 2003) and explicit bias. The explicit bias measure was created for the purpose of this study and assessed for Hispanic and White stereotypes. Similar to the first study, colorblind and multicultural strategies were effective in reducing biases when presented with low ethnic conflict. Although participants in the multicultural and colorblind conditions were likely to exhibit lower explicit biases in higher interethnic conflict scenarios, individuals in the colorblind conditions were more likely to exhibit implicit biases. Findings on the implicit measures indicated that colorblind attitudes reflected suppression of deeply felt prejudices and that responses were, nonetheless, still biased rather than truly colorblind.

The third (n = 55 White students) and fourth studies (n = 70 White students) explored whether or not time would biases of individuals who endorsed colorblind ideologies would rebound over time. After a 20-minute delay, the biases of the individuals placed in the colorblind condition rebounded suggesting that colorblind strategies may be ineffective at reducing prejudicial biases in the long run. Unlike in the first three experiments, students were not persuaded to use an ideology over the other. Rather, the fourth study consisted of a pretest where individuals’ ideologies were assessed. Based on their answers, participants were divided according to ideology and
were given scenarios of high or low interethnic conflict. Similar to the findings in the first two studies, participants with colorblind and multicultural ideologies are more likely to have reduced intergroup biases when conflict is low. A multicultural ideology was found to not have a stronger rebound effect. These findings suggest that colorblind strategies may be useful in resolving immediate high interethnic conflict; however, multicultural strategies may be a better strategy in maintaining long-term interethnic and interracial connections.

Gutiérrez and Unzueta (2010) found that individuals who were primed with colorblind conditions were more likely to like Blacks or Latinos who do not fit stereotypes associated with their designated ethnicity/race. People of Color who subscribe to White middle class norms are socially preferred suggesting that Whiteness is the standard (Neville, Roderick, Durán, Lee, & Brown, 2000). These studies seem to demonstrate that brief exposure to a norm of colorblindness only superficially addresses group differences by ignoring them and suggesting a universal idea of “humanity”; this exposure does not lead to lasting change in study participants’ pre-existing attitudes.

Bonilla-Silva (2003) states that colorblindness reinforces Whites’ beliefs that minorities’ poor work ethics and cultural limitations contribute to their poverty and that segregation or racial grouping is natural. In other words, colorblindness reinforces the notion that people of Color are to blame for their own oppression and unfair treatment. Correll, Park, and Smith (2008) argue that colorblindness does not promote positive long-term intergroup relations since pre-existing racial schemas are likely to emerge over time. Rather than minimizing racial prejudices, colorblindness can actually lead to racial
insensitivity about the social disadvantages of race, as well as the greater likelihood of blaming ethnic or racial minorities of discriminatory practices.

Colorblindness is made up four frames: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2001). As described earlier, these frames describe how some people, typically Whites, believe that there are equal opportunities for everyone, racial grouping is natural, cultural beliefs are at the core of racial disparities, and finally, that racism is no longer an issue (Bonilla-Silva, 2001; Neville, 2008). These beliefs are common among non-Latino Whites and have been found to negatively affect people of Color. For example, Holoien and Shelton (2012) found that colorblindness negatively affected minorities’ cognitive functioning. Moreover, Whites who express colorblindness beliefs increased acts of prejudice and decreased their interactions with people of Color. Colorblindness is a double-edged sword.

Neville, Roderick, Durán, Lee, and Brown (2000) created the Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) in order to assess the cognitive aspects of color-blind racial attitudes. The scale consists of 20 items which people rate on a 6-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree). Scores that are obtained from the instrument are indicative of this person’s colorblindness. The higher the score, the more likely the person is to endorse color-blind attitudes. For the purpose of this study, Latinos’ colorblind attitudes will be explored; specifically, in relation to Latino White privilege and internalized racism.

Racism

The United States, similar to other racialized countries, has a longstanding history
with racism. Immigrants, especially immigrants of Color, as well as people of Color have been subjected to unfair treatment on the individual and institutional level. For example, a long history of research has shown that, after accounting for other sources of variation, darker skinned non-White individuals are less likely to earn as much money as Whites, have less access to the housing market, are more likely to be mistreated in a number of venues including stores and restaurants, and are thought of as less attractive (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Hill, 2002). In a study conducted by Pager and Shepard (2008) White ex-convicts were more likely to be hired over African Americans with no criminal history. Moreover, Blacks and darker skinned Latinos are more likely to be racially profiled by the police, be arrested, prosecuted, incarcerated, and executed (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). People of Color are also more likely to experience negative health outcomes including “…higher rates of mortality, earlier onset of disease, greater severity and progression of disease, and higher levels of comorbidity and impairment (Williams & Mohammed, 2013, p. 1153).

Carter (2007) reviewed a number of studies and the psychological effects of racism and concluded that racism is related to psychological and behavioral exhaustion as well as affliction. This psychological distress can be observed across a number of socioeconomic statuses. Doctoral students of African American and Latino descent, for example, have reportedly experienced the negative side effects of racism with many reporting feelings of otherness, isolation, and at times, depression while in their graduate programs (Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011). These studies have demonstrated how people of Color, especially those who do not identify as White or subscribe to Whiteness, are more likely to experience the negative effects of racism.
Internalized Racism

Although direct acts of racism from majority group members have detrimental effects on people of Color, less is known about internalized racism, that is, the effects of racism on oppressed individuals’ self-view and worldview. As described earlier, the effects of racism can be observed at the personal and institutional level, suggesting that it may play an important role in people of Color’s overall wellbeing.

Despite the relative dearth of research on internalized racism, some researchers have notably addressed racially identity, including internalized racism. For example, Cross (1995) created the *Nigrescence (which translated means “the process of becoming Black”)* Model, in order to understand development of racial identity among African Americans. The *Nigrescence Model* is a five-stage model, which describes the achievement, of a Black identity. It involves the evolution of possessing an anti-Black self-hating identity to a more pro-Black self-loving identity. In his study of college aged Latinos, Hipolito-Delgado (2010) concluded that Latinos who possess an anti-Latino identity are more likely to internalize racism (Hipolito-Delgado, 2010).

Padilla (2001) defined internalized racism as “the turning upon ourselves, our families and our people---the distressed patterns of behavior that result from the racism and oppression of the majority society” (Padilla, 2001, p. 1). According to Padilla (2001), internalized racism is a result of external oppression by the majority group. Speight (2007) goes on to state that internalized racism is the acceptance of “all about the cultural imperialism, the domination, the structure, the normalcy of the ‘way things are’ in our racialized society” (p. 129). Pyke (2000) described how political ideologies such as meritocracy could indirectly obscure oppression by suggesting that inequality does not
exist in the working or academic environment. Therefore, internalized racism is a result of a number of external socio-cultural factors that are found outside of the individual and impact their self-view.

It is believed that individuals who have higher levels of internalized racism are more likely to report higher levels of stress, have higher levels of psychological distress, and suffer from health issues (Kwate & Myer, 2011; Tull, Sheu, Butler, & Cornelious, 2005; Williams & Mohammed, 2013). A study conducted by Tull et al. (2005) found that Black women who had higher levels of internalized racism were more likely to use passive coping styles as a result, and suffer from dysregulated cortisol levels. Similarly, Kwate and Myer (2011), as discussed in Williams and Mohammed (2013), concluded that internalized racism decreases self-esteem and psychological well-being, with the result that health is adversely impacted. Increased levels of alcohol consumption, unhealthy weight, abdominal obesity, high blood pressure, and pre-diabetic levels of fasting glucose have also been linked with internalized racism (Williams & Mohammed, 2009). These findings suggest that internalized racism may play an important role on physiological as well as psychological wellbeing. Thus, understanding its effect on people of Color is crucial in the prevention and treatment of physiological and psychological illnesses.

Internalized racism may also lead to denial of one’s heritage, disengagement in cultural customs, and uncritical assimilation to mainstream culture. For example, Asian Americans who have higher levels of internalized racism are more likely to seek acceptance from Whites by distancing themselves from their Asian heritage (Pyke & Dang, 2003). Similar findings have been found for the Latino community. Individuals
who reported a U.S. cultural identity were more likely to have internalized racism and hold negative stereotypes about their Latino identity (Hipolito-Delgado, 2010).

Furthermore, people of Color are more likely to involve themselves in “defensive othering” in order to disengage from the subordinate group and be more like the White dominant group; in defensive othering, individuals of color may oppress members of their own community in order to align with the majority group, deny their heritage, and gain the benefits associated with Whiteness (Pyke, 2000; Schwalbe et al., 2000). As Paulo Freire (1970) explained it, the oppressed become “sub-oppressors” because of their desire to gain power in a racially stratified society. For example, a young non-White Latina who has internalized racism may avoid the sun, straighten her hair, and question and even mock those who do not partake in these beauty rituals. Moreover, she may deny her culture altogether and distance herself from partaking in cultural traditions and hold negative attitudes towards Latinos who have a stronger ethnic identity. In this example, her attempt to gain power in a racially stratified society has led her to turn on herself and others similar to her.

Hipolito-Delgado (2010) created the Mouchihua Tepehuani scale in order to assess internalized racism among Latinos. This scale was based on the Nadanolization (NAD) scale a psychometric tool that assesses for internalized racism among African Americans. Scale items assessed for stereotypes about the Latino community. Participants were then asked to rate their agreeableness with these items on a 7-point Likert scale. Statements such as “Chicanos/Latinos are born with greater sexual desire than Whites” and “Chicanos/Latinos are carefree, happy go lucky” were included in the scale. It consisted of a total of 25 items; a high Cronbach’s alpha of .85 indicated its
internal consistency and reliability. Because internalized racism plays a big role among people of Color, it is important to understand how this phenomenon presents itself among Latinos, and specifically, how internalized racism plays a role in White privilege among Latinos.

**Colorism**

As discussed earlier, the Latino community is a racially diverse and heterogeneous ethnic group. Because of this diversity, Latinos can vary from very light to very dark. Despite this color variation, Latinos are often grouped into one category with individuals on opposite ends of the color spectrum being thought of as non-Latino. Not only does Latinos’ appearance play a role on how an individual self-identifies and is labeled, it also affects socioeconomic status and educational attainment (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Lopez, 2003). Murguia and Saenz (2002) found that lighter skinned Mexicans had a better income, were more likely to complete a high school degree, and hold positions of power. They are also more likely to socialize and be accepted by non-Latino Whites (Murgia & Saenz, 2002). The Felero vs. Styerk (1998) case, in which a darker skinned Latino stated that he was being discriminated against and eventually fired by a lighter skinned Latino. This is one of the many examples that demonstrate how darker skinned Latinos were more likely than their lighter counterparts to be fired, or not even be considered for a job position in the first place (Hall, 2011). Darker Latinos were also more likely to be discriminated against and face unfair treatment (Gómez, 2000). Because of the skin tone bias that exists within the Latino community, Latinos may be more likely to aspire for lighter skin, a White racial identity, and internalize racism.
Gender

It would be remiss to not discuss gender as a critical component in the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes and White privilege attitudes. Exploring the effect of gendered hierarchy in regards to race and privilege is of great importance. The following findings are based on the experiences of non-Latino Whites given that these concepts have not been greatly investigated among Latinos. Neville and colleagues (2000) found that men, as opposed to women, were more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes. Similarly, men versus are women are more likely to endorse statements that reflect symbolic racism (Sidanius, Levin, van Laar, & Sears, 2008). Racial resentment towards people of Color seems to also be mitigated by gender. Smith, Senter, and Starchan (2013) found that White men who hold conservative political worldviews, as opposed to White women, are more likely to demonstrate racial resentment towards minorities. Meanwhile White women were more likely to demonstrate racial resentment if they majored in non-social/human service majors (Smith, Senter, & Starchan, 2013). In regards to White privilege, White women are more likely to be aware of White privilege and its ramifications (Pinterits et al., 2009). Women’s experience with sexism can help explain some of the findings; however, White women may sometimes be unaware of their White privilege because of their experiences with sexism (Pratto & Stewart, 2012).

Gender hierarchy is also found among the Latino culture. Machismo first emerged in the Iberian Peninsula (Spain and Portugal) as a set of views, which places men in a position of power and supremacy over women (Mayo, 1994). Machismo permeates Latino culture and is said to have effects across a number of domains. For
example, Glass, and Owen (2010) surveyed a total of 70 Latino men to explore father involvement. The authors used a series of 4 self report measures, which assessed for acculturation (Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale, Zea, Reisien, Poppen, Bianchi, & Echeverry, 2007), ethnic identity (Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure—Revised, Phinney & Ong, 2007), machismo (Machismo Measure (Arciniega et al., 2008), and finally, parental involvement (Inventory of Father Involvement, Bradford, Hawkins, Palkovitz, Christiansen, & Day, 2002). Fathers who endorsed machista attitudes and who were less acculturated to American culture were more likely to report lower levels of parental involvement. Upon conducting a linear regression, the authors found that machismo accounted for variance in parental involvement. Thus, machismo appeared to play an important role in determining whether or not Latino men were involved in their children’s’ lives. Although Glass and Owen (2010) study explored how gender roles impact Latinos’ relationship with their children, Latino gender roles are far more masculinity is far more complex than the negative set of behaviors that make up machismo ideology (Liang, Salcedo, & Miller, 2011). Because the majority of the literature around White privilege focuses on the experiences of non-Latino White men, this study seeks to explore how gender impacts the development of white privilege and colorblind attitudes.

Summary

For the purpose of this dissertation, the literature reviewed includes research on race, colorism, and internalized racism among Latinos. A review on colorblind attitudes and White privilege among non-Latino Whites is also provided. Because I could not find any research on White privilege among Latinos, the racial experiences of non-Latino
Whites were used as a comparison. Although this literature review illustrates the experiences and viewpoints of Latinos in the United States, a section on the history and politics of race in Latin America is also provided. Similar to the coordinates highlighted in the Feminist Ecological Model (FEM), the literature review describes how certain characteristics of individuals influence and shape their perceptions on Whiteness. Finally, the review demonstrates the contradictions that exist within the Latino community regarding racism and racial identification.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Research Design

For the purpose of this study, a correlational quantitative research design was utilized to collect and analyze data. Quantitative research seeks to systematically and mathematically explore variables with the purpose to explain naturally occurring phenomenon and test pre-existing theories (Krelinger, 1979; Creswell, 2014). It also decreases researcher bias, by providing a detached perspective on naturally occurring events. Correlational quantitative research enables researchers to obtain information through the use of psychometrically sound surveys that are said to measure a specific occurrence or phenomena in the environment.

Given that the concept of White privilege has not been studied within the context of the Latino community, this study sought to provide a preliminary investigation and understanding of white privilege among Latinos. Thus, for the purpose of the current study, a correlational prediction design was used to examine the relationship among variables (Creswell, 2008). The relationships among White privilege (WPAS, 2009), colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS, 2000), internalized racism (Mochihua Tephuani Scale, 2010), skin color, gender, education level, and age of arrival were examined. Correlational research looks at the strength and directionality among the variables analyzed. This research design provides a foundational understanding of White privilege among Latinos and the variables associated with this phenomenon.
Participants

A total of 151 adults (34=Males, 116=Females, 1=Other) were recruited for the current study. Participants represented diverse Latino countries of origin (Please see table 2). Prior to gathering the data, sample size was determined through the use of Green’s (1991) theory. According to Green’s (1991) report, an adequate sample size can be determined by the following equation $N>50 + 8(m)$, where $m$ is the number of independent variables of interest. For the purpose of this study, a total of 8 independent variables (skin color, gender, mean scores on the CoBRAS, mean scores on the WPAS, mean scores on the Mochihua Tephuani Scale, education level, age of arrival, and racial identification) were analyzed, thus making the ideal sample size for the current study 114 or larger. When using regression analyses, Green (1991) also proposed that a medium effect size could be obtained through a sample size of $104 + m$, the independent variables of interest. However, when determining which sample size to use, the larger sample size is preferred (Van Voorhis & Morgan, 2007). As a guideline for the current study, and in order to minimize type II error, increase statistical power, and increase the generalizability of the study’s findings, the sample size of 114 or larger was utilized.

Procedure

For the current study, non-probability based sampling was used as the main method of recruitment. Specifically, acquaintance and snowball sampling was utilized to recruit Latino participants. E-mails with survey information were sent to professional organizations geared towards the Latino community. These organizations were encouraged to provide survey information to their members through the use of a scripted and IRB approved message provided by the researcher. Prospective participants in the
greater New England area were recruited by e-mails. Organizations, specifically Latino student organizations, at universities were provided with survey information via email. E-mails were also sent to the researchers’ professional and personal networks requesting individuals to forward the survey information to other Latinos. Finally, social media outlets such as Facebook® were used to recruit participants. Information regarding the study was posted on Facebook® groups such as Latinas Completing Doctoral Degrees, Latinos Completing Doctoral Degrees, or Latinas Think Big. Individuals on these social media forums were asked to forward the survey information to other Latinos in their professional and personal networks. Other forms of social media recruitment included status updates and posts on Facebook® where survey information was provided to prospective participants.

The electronic version of the survey was accessed through the use of web-based research software named Qualtrics®. Qualtrics® is a web-based tool that is used to collect data and survey information electronically. A direct URL link was provided to participants who were interested in completing the survey. Upon clicking on the URL link, participants were prompted to answer whether or not they were 18 years of age. If the participants reported that they were or above the age of 18, other information including, a more detailed criteria screener, informed consent, as well as contact information for the principal investigator and researcher were provided. Other survey items included a demographics questionnaire, the White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS), Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS), Mochihuana Tephuani Scale, and the New Immigrant Survey Scale of Skin Color Darkness (NIS). Upon completing the survey, participants were given the option to provide an email to participate in a raffle for
a $100 dollar Visa® gift card. Participants were assured that identifying information would be kept confidential and would not be linked to their responses. This ensured the veracity and authenticity of the participants’ responses.

**Instrumentation**

**Demographics Questionnaire.** For the purpose of the current study, a demographics questionnaire was created with some of the questions modeled after Hipolito-Delgado’s (2010) study on internalized racism among Latinos. This questionnaire consisted of 16 questions that assessed for gender, ethnicity, race, language ability, socioeconomic status, as well as age of arrival to the United States (see Appendix A for demographic information).

**White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS).** The WPAS was created in order to assess the dimensions of White Privilege (Pineterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009; (see Appendix B). According to the authors, attitudes surrounding White privilege consist of affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions. First tested on undergraduate and graduate students in 2009, the WPAS revealed four White privilege subscales across 28 items: (1) Willingness to confront White privilege ($\alpha = .91-.95$), (2) Anticipated costs of White privilege ($\alpha = .73-.83$), (3) White privilege awareness ($\alpha = .74-.84$), and (4) White privilege remorse ($\alpha = .87-.91$). Some of the sample items on the WPAS include statements such as, “Plenty people of Color are more privileged than Whites” or “I am ashamed of my White privilege”. Participants were asked to respond to these statements on a 6-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree). The internal consistency of the scale, including the subscales, ranges from .73 to .95 suggesting that the items on the scale are measuring the same multifaceted general construct, (i.e., White
privilege) including the cognitive, behavioral and affective dimensions of White privilege.

As described earlier, the WPAS is divided into four subscales. Willingness to confront White privilege consists of 12 items that assess the behavioral dimensions related to White privilege. For example, statements such as “I intend to work towards dismantling White privilege” or “I am eager to find out more about letting go of White privilege” explores the actions taken by the individual to challenge White privilege on an individual and systemic level. The second subscale of the WPAS, anticipated costs of addressing White privilege, consists of items such as “If I address White privilege, I might alienate my family”. Items on this subscale addresses the potential ramifications of addressing White privilege on a social and interpersonal level. White privilege awareness consists of 4 items that assesses for the cognitive dimensions related to White privilege such as: “Our social structure promotes White privilege.” White privilege remorse consists of 6 items that assess for the affective dimensions of White privilege. Items such as “I feel awful about White privilege” are found on this subscale. Higher composite scores indicate that the individual has a greater likelihood to be aware of White privilege and its affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions.

Pintereits and colleagues (2009) explored how the WPAS was related to other theoretical constructs in the field of psychology and racism, including colorblind racial attitudes. Specifically, scores on the CoBRAS (Neville et. al, 2000) were significantly associated with WPAS factors and were found to have convergent validity ranging from $r = -.27$ to $r = -.81$, $p < .001$. 
It is important to note that for the purpose of this study, participants were given an “N/A” option for items 6, 11, 23, 24, 25, & 26. These items included statements such as, “I’m glad to explore my White privilege” or “I am angry that I keep benefiting from White privilege.” The “N/A” option was added to these 6 items because they assessed an individual’s direct experience of White privilege. Also, the scale was normed on the experiences of European Whites and not on the experience of Latino Whites. Therefore, the “N/A” option allowed participants to answer the question directly if they felt that it pertained to them or select the “N/A” option if they do not believe that they experience White privilege. Additionally, the “N/A” option was added to these items because Latinos, regardless of racial identification and skin color, were asked to participate in the study. Prior to gathering the data, the researcher consulted with the WPAS main author, Jane Pinterits, and gained approval for adding the “N/A” option to the aforementioned 6 items. Because the great majority of the Latinos in the study (n = 122) chose the N/A option, regardless of racial identification or skin color, items 6, 11, 23, 25, 25, & 26 were dropped from the total mean scores.

**Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).** The Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale, commonly referred to as CoBRAS, is a 20-item scale that measures the cognitive aspects of colorblind racial attitudes (Neville, Roderick, Durán, Lee, & Brown, 2000). Initially, the CoBRAS scale consisted of 26 items that assessed for colorblind racial attitudes. However, upon conducting a principal component analysis, Neville and colleagues (2000) concluded that the final 20 items were the most conceptually sound and produced the strongest factor loadings. The scale consists of three subscales: 1) Awareness of Racial Privilege ($\alpha = .83$), 2) Institutional Discrimination ($\alpha = .81$), and 3)
Blatant Racism ($\alpha = .76$). The alpha coefficient for the total score is .91 indicating that the 20 items, including the subscales, are measuring a similar construct (i.e., colorblind racial attitudes). Statements such as, “Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not” were rated on a 6-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree). (Appendix C).

As described earlier, the CoBRAS (2000) consists of three subscales. Awareness of White privilege consists of 7 items that assess White privilege. Sample items such as “White people in the U.S. have advantages because of the color of their skin” were included in this subscale. Institutional discrimination, the second subscale, consists of 7 items such as “Social policies such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people”. This subscale explored individuals’ awareness of systemic racism, including racial discrimination and exclusion. Finally, the third subscale, Blatant Racial issues consist of 6 of items. These items explore the extent to which individuals are aware of overt and pervasive racism. A sample item on this subscale includes: “Social Problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.” The CoBRAS demonstrated high concurrent validity ($r = .36 - .55$) with two other scales (QDI and MRS) that measure racial prejudice indicating that higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) are related to greater racial bias towards groups of Color (Neville et al., 2000).

During the initial validation of the CoBRAS, African Americans and Latinos were more likely than Whites to be aware of colorblind attitudes and beliefs (Neville, Roderick, Durán, Lee, & Brown, 2000). This was especially true for the Latino sample. It is important to note, however, that the Latinos in this sample identified mostly as “Chicano” and were not representative of Latinos across national and racial lines. Higher
scores on the CoBRAS indicate a colorblind racial attitude, including the denial of racism and its ramifications on people of Color residing in the United States.

**Mouchihua Tepehuani Scale.** The Mouchihua Tepehuani Scale (Hipolito-Delgado, 2010) is a modified version of the Nadanolization Scale (Taylor & Gundy, 1996), which was originally used to measure internalized racism among African Americans (please see Appendix D). The words “Mouchihua Tepehuani” mean to “become the conqueror” in Nahuatl, the native language of the Aztecs; thus prompting Hipolito-Delgado (2010) to use this as the title of the scale. The survey consists of 25 items reflective of Latino stereotypes. For example, items such as, “All Chicanas/os Latinas/os act alike”, “Chicana and Latina women are more sexually open and willing than White women”, or Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are born with greater rhythm than Whites”. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with these items on a 7-point likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). A total score is obtained from each of the 25 items with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood to internalize Latino stereotypes. Similar to the CoBRAS (2000) scale, the majority of participants identified as Chicano or Mexican and was not representative of Latinos across national and racial lines. The scale’s internal consistency was .91.

**New Immigrant Survey (NIS).** The New Immigrant Survey Scale of Skin Color Darkness (Massey & Martin, 2003) is a 10-point visual scale ranging from 1 to 10 with 1 representing the lightest skin tone possible and 10 representing the darkest skin tone possible (Appendix E). The 10-point visual scale consists of hands, of similar shape and size, ranging in skin color from 1 to 10. Participants were asked to select which hand best represents their self-perceived skin color/tone. The NIS (2003) was strongly and
positively correlated with Jablonski and Chaplin (2000) spectrophotometered assessment of skin color, thus making the NIS a reliable tool to assess skin color/tone (Hersh, 2008).

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

1. Does endorsement of White privilege attitudes exist among lighter skinned Latinos/as?

   **Hypothesis 1:** It was predicted that lighter skinned Latinos would have higher endorsement of White privilege attitudes compared to Latinos who are not lighter skinned.

2. Are lighter skinned Latinas versus lighter skinned Latinos more likely to endorse White privilege attitudes?

   **Hypothesis 2:** It was predicted that lighter skinned Latinas versus lighter skinned Latinos would have higher endorsement of White privilege attitudes as compared to Latinos/as who are not lighter skinned.

3. Are Latinos, regardless of skin color and racial identification, more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes? Is the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes impacted by age of arrival for immigrant Latinos?

   **Hypothesis 3:** It was predicted that Latinos, regardless of skin color, are more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS). Additionally, it is predicted that age of arrival to the United States is predictive of colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS).

4. Does awareness of White privilege a subscale on the WPAS and colorblind racial attitudes impact whether or not a Latino, regardless of skin color, internalize racism?
**Hypothesis 4:** It was predicted that lower levels of White privilege awareness, a subscale on the WPAS and higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes would yield higher levels of internalized racism.

5. Is there a difference in internalized racism scores (Mochihua Tepephuani Scale), among Latinos according to skin color as measured by the New Immigrant Scale? Does the endorsement of White privilege attitudes (WPAS) and colorblind attitudes (CoBRAS) further contribute to the difference in internalized racism scores (Mochihua Tepephuani Scale)?

**Hypothesis 5:** It was predicted that lighter skinned Latinos with lower scores on the White privilege attitudes (WPAS), and who endorsed higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) were more likely to internalize racism (Mochihua Tepephuani Scale).

6. Does racial identification and education level predict White privilege attitudes and internalized racism?

**Hypothesis 6:** It was predicted that level of education and racial identification were related to acknowledgment of White privilege and internalized racism.

**Data Analysis**

The statistical program called the Statistical Program for Social Sciences, (SPSS Version 24), was utilized to analyze the data gathered in the current study. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and frequencies) were first calculated prior to conducting further statistical analyses such as an ANOVA or Multiple Regression. Frequencies were used to identify missing data and eliminate incomplete data entries.
from the sample. A final sample size was finalized upon using descriptive statistics to analyze and clean the data. Other statistical analyses that were conducted included: independent t tests, ANOVA (one way and two way), Spearman Rho Correlations, and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis.

**Hypothesis 1:** To test the hypothesis that that lighter skinned Latinos will have higher endorsement of White privilege attitudes compared to Latinos who are not lighter skinned, descriptive statistics were used to obtain an overall White Privilege Attitudes Score (WPAS). Upon calculating the composite scores of the WPAS, descriptive statistics were used to sort participants into groups on the basis of skin color. Using the skin tones depicted in the NIS scale, participants were separated into three separate categories (light, medium, and dark). Participants with skin tones 1-3 were considered light-skinned, 4-7 were considered medium skinned, and 8-10 were considered dark skinned. Once the grouping of the independent and dependent variables were created, the assumptions for an independent t tests were examined and met. The assumptions for an independent t test are as follows: independence of observation, continuous dependent variable, bivariate independent variable, and a normally distributed dependent variable.

**Hypothesis 2:** In order to test the hypothesis, that lighter skinned Latinas versus lighter skinned Latinos will have higher endorsement of White privilege attitudes as compared to Latinos/as who are not lighter skinned a two-way ANOVA was conducted. Similarly, assumptions for a two-way ANOVA were explored and met. They are as follows: continuous dependent variable, two bivariate or multivariate independent variables, independence of observations, absence of outliers, normally distributed dependent variable, and finally homogeneity of variances.
**Hypothesis 3:** To test the hypothesis that Latinos, irrespective of skin color hue, will endorse colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS), an overall composite score of colorblind attitudes was computed. Once these overall scores were obtained, descriptive statistics analyses were conducted in order to determine the average score of colorblind attitudes of the participants in the study. Upon calculating these scores, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess whether or not skin color differences in the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes existed. The assumptions of the one-way ANOVA were examined met.

Prior to conducting the Pearson correlational analysis, the following assumptions: continuous variables, linearity, no outliers, and normality were examined. Assumptions of linearity, outliers, and normality were violated for both of the continuous variables (i.e., age of arrival and mean scores on the CoBRAS). As a result, a non-parametric correlational analysis, Spearman’s Rho, was utilized to analyze the strength and directionality between the two variables of interest.

**Hypothesis 4:** To examine the hypothesis that lower levels of White privilege awareness, a subscale on the WPAS and higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes would yield higher levels of internalized racism, a Multiple Pearson Correlational analysis was used. Similar to the hypotheses above, the “Compute Variable” option was used to obtain the summation of scores for the internalized racism variable. Prior to conducting the analyses, the assumptions of Pearson correlation were explored. Upon examining the Q-Q plots, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality, and Box plots, the assumptions of linearity, normality, and outliers were violated (CoBRAS mean scores, Internalized Racism mean scores, White Privilege awareness subscale mean scores from
the WPAS). As a result, Spearman’s Rho, a non-parametric correlational analysis, was utilized. Similarly, multiple Spearman Rho correlational analyses were used to explore the extent to which internalized racism, colorblind racial attitudes, and overall White privilege attitudes were related to one another.

**Hypothesis 5:** A Multiple Regression Analysis was used to test the hypothesis as to what extent the participants’ skin color, endorsement of White privilege attitudes (WPAS), Colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) were predictive of internalized racism (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale). Prior to conducting this linear regression, the assumptions for linear regression were checked. The assumptions are as follows: linear relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable, normality, no autocorrelation, no or little multicollinearity, and finally, homoscedasticity. Because the assumptions of multiple linear regression were met, a linear regression was deemed appropriate in order to explore the aforementioned hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 6:** Prior to exploring the final hypothesis, that education level and racial identification predicted endorsement of White Privilege Attitudes (WPAS) and internalized racism the researcher explored the assumptions of Multivariate analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The assumptions of MANOVA are as follows: two or more dependent variables, categorical independent variables, independence of observations, adequate sample for each level of the independent variables, no outliers, normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance, and finally, no multicollinearity. Given that the sample size for the racial categories in the study were uneven and that the education levels were also uneven, a MANOVA would be considered inappropriate. The required sample size for the independent variables, including the levels of the independent
variables (i.e., race and education), were not met. Moreover, even when removing the outliers, normality was also violated. Because the sample size assumption was violated among the other assumptions, a MANOVA was not appropriate. Ideally, the sample size would be even for each of the independent variables and a minimum of 20 cases per level of variable being explored.

Given that MANOVA would not be an appropriate statistical analysis for the current data set, an alternative approach was applied to hypothesis 6. The author collapsed the racial and education independent variables into two separate levels. For the racial category, participants were separated according to their racial categorization White (n = 42) and non-White (n = 90). Additionally, the sample size of the education variable was altered and excluded the smaller sample size of high school educated participants (n = 9). Therefore, the education variable consisted of two distinct levels: associate’s/bachelor’s level graduates (n = 47) and graduate students (master’s and doctoral level; n = 85). Normality of the dependent variables (internalized racism and overall white privilege attitudes) was determined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which postulates that variables are normal if the statistical significance level is above .05. Because the variables were not normally distributed, a log transformation was conducted in order to normalize the dependent variables of internalized racism and overall White privilege attitudes. Upon creating a log transformation and removing outliers, the variables were normalized. Because the other assumptions of MANOVA were met, a MANOVA was deemed appropriate in order to explore the hypothesis.
Summary

This chapter provided information on the research methods utilized in this study. Specifically, a summary on the research design, sample size and the demographic make up of the participants, recruitment procedures, psychometric properties of the instrumentation used, and a description of the statistical analyses was provided. Research questions, hypotheses, and analyses needed to test hypotheses were reviewed in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4

Results

Demographics

Participants

The current study included a total of 151 participants of Latino/Hispanic descent. Of these 151 participants, 34 were Latino men, 116 were Latina women, and 1 participant identified their gender as “other”. It is worth mentioning that 260 Latino participants began completing the survey online but dropped out after completing the consent form or some of the questions on the demographics portion of the survey.

As described earlier, the participants identified as Hispanic/Latino or with one of the Latin-American countries (i.e., “Spaniard”, “Venezuelan”, “Puerto Rican”, etc.), lived in the United States, had a high school degree, were above the age of 18, and were fluent in the English language (Please see Table 2 for Hispanic/Latino Country of Origin). The majority of participants were married (n = 80, 53%) or single (n = 58, 38.4%). The remaining participants were divorced, widowed, or remarried (Table 6). Because the goal of this study was to explore attitudes surrounding White privilege, the perspectives of both men and women were crucial. Recruiting Latino men for the current study was very difficult despite the various attempts to engage them. Only 34 Latino men completed the survey.

For the purpose of the current study, it was important for the participants to be English-literate. The surveys were written in English in order to maintain consistency throughout the surveying and data analysis process. Changing the language of the instruments can affect the validity and reliability of the psychometric constructs used in
the study. Approximately, 89% of the participants, however, spoke another language besides English in their day-to-day lives with loved ones and family members.

Originally, one of the study’s primary foci was to obtain a representative sample of Latinos residing in the United States including a wide array of Latinos across the socioeconomic spectrum. Because social class is a multidimensional and complicated phenomenon, researchers have often times found it difficult to clearly define and pinpoint the features of social class. However, a number of categories including educational level, parental education, and profession, are said to be central factors of social class (Hout, 2008). Based on this definition, the majority of the participants in the current study would be thought as “middle class” given their educational attainment and occupational status. The majority of participants (88%) completed an Associate’s Degree or higher, 34% completed an Associate’s or BA/BS, 44% completed a MA, 16% completed a doctorate or another professional degree, and the remaining 6% of participants, completed a high school degree or GED equivalent (Please see Table 5). Although Latinos’ matriculation in colleges is higher than non-Latino Whites (Pew Hispanic Research Center, 2013), Latinos continue to be one of the least educated ethnic groups in the United States, with only 20% of American born Latinos and 12% of foreign born Latinos possessing a bachelor’s degree (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). National origin, however, seems to impact educational achievement among Latinos. For example, Venezuelans are the most educated Latino ethnic group in the United States, with more than 50% of Venezuelans ages 25 and older possessing a Bachelor’s degree (Pew Research Center, 2013). The majority of Latinos in the current study were among the most educated Latinos residing in the United States, having obtained an Associate’s
degree or higher (Pew Research Center, 2013). Thus, the college educated Latino sample in the current study is not generalizable to the majority of Latinos residing in the United States. Rather, the sample reflects a smaller subset of college and graduate educated Latinos.

The average age of the participants was 33 years with the age range being between 18 and 68 years (see Table 1). Sixty-eight percent of the participants were born in the United States with the remaining 32% born outside of the USA. The average age of arrival for foreign-born participants was 15 years with individuals arriving as infants up to age 47.

The majority of the participants were of Mexican (56%) and Puerto Rican (13%) descent while the remaining 21% were of Caribbean, Central, and South American descent. Forty-five percent of the participants identified their race as “other” while 31% identified themselves as White alone (see Table 3). The remaining participants identified as Multiracial (11%), American-Indian/Alaskan Native (5%), or Black (6%). The majority of individuals who identified as White were of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Spanish and South American descent. A similar trend was found among participants of Mexican and Puerto-Rican descent who identified as “Other.” The participants’ racial identification with the White and/or Other category reflects similar national trends found in the U.S. Census (2010).

**Skin Color**

Latinos utilized The New Immigrant Survey Scale of Skin Color Darkness (Massey & Martin, 2003) to assess their skin color. For the purpose of this study, skin tones 1 to 3 were rated as light, 4 to 7 were rated as medium, 8 to 10 were
rated as dark. When asked to rate their skin color from light to dark, approximately 66% (n = 99; Males = 23, Females = 76) of participants rated their skin color as “light”. Approximately 31% (n = 47; Males = 13, Females = 34) of the participants rated their skin tone as “medium”. Finally, less than 1% (Male = 1) rated their skin color as dark. Five participants (4 women and 1 gender other), did not rate their skin color (Table 4). A cross tabulation analysis was used to summarize the relationship between self-racial identification and skin tone. The great majority of participants who rated their skin color as “light” racially identified as White (n = 39) or Other (n = 41). The remaining 15 participants who rated their skin color as light identified as or as multi racial (n = 10), Alaskan Native (n = 4), or Black (n = 1). Participants who rated their skin color as “medium” racially identified as Other (n = 25) or White (n=8) while the remaining 12 participants identified as multi racial (n = 6), Alaskan Native (n = 3), or Black (n = 3).

**White Privilege Attitudes Scale**

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreeableness on statements regarding White privilege. Prior to gathering the data, the researcher consulted with the WPAS main author, Jane Pinterits, and gained approval for adding the “N/A” option for a total of 6 items (6, 11, 23, 24, 25, & 26). These 6 items were given the “N/A” option since they directly measure a White person’s experience with White privilege and not the overall construct of White privilege. For example the statement, “I’m glad to explore my White privilege” (item 6) assesses Whites’ exploration or lack thereof White privilege. Given that Latinos are made up of racially diverse individuals, the “N/A” option was provided for those who may not racially identify as White or for those who do not believe that they benefit from White privilege. Additionally, the “N/A” option was added to the
6 items on the WPAS scale given that Latinos, irrespective of skin color/hue and/or racial identification, were asked to participate in the current study.

For the purpose of this study, the 6 items with the “N/A” option were excluded from the total WPAS score given that the majority of the participants, including Latino participants who racially identified as White, selected the “N/A” option. Upon removing these 6 items from the final score, mean score of the Latinos’ White Privilege Attitudes was 3.68 (SD= 0.41) indicating “neutral” attitudes towards White privilege. No gender differences were noted in White privilege attitudes scores between men (M = 3.67, SD = 0.51) and women (M =3.68, SD = 0.38). Although the majority of responses fell within the “neutral/somewhat disagree” range, 22.5% of participants (n = 34) were likely to endorse a higher awareness of White privilege attitudes, a subscale found within the WPAS. Additionally, participants who answered these items were mostly light skinned (n = 30) over medium skinned (n = 4). Meanwhile, 6% of the Latinos in the present study (n = 9) were less likely to be aware of White privilege, including the “…racial power and privileges (Whites) wield” (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 64).

The following section will summarize the findings of the smaller number of participants (19% to 34%) who completed items directly related to their White privilege, albeit the N/A option. However, responses to these 6 items that assess individuals’ direct experience of White privilege were answered inconsistently. For example, a participant would rate the statement “I am ashamed that the system is stacked in my favor because I am White”; however, this same participant would select the “N/A” option for the statement “I’m glad to explore my White privilege.” The inconsistency in response patterns may be indicative of methodological limitations (i.e., modified version of the
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WPAS that was not normed on Latino Whites) or it may be a reflection of the fluidity of privilege for lighter skinned or White Latinos. Moreover, individuals, regardless of skin color may feel that White privilege does not pertain to them because of the discrimination they encounter due to their ethnicity. It is important to keep this in mind when reading and interpreting the current results.

A total of 122 participants selected the N/A when asked to rate their agreeableness with the following statement, “I am ashamed that the system is stacked in my favor because I am White.” Meanwhile, the remaining 19.2% (n = 29) of participants rated this statement as “neutral” (M = 3.79, SD = 1.59), may suggest a level of uncertainty or lack of formulated opinion regarding their experience of White privilege. Of these 29 individuals, 22 identified their race as White alone while the remaining 7 identified themselves as Multiracial (n = 4), Other (n = 2), and Native Alaskan (n = 1). Self-identified multiracial Latinos were also more likely to rate their skin tone as light (n = 28) versus medium (n = 1). When asked to rate “I don’t care to explore how I supposedly have unearned benefits from being White”, 66.2% of individuals (n = 100) selected the N/A option. The remaining 33.8% (n = 51) disagreed with the aforementioned statement (M = 2.18, SD = 1.55) suggesting that when given the option participants who answered this question expressed an interest to learn more about White privilege and whether or not they benefit from it. Of these 51 individuals, 27 identified as White, 16 identified as Other, while the remaining 8 identified as Multiracial (n = 6) or Alaskan Native (n = 2). Moreover, these individuals were more likely to rate their skin tone as light (n = 43) versus medium (n = 8).

Interestingly the statement “I’m glad to explore my White privilege” yielded a
“somewhat agreeable” response from participants (n = 47, M = 4.49, SD = 1.47). Of these 47 individuals, 26 identified as White, 14 as Other, 6 as Multiracial and 1 as Alaskan Native. The majority also rated their skin as light (n = 40) over medium (7). The inconsistency in response pattern to the questions dropped from the final analysis indicates that the WPAS may not fully capture White privilege for Latinos. It may also suggest that White privilege for Latinos may be variable and contingent upon environment or perhaps racial awareness or privilege. Or it may also suggest that White privilege does not apply to Latinos residing in the United States. Nonetheless, these inferences should be interpreted with caution given the dearth of research in which to compare the current findings.

The WPAS (2009) consists of 4 subscales that measure the behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions of White privilege. Similar to the overall WPAS scores, items 6, 11, 23, 24, 25, & 26 were dropped from the subscales’ average totals. The Confronting White privilege subscale, which assesses for the behavioral dimension of White privilege and consists of 12 items yielded a “neutral/somewhat agreeable” response from participants (M = 3.93, SD = .52). The Awareness of White Privilege Subscale, which reflects the cognitive dimensions of White Privilege and consists of 4 items, yielded a “neutral” response from participants (M = 3.22, SD = .75). On the other hand, the 6-item affective White privilege remorse subscale yielded a “somewhat agreeable” (M = 4.34, SD = .72) response from participants. Finally, the 6-item subscale of Anticipating costs of White Privilege, which examines the intersection between the affective and behavioral dimensions of White privilege, yielded a “disagreeable/neutral” response from participants (M = 2.99, SD = .52). Please refer to Table 10.
Colorblind Racial Attitudes

The CoBRAS (2000) assesses the cognitive dimensions of colorblind attitudes including beliefs about racial privilege, blatant racism, and finally, institutional racism. Overall scores on the CoBRAS (2000) range from 20 to 120, with higher scores indicating colorblind racial attitudes. However, the range for the subscale scores differs from the overall scores on the CoBRAS. Scores on the Racial Privilege and Institutional Discrimination subscales ranging from 7 to 42 with the higher scores indicating lack of awareness of White privilege and the impacts of systemic racism and discrimination on the social and economic standing of people of Color. Scores on The Blatant Racism subscale, ranges from 6 to 36 with higher scores indicating the unawareness of the prevalence of racism in the U.S. society. Items on the CoBRAS include statements such as “Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich” were ranked on a 6 point Likert Scale where participants ranked their agreeableness with each statement. Participants had an overall mean score of 72.83 (SD = 5.0) indicating a moderate level of racial colorblindness. As for the perceived Racial Privilege subscale, participants had a mean score of 26.30 (SD = 2.62) suggesting that participants hold a neutral view of White privilege. Scores on the Institutional Discrimination subscale (M = 20.03, SD = 4.10) indicated awareness of systemic racism and its implications on people of Color. Finally, a mean score of (M = 26.49, SD = 1.89) for the Blatant Racism subscale moderate awareness of the pervasiveness of racism in the United States.
Mochihua Tepehuani Scale (2010)

Participants were asked to rate a series of 26 questions related to internalized racism on a 7 point Likert Scale. The scale consists of statements such as “Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are better at sex than Whites”. Participants’ agreeableness with each statement equated a higher internalized racism score. In other words, participants were more likely to internalize and believe stereotypes related to being Latino. Composite scores ranging from 25 to 175 were calculated with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of internalized racism. Lower scores suggested that individuals were less likely to endorse statements related to internalized racism. The mean scores for the current sample were 55.89 (SD = 20.30) indicating lower levels of internalized racism. Curiously enough, statements related to Latino sexuality, family values, and religiosity yielded higher scores than the overall mean. In other words, participants agreed more with statements such as “Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are better at sex than Whites” (M = 81.64, SD = 42.38). Although participants were more likely to agree with this statement, the neutrality of their responses seems to indicate uncertainty or that the participants were undecided with how much they did or did not agree with the aforementioned statement. A statistically non-significant difference on internalized racism scores was found between men (M = 63.18, SD = 25.35) and women (M = 53.32, SD = 17.87), p = .232

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis One

Independent t-tests were used to test the hypothesis that lighter skinned Latinos would be more likely to endorse White privilege attitudes (WPAS) compared to Latinos who are not lighter skinned. The WPAS (2009) was used to determine awareness of
White privilege or lack thereof. Mean scores between the number of 1 and 6 were calculated. Higher scores on the WPAS indicate higher awareness of White privilege and its cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions.

The overall mean score on the WPAS was \( (M = 3.68, \text{SD} = .41) \) suggesting that the participants in the current sample, regardless of skin color, held a moderate level of White privilege attitudes. An independent t-sample test was conducted to explore differences of White privilege awareness between lighter skinned \( (n = 99) \) and medium skinned participants \( (n = 47) \). The sample size of medium skinned participants was smaller in comparison to lighter skinned participants thus impacting the statistical power of the following findings. Moreover, the selection of the participants was not random since the main method of recruitment involved chain referral sampling. However, the other assumptions of the independent t-sample test were met (i.e., independence of observations and continuous dependent variable).

An independent t-sample test also revealed no statistically significant differences between individuals who were light \( (n = 99, \text{NIS-SSCD}: 1-3, M = 3.65, \text{SD} = .42) \) or medium skinned \( (n = 47, \text{NIS-SSCD}: 4-7, M = 3.73, \text{SD} = .38; t (144) = -1.19, p = .238, \text{two tailed}) \) in the endorsement of White privilege attitudes. The magnitude of differences in means of the endorsement of White privilege attitudes (mean difference = -.09, CI: -.228 to .057) was small as well. Only one individual classified himself as dark skinned; thus, his response was excluded from the analysis.

**Hypothesis Two**

An independent t sample test was used to examine the hypothesis that lighter skinned Latinas versus lighter skinned Latinos would have higher endorsement of White
privilege attitudes as compared to Latinos/as who are not lighter skinned. The sample size of males (n = 34) versus females (n = 116) was much smaller therefore impacting the generalizability and statistical power of the findings. The independent t sample test indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the endorsement of White privilege attitudes between men (M = 3.67, SD = .087) and women (M = 3.69, SD = .036; t (145) = -.230, p = .82, two tailed). The magnitude of differences in the means (mean difference = -.019, 95% CI: -.178 to .141) was small.

In order to further explore the effects of skin color and gender on awareness of White privilege and interactions between gender and skin color, a two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted. Participants were divided into two groups according to skin tone (light and medium) and gender (male and female). Prior to conducting the analysis, the assumptions for a two-way between subjects ANOVA was assessed and were not violated. There was not a statistically significant interaction between the effects of gender and skin color on awareness of White privilege, $F(2, 140) = .1244, p = .291$. Moreover, there was no main effect for gender $F(2, 140) = .046, p = .955$ and skin color $F(2, 140) = .103, p = .902$ on awareness of White privilege.

**Hypothesis Three**

To test the hypothesis that Latinos, regardless of skin color and Latinos who arrived to the United States later in life, would endorse colorblind attitudes, mean scores on the Color Blind Racial Attitudes (CoBRAS) were calculated and Pearson Product Correlational Analyses were conducted.

Composite scores on the CoBRAS range from 20 to 120 with higher scores indicating tendencies to endorse colorblind attitudes (Neville, Roderick, Durán, Lee, &
For the participants in this study, the mean score on the CoBRAS was 72.83 (SD = 5.0). These findings seem to indicate that the participants in the sample hold somewhat neutral colorblind racial attitudes.

To assess whether or not differences existed between individuals who identified as light or medium skinned, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted. The assumptions of one-way ANOVA were examined and were not violated. The one-way ANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference in mean CoBRAS scores for participants with light skin (M = 72.96, SD = 4.95) or medium skin (M = 72.44, SD = 5.11); \(F(1, 144) = 0.34, p = .562\).

To test the extent to which age of arrival is related to the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes, a correlational analysis was conducted. Specifically, the directionality and the strength between the bivariate variables (i.e., age of arrival and overall mean score on the CoBRAS) were examined. The majority of participants in this study were born in the United States. Approximately 31% of the participants (n = 47) arrived to the United States at 15.04 years (SD = 10.71).

Prior to conducting the correlational analysis, the following assumptions: continuous variables, linearity, no outliers, and normality were examined. Assumptions of linearity, outliers, and normality were violated for the continuous variables (i.e., age of arrival). As a result, a non-parametric correlational analysis, Spearman’s Rho, was utilized. There was a non-significant correlation of .126 (p = .399) between age of arrival to the United States and the mean scores on the CoBRAS. However, age of arrival was positively correlated with awareness of White privilege, one of the subscales on the
WPAS (2009), $r = .469$ (p = .001) indicating that Latinos who arrived later in life were more likely be aware of the benefits associated with being White privilege.

**Hypothesis Four**

In order to examine the fourth hypothesis, that lower levels of White privilege awareness, a subscale on the WPAS, and higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes would yield higher levels of internalized racism, a Pearson Correlational analysis was used. As described earlier, correlational analyses explore the directionality and strength among the variables of interest. Prior to conducting the analyses, the assumptions of Pearson correlation were explored. Upon examining the Q-Q plots, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality, and Box plots, the assumptions of linearity, normality, and outliers were violated (Internalized Racism mean scores, White Privilege awareness subscale mean scores from the WPAS). As a result, Spearman’s Rho, a non-parametric correlational analysis, was utilized. Non-significant correlations were found among colorblind attitudes (CoBRAS) and White privilege awareness (WPAS), $r = .057$, $p = .484$ and internalized racism (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale) and White privilege awareness $r = -.014$, $p = 864$. However, a positive correlation was found between internalized racism and colorblind racial attitudes, $r = .253$, $p = .002$, suggesting that the participants who internalized negative stereotypes about being Latino were more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes. Please table 7.

Similarly, Multiple Spearman Rho correlational analyses were used to explore the extent to which internalized racism, colorblind racial attitudes, and overall White privilege attitudes were related. A non-significant correlation was found between colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) and White privilege attitudes (WPAS), $r = -.139$, p
White privilege attitudes (WPAS) and internalized racism (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale) were close to being statistically significant yielding a correlational value of $r = -.159, p = .051$. Finally, as described in the previous correlational analysis, a positive correlation between internalized racism and colorblind racial attitudes, $r = .253, p = .002$, suggesting that the participants who internalized negative stereotypes about being Latino were more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes (Table 8).

**Hypothesis Five**

A Multiple Regression Analysis was used to test to the hypothesis that participants’ skin color, overall White privilege attitudes (WPAS), colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) were predictive of internalized racism (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale). Specifically, the multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess the simultaneous effects of skin color, White privilege attitudes, and colorblind racial attitudes on internalized racism. Before conducting the multiple linear regression, the assumptions for multiple linear regression were checked. The assumptions are as follows: linear relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable, normality, no autocorrelation, little multicollinearity, and finally, homoscedasticity (Creswell, 2008). It is also important to note that the independent variables must be continuous while the sample size per independent variable should include, minimally, 20 cases. Because this hypothesis consisted of three continuous independent variables with minimally 20 cases per independent variable, a multiple linear regression was deemed appropriate. Although the independent variables in the current sample exceeded 20 cases, the majority of participants rated their skin color as light ($n = 99$) versus medium
(n = 47) thus affecting the generalizability of the findings for Latinos who have darker skin color hues.

Next, linearity between the independent variables and dependent variables were observed. A scatter plot was used to observe whether or not there was linearity between the variables. Normality of the dependent variable (internalized racism) was also determined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which postulates that variables are normal if the statistical significance level is above .05. Because the variable was not normally distributed, a log transformation was conducted in order to normalize the dependent variable of internalized racism. Multicollinearity of the independent variables was also assessed prior to conducting the regression. In order to explore multicollinearity, correlations between the independent variable are below .8 and the Variation Inflation Factor (VIF) must be below 10. An analysis of the Durbin Watson test was used in order to explore autocorrelation. Ideally, for autocorrelation not to be met the Durbin Watson test should be between the values of 1.5 and 2.5; values between 0 and 4 are still deemed acceptable. Finally, in order to explore homoscedasticity, the Normal P-Plot of Regression Standardized residuals are assessed. Because the latter assumptions were met, a linear regression was deemed appropriate in order to explore the hypothesis.

The multiple linear regression model with the three independent variables (skin color, colorblind racial attitudes, and White privilege attitudes) produced $R^2 = .085$, $F(3,142) = 4.41$, $p < .005$. Colorblind racial attitudes contributed the most to regression model ($\beta = .252$) followed by attitudes related to White privilege ($\beta = -.112$), and skin color ($\beta = .046$). It is noteworthy to mention that White privilege attitudes had a negative
weight (opposite from colorblind racial attitudes) indicating that as endorsement of White privilege decreases, levels of internalized racism increases. Colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS) were found to be statistically significant predictors of the regression model, \( p < .02 \). However, skin color, \( p = .572 \), and White privilege attitudes (WPAS) did not contribute to the regression model, \( p = .174 \). The aforementioned findings suggest that colorblind racial attitudes are predictors of internalized racism while skin color and White privilege attitudes (WPAS), did not play a role on the development of internalized racism. The findings partially supported the hypotheses that skin color, colorblind racial attitudes, and White privilege attitudes contribute to internalized racism. Please refer to Table 9.

**Hypothesis Six**

Finally, it was predicted that level of education and racial identification were related to acknowledgment of White privilege and internalized racism. For the purpose of this hypothesis, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used. A MANOVA is used when there is more than one dependent variable. In this case, the effects of education and racial identification on awareness of White privilege and internalized racism were investigated. Ideally, the sample size would be even for each of the independent variables and a minimum of 20 cases per level of variable being explored. Prior to exploring the final hypothesis, the researcher explored the assumptions of Multivariate analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The assumptions of MANOVA are as follows: two or more dependent variables, categorical independent variables, independence of observations, adequate sample for each level of the independent variables, no outliers, normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance, and finally, no
multicollinearity. Given that the sample size for the racial categories were small with the some of the racial categories consisting 6 or 7 participants, a MANOVA would be considered inappropriate. As a result, the racial and education independent variables were collapsed into two separate levels therefore, making a MANOVA appropriate. Because the other assumptions of MANOVA were met, a MANOVA was deemed appropriate in order to explore the hypothesis.

A two-way multivariate analysis variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine whether there were differences in the endorsement of White privilege attitudes and Internalized racism according to an individual’s education level (undergraduate and graduate) and racial identification (white and non-White). A non significant MANOVA was obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .001 $F(2, 125)=.40, p = .961$. Because the findings of the MANOVA were statistically insignificant, no follow up tests, including post-hoc tests were conducted.

**Summary**

Chapter 4 contained a description of the procedures implemented to gather the data as well as the demographic make up of the participants. Results of the data analysis, as well as the procedures needed to conduct this analysis, were presented in this chapter.

The purpose of the current study was to provide a preliminary examination of White privilege attitudes among Latinos across skin color hue and racial identity. Relationships among White privilege and other measures that assess for racial attitudes and biases were also examined. It further examined whether the following demographic variables such as age of arrival to the United States, gender, skin color, racial

...
identification, and education level affected awareness of White privilege, internalized racism, or colorblind racial attitudes.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The current study’s aim was to examine White privilege among Latinos residing in the United States. In particular, this study sought to explore White privilege (WPAS) among Latinos across skin color hue. In addition, colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS; 2000), internalized racism (Mochihua Tephuani; 2010), racial identification, age of arrival (for immigrant Latinos), gender, level of education, and skin color were also examined. Because White privilege within the Latino community has been understudied, the Feminist Ecological Model (FEM) (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) was used to contextualize, interpret, and draw conclusions about the results. Specifically, the FEM is a useful multifaceted model that explains the various systemic ecological forces that impact Latinos racial identification, specifically their attitudes and perceptions on White privilege.

The FEM (Ballou, Matsumoto, & Wagner, 2002) provides a framework to interpret the findings of the current study. The FEM is made up of four distinct spheres (macro, exo, micro, and individual) as well as other elements including planetary/climatic conditions and history. Other aspects of identity such as age, race, social class, and gender are coordinates in the model and intersect across the elements in the model. The various dimensions in the model are critical components in explaining the experiences of people. However, the majority of the measures used in this study focus primarily on the individual level; specifically the thoughts and feelings the participants have regarding colorblind racial attitudes, White privilege, and internalized racism. This does not mean that external forces found on the macrosystem, exosystem, or microsystem do not play a
role racial awareness among Latinos. On the contrary, the systemic forces found on the 3 distal spheres influence identity development, including racial identity development for Latinos.

This chapter will be organized according to the research questions outlined in the current study: White privilege among lighter skinned or White identified Latinos (research question 1 and 2), White privilege attitudes, colorblind racial attitudes as predictive of internalized racism (research question 5) and finally, racial identification and educational level as predictive of internalized racism (research question 6). Statistically significant findings of the study will also be included and divided according to research question: colorblind racial attitudes among Latinos, including colorblind racial attitudes among immigrant Latinos (research question 3), relationships among internalized racism, awareness of White privilege, colorblind racial attitudes and skin color (research question 4). Moreover, the FEM will be utilized to support interpretations of the data. Implications for clinical practice and for future research are also discussed. Finally, limitations of the current project, including methodological constraints in gauging White privilege among Latinos are provided.

**White Privilege among Lighter Skinned Latinos or White Latinos**

Contrary to the current study’s first and second hypotheses, lighter skin color and gender did not play a predictive role on the development, or lack thereof, White privilege. For the purpose of this study, White privilege was operationalized using Pinterits et al., (2009) psychometric scale of White privilege attitudes. Specifically, participants who rated their skin no darker than the 3 on the NIS (2003) and/or identified their race as White alone were anticipated to experience White privilege. However, the majority of the
participants, including those who were considered light skinned and/or racially identified as White were more likely to skip questions related directly to their White Privilege. For example, when asked to respond to the following statement, “I am ashamed that the system is stacked in my favor because I am White” nearly 81% of participants selected the “N/A” option. Thus, it was difficult to confirm whether or not individuals of Latino descent experienced White privilege given that questions related directly to White privilege were avoided or answered inconsistently. Methodological limitations of the WPAS (2009) will be reviewed in greater detail later in the limitations portion of this chapter.

The current political climate, as well as the negative stereotypes that stigmatizes Latinos residing in the United States, may be impacting Latinos racial identity development, including their perceptions on White privilege, including their thoughts as to whether or not they benefit from White privilege. Historically, Latinos, specifically those with darker skin, have been subjected to discriminatory practices including job discrimination and housing and school segregation (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Ortiz & Telles, 2012; Healey & O’Brien, 2015). Also, the legislation and regulation of the 1980s made it difficult for Latino immigrants, particularly those of Mexican descent, to legally enter the United States (Ortiz & Telles, 2012). Based on these historical accounts of oppression and unfair treatment towards Latinos, Latinos irrespective of skin color or racial identification may believe that White privilege does not apply to them. The current political climate, specifically the anti-immigrant and the discriminatory statements made by President Trump about Latinos, in particular about Mexicans, could have reminded
Latinos that irrespective of skin color they are still being targeted and discriminated against.

**Racial Identification of Latinos.** Another historical account that may be contributing to the participants’ racial identification includes the definitions of race in Latin America. For example, Whitening policies in Latin America encouraged the emigration of European immigrants to areas where Indigenous and African individuals as to ‘improve the race.’ (Chavez-Dueñas, et. al, 2014). Thus, ‘improving the race’, also meant lightening skin color as well as internalizing European values and ideals. African and Indigenous values were deemed inappropriate and less desirable. Darker skinned individuals in countries such as the Dominican Republic and Brazil are more likely to identify with mixed categories such as “pardo” or “mulato” due to its proximity to Whiteness (Howard, 2001; Schwartzman, 2007). The phenomenon of colorism in Latin American countries could help explain why the majority of participants identified as White (31%) or Other (45%) versus with the African or Indigenous racial categories. This racial identification with White or Other may be the participants’ ways of distancing themselves from their African or Indigenous roots. For example, Bonilla-Silva (2002) found that White-identified Latinos, specifically those of Cuban descent, were less likely to view Blacks positively and were more likely to hold higher paying jobs (Grillo, 2000). Bonilla-Silva (2002) findings suggest that that lighter skinned and/or Latinos who identify as White may have negative biases towards darker skinned individuals, particularly those of African descent. Additionally, Latinos’ racial socialization process consists of anti-Black messages including criticism of darker skin, African features, and elevation of Whiteness (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014). For example, over 90% of
Dominicans, are of African or biracial (White and Black) yet Dominicans are more likely to vehemently deny their Blackness and embrace Eurocentric definitions of race (Torres-Sailant, 1998). In the current study, only 4% (n = 6) of the participants identified as Black suggesting that participants may be suppressing their Blackness (Darity, Dietrich, & Hamilton, 2005). Darity, Dietrich, and Hamilton (2005) found that Latinos with medium, dark or very dark skin were likely to racially identify as White although socially, they would be considered non-White. Because the current study utilized self-classification versus social classification reports of skin color, it is difficult to determine whether or not others would socially classify individuals who identified as light as light. Other variables, including participants’ phenotype, hair texture, facial features, were not included in the analysis, thus making it difficult to determine whether or not Latinos’ who identified as light would be perceived phenotypically non-White. Conversely, approximately 60% of the Latinos in the sample possessed a graduate degree supporting previous findings that Latinos with lighter skin are more likely to have greater educational attainment and higher income (Tafoya, 2005). Because phenotype was not evaluated in the current study it is difficult to determine whether or not individuals’ skin tone or racial identification was congruent with their appearance.

The participants’ tendency to select “other” or “multiracial” (56%) is in line with previous studies that have indicated that Latinos are more likely to identify with “other” racial categories as well as with their national identity when asked to describe their race (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014; Taylor, Hugo-Lopez, Hamar Martinez, & Velasco, 2012). The participants’ racialization processes can be explained through the macrosystem and exosystem of the FEM. Ideologies, worldviews, politics and other
institutions including the government and the media heavily influence the racialization of individuals. As described earlier, governmental institutions like the U.S Census has influenced the browning of Latinos residing in the United States (Etzioni, 2007). In 1970, the US census began using the term “Hispanic” to categorize individuals who were considered “person of Spanish origin.” The Chicano Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, however, brought about the idea of a “brown” identity for Mexicans residing in the United States, an identity that was based mostly on the experiences of darker skinned, non-White working class Mexicans (Lopez, 2003). After the Chicano Civil Right Movement, Mexicans, including Mexican academics, legal scholars, and activists across skin color hue were more likely to identify as Chicano and as non-White (Delgado, 2004; Ortiz & Telles, 2014). Identification with ethnicity including country of origin versus race is also found amongst other Latino groups. In a recent survey, Latinos (51%) were more likely to racially identify as “Other” and describe their race using national terms such as Venezuelan, Mexican, Colombian, etc. (Taylor, Hugo-Lopez, Hamar Martinez, & Velasco, 2012). The racialization processes of Latinos places an emphasis on cultural socialization (i.e., messages about one’s ethnicity and group membership) over preparation for racial bias (messages about discrimination) suggesting that Latinos are more likely to use race and ethnicity interchangeably (Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006). As a result, Latinos are more likely to report confusion and apprehension when discussing their race (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014).

Latin America’s governmental policy surrounding race may also be impacting the current participants’ racial identification. *Mestizaje*, a racial colorblind ideology, was
implemented in Latin America as an attempt to create an egalitarian society free of racism. Chavez-Dueñas and colleagues (2014) described how the myth, “social class matters more than color” contributes to the denial of skin color based privileges in Latin America and arguably in the United States. Latinos who benefit from lighter skinned privilege may struggle with this concept as it brings up feelings of discomfort, shame, and guilt (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014). Lee (2004) and Bonilla-Silva (2014) went on to describe how lighter skinned individuals residing in the United States are more likely to have positive outcomes across all domains, including both professionally and economically. Yet racial identity development frameworks do not explore the racial differences among Latinos, including the privileges experienced by lighter skinned Latinos (Freedman & Gallegos, 2001). Participants in the current study, including those who racially identified as White or who possess lighter skin, were less likely to answer questions directly related to their White privilege. For example, statements such as “I am glad to explore my White privilege” or “I am ashamed that the system is stacked in my favor because I am White” were more likely to be answered with the N/A option (n = 120). This tendency to select N/A may be in line with previous studies, which have highlighted Latinos’ confusion and apprehension when discussing race (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014). Perhaps the participants in the current study were likely to select the N/A option because they do not believe that White privilege pertains to them in the way that it does for non-Latino Whites. Although Latinos who typically identify as White and possessed lighter skin and European features were more likely to be middle class, obtain professional jobs, and be community leaders (Lopez, 2003), they still experience discrimination in comparison to their non-Latino White peers (Ortiz & Telles, 2014).
These experiences with discrimination may remind Latinos that albeit their lighter skin color or White racial identification, White privilege does not pertain to them. Conversely, discussing privilege may illicit feelings of guilt, shame, discomfort and avoidance (Chavez-Dueñas, et. al, 2014) for Latinos who are lighter skinned or who identify as White. The findings highlight the fluidity of Latinos’ racial identification according to context.

As described earlier, gender did not seem to play a significant role on awareness of endorsement of White privilege attitudes. The current study had more women (n= 116) than men (n= 34) as a result increasing the likelihood of committing a Type II error. In other words, the smaller sample size of men, in comparison to the larger sample size of women, made it difficult to detect differences in gender when it may exist. Consequently, it is imperative that the gender imbalance be kept in mind as having statistical implications. Specifically, it is important to keep the gender imbalance in mind when reading the following interpretations. Pinterits and colleagues (2009) found that White women, as opposed to White men are more likely to be more aware of White privilege, confront White privilege, and have White privilege remorse. Similarly, Neville and colleagues (2000) found that men are more likely to endorse colorblind beliefs. The current study’s findings do not seem to support previous findings that suggest men are less likely than women to be racially aware and are more likely to hold colorblind racial attitudes. Perhaps the participants in the current study, because of their Latino identity, have been exposed to instances of discrimination. For example, boys of Color as compared to girls of Color are more likely to report discrimination (Fishcer & Shaw, 1999; Hughes et al., 2006). Based on these experiences with discrimination, men of
Color, including the Latinos in the current sample, may be more aware of how race plays a role on one’s identity. However, as stated earlier, the sample in the current study is small thus making it difficult to draw clear conclusions about the current findings.

**Skin Color, White Privilege Attitudes, Colorblind Racial Attitudes as predictive of Internalized Racism**

The fifth hypothesis explored whether or not participants’ skin color, overall White privilege attitudes (WPAS; 2009), colorblind racial attitudes (CoBRAS; 2000) were related to higher levels of internalized racism (Mochihua Tepehuani Scale; 2010). Similar to the previous findings, the presence of colorblind racial attitudes was associated with higher levels of internalized racism; however, White Privilege Attitudes and skin color were not predictive of internalized racism. These findings suggest that overall White privilege attitudes (WPAS) and lighter skin color, are not related to internalized racism. However, this finding should be interpreted with caution given that the majority of lighter skinned and Latinos who identified as White were unclear as to whether or not they benefited from lighter skinned privilege or White privilege.

**Racial Identification and Educational Level Predictive of Internalized Racism**

The sixth hypothesis explored whether or not education level and racial identification influenced development of internalized racism and attitudes towards White privilege. Due to differences in sample size in racial identification (White = 47 and non-White = 104) and education (high school through bachelor’s degree = 51 and graduate students = 90) the following should be interpreted with caution in mind. Racial identification and educational level were not predictive of internalized racism or attitudes towards White privilege. These findings were surprising in light of previous
studies suggesting that individuals of color who have higher educational attainment are less likely to internalize racism (Cort et al., 2009) and are more likely to be aware of racism in academic settings (Ortiz & Telles, 2012). As reported earlier, the findings may be impacted by the difference in sample size between individuals with an undergraduate degree versus a graduate degree. Therefore, the findings may be more indicative of a type II error.

An important factor to note is that the majority of Latino participants who identified as White were college graduates or possessed graduate degrees. These findings were similar to the finding in the U.S. Census (2010), which reports that the majority of Latinos who identified their race as White were college educated. Because Whiteness is praised and valued in Latin America, it is of no surprise that Latinos who possess a college degree would identify as White, irrespective of skin color. Padrón (2015) went on to describe how Whiteness in Venezuela was not always related to skin color. On the contrary, Whiteness was related to a myriad of factors including social class, education, and manners (Padrón, 2015).

Padrón’s (2015) focus on social class, and not skin color, as the driving force behind Whiteness and White privilege in Latin America could be interpreted as a form of minimization and avoidance of lighter skin color privilege (Chavez et al., 2014; Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). Bonilla-Silva (2006) has documented how lighter skinned Latinos are more likely to hold privileged jobs and have better life outcomes across a number of social domains. The current study relied on self-report of race and skin color, therefore making it difficult to determine whether or not phenotype or educational attainment was related to the racial identification of the current study.
Statistically Significant Findings of the Current Study

Relationships among Internalized Racism, awareness of White privilege, and Colorblind Racial Attitudes

The fourth hypothesis sought to examine the extent to which internalized racism, awareness of White privilege (a subscale on the WPAS), and colorblind attitudes were related to one another. Colorblind racial attitudes, awareness of White privilege, and internalized racism were not related to one another. However, a positive relationship between internalized racism and colorblind racial attitudes was identified. This finding suggests that Latinos who endorse higher levels of internalized racism are more likely to possess colorblind racial attitudes and view life through a racial colorblind lens. This finding seems to corroborate past findings that suggest people of Color, specifically individuals of African American descent, who endorse colorblind racial beliefs are more likely to internalize racism, blame other people of Color for social and economic disparities, and prefer friendships with Whites (Neville, Coleman, Falconer, & Holmes, 2005).

Colorblind racism is related to modern racial theories which postulates that racism is no longer an issues and that racial minorities are to blame for their social standing (Neville et al., 2000). Based on this definition, it is not surprising that colorblind racial attitudes were related to higher levels of internalized racism. Accepting the view that racism does not contribute to the subjugation of one’s group, maintains the status quo including the oppression and unfair treatment of ethnic and racial minorities. The current finding implies that Latinos who endorse colorblind racial attitudes, accept the dominant White hegemony, and deny the existence of racism may be vulnerable to unconsciously
perpetuating the cycle of racism against other Latinos. For example, Latinos who believe negative stereotypes about their community (e.g., “Latinos are not reliable” or “Latinos are less intelligent than Whites”) may be less likely to protect their group’s interest and are more likely to work against their own progress and the progress of their community as a whole. Similarly, Neville and colleagues (2001) speculated that colorblind racial attitudes endorsed by other African Americans serve to perpetuate racial inequities; however, studies have yet to address this topic further making this a supposition that needs to be explored in the future. Aside from understanding internalized racism from the individual lens, internalized racism can also be understood through the macrosystem and exosystem of the FEM. Internalized racism has its historical roots in the racist ideologies, structural hierarchies, and political views implemented by the dominant European group. Although the majority of studies have focused on racism versus internalized racism, a great number of scholars have contributed to the literature on internalized racism (Clark & Clark, 1939; Hipolito-Delgado, 2010; Kwate & Myer, 2011; Padilla, 2001; Pyke, 2000; Pyke & Dang, 2003; Speight, 2007; Tull, Sheu, Butler, & Cornelious, 2005; Williams & Mohammed, 2013).

The earliest research on internalized racism was the doll study where Black children demonstrated their preference for White dolls over Black dolls (Clark & Clark, 1939). Early studies, like the Clark and Clark study, demonstrated how the internalization of White racism led to self-hatred among non-Whites. Akbar (1984) speculated that internalized racism among Black Americans, which he referred to as psychological/mental slavery, has its roots in the African slave trade. Europeans viewed non-Whites, including Indigenous and African slaves, as immoral and overall defective
(Sussman, 2014). Because of the omnipresence of Whiteness in American and Latino culture, including the myth of meritocracy, individuals of Color may be more likely to internalize racism and become like the colonizers (Freire, 1970; Hipolito-Delgado, 2010). The Latinos in the current sample who endorsed colorblind racial attitudes and internalized racism may have done so as a result of the history of racism and oppression in Latin America and in the United States. Given the preference for Whiteness in both Latin America and in the United States, the Latino participants could believe that are inferior in comparison to Whites thus making them more likely to believe negative stereotypes about their ethnic group. This finding is of concern given that people of Color who internalize racism are more likely to have a poor ethnic identity, prefer friendships with Whites over friendships with individuals of their ethnic group, encounter difficulties in their romantic relationships and experience economic and health inequities (Taylor, 1990; Neville et al., 2005; Tull, et al., 2005; Speight, 2007; Hipolito-Delgado, 2016).

Colorblind Racial Attitudes among Latinos, including Colorblind Racial Attitudes among foreign-born Latinos

Latinos, across the skin color spectrum, were more likely to endorse “neutral” colorblind attitudes. This finding suggests that the Latino participants in this study are sometimes aware that people of Color may experience unfair or poor treatment. Yet the neutrality of the responses seems to indicate that participants may not always view race or skin color as a predictor of success or oppression for that matter. This finding supports the historical and political ideology (found in the macrosystem and exosystem of the FEM) of mestizaje, which deems that everyone is racially mixed and that racism is obsolete (Chavez et al., 2014). This finding seems to be contradictory in nature. The
Latinos in the sample recognize that White privilege exists; yet they also endorse beliefs that are racially colorblind. Because colorblind attitudes deemphasize the importance of race and deny the pervasiveness and impacts of racism, the Latino participants may have a difficult time recognizing how their lighter skin have allotted them certain societal privileges (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Meanwhile, Latinos with darker skin who endorse colorblind racial attitudes may be less prepared for racial bias when it occurs.

Organista (2009) described how his lighter skinned “huero” (Mexican colloquialism for blonde) appearance allotted him favorable experiences and interactions with professors and peers. Although he felt stigmatized due to his Latino identity, he noticed his lighter skin, European features, and lighter hair made him seem more likable and more attractive to individuals within and outside of his community, specifically non-Latino Whites. Organista (2009) suggests that a scale be created to assess the experiences of Latinos who can be stigmatized for being Latino while receiving preferential treatment because of their European features and lighter skin. Because the great majority of the participants in the study possessed lighter skin, it may have allotted them preferential treatment. However, it may be difficult for the participants to recognize this preferential treatment because of the negative stereotypes associated with being Latino as well as the United States’ tendency to use Latino as a racial marker versus an ethnic marker.

Additionally, the discourse on race in Latin America may encourage lighter skinned Latinos to deny privileges associated with their lighter skin (Chavez-Dueñas, et al., 2014).

The study sought out to explore whether or not age of arrival for foreign-born Latinos impacted the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes. Given the historical
context of *mestizaje* in Latin America, it was predicted that Latinos who arrived to the United States later in life were more likely to endorse colorblind racial attitudes as seen in Latin America. It was found that age of arrival did not reveal higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes. This was a surprising finding given that racial categories were dropped from the majority of Latin American censuses and that the government adapted the colorblind ideology of *mestizaje* across Latin America (Dueñas-Chavez, et al., 2014). This finding could be explained by myriad of confounding variables including skin color and education level as well as the smaller sample size of foreign-born Latinos (n = 47).

The role of context needs to be considered as influencing the endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes. Because the majority of the Latinos in the current study possessed a graduate degree, their access to academic resources could have decreased their colorblind racial attitudes. For example, Hogchschild, (1995), Kluegel and Bobo (2001) and Benson (2006) found that individuals of color who had higher levels of education attainment and were more likely to be aware of the systemic barriers that act as barriers to their social mobility. Similarly, the Latinos in the current sample may be more aware of discrimination and prejudices geared towards Latinos thus, decreasing their colorblind racial attitudes. Unfortunately, the colorblind attitudes of Latinos with less education attainment were not taken into account therefore, it is unknown if educational attainment, for Latinos, minimizes colorblind racial attitudes.

Interestingly, a moderate positive correlation \( r = .469, \ p < .001 \) was found between age of arrival and awareness of White privilege attitudes, a subscale on the WPAS (Pinterits et al., 2009). Latinos who arrived to the United States later in life were more likely to be aware of White privilege and its ramifications on racial inequality in the
United States (Pinterits et al., 2009). Perhaps the Latinos in the current sample, in an attempt to maintain their cultural heritage, were more likely to gravitate towards other Latinos as a result becoming attuned to the racial inequalities that Latinos experience. For example, Black migrants were more likely to relate with Black Americans over time because of instances of racism and discrimination (Benson, 2006). Being exposed to higher education may have also contributed to this finding. The majority of the Latinos in the current sample, including those with immigrant histories, possessed an associate’s degree or higher. Previous studies have found that Latinos are more likely to be treated unfavorably and be viewed as less intelligent in academic or professional settings (Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; Telles & Ortiz, 2012). Experiences with discrimination could have made the participants, especially foreign-born Latinos who arrived later in life to the United States, more attuned and aware of the benefits associated with being non-Latino White.

**Contributions of the Current Study**

The current study brought to light the fluidity of race and ethnicity among Latinos. As stated earlier, 56% of the Latinos in the current study were likely to identify with an “Other” or a multiracial category when describing their race. Araujo-Dawson and Quiros (2014) found a similar phenomenon among Latina women. According to the authors, Latinas were more apprehensive when identifying their racial identity and were more likely to interchange with ethnicity and national origin when describing their race. Also, 31% of Latinos in the current study identified their race as White alone. However, when asked about their direct experiences with White privilege, they were more likely to choose the N/A option. This suggests that Latinos experiences with discrimination may
influence their attitudes towards White privilege. Conversely, Latinos identification with a White category may also reflect a preference for Whiteness (Araujo-Dawson & Quiros, 2014; Darity, Dietrich, and Hamilton, 2005). Therefore, when thinking about Latinos’ racial identification it is important to observe context, including sociopolitical factors that impact Latinos racial identity development.

An interesting finding of the study was that Latinos who arrived to the United States later in life were more likely to be aware of White privilege. This finding seems to suggest that immigrants may have built an awareness of the environment around them including the omnipresence of Whiteness in the United States (Kong, 2010). Colorblind racial attitudes and internalized racism were found to have an inverse relationship suggesting that individuals who endorse colorblind racial attitudes are more likely to internalize negative stereotypes about their community. This is an important concept to explore given that internalized racism leads to detrimental outcomes across a number of life and social domains. Additionally, this study provided an understanding of Latinos in professional settings, including in academia. These findings seem to suggest that although education provides Latinos with social capital it does not keep them free from the impacts of racism (Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011).

**Future Studies**

Future studies are encouraged to further explore whether or not phenotype and skin color play a predicting role on racial identity among Latinos across socioeconomic status. Darity, Dietrich, and Hamilton (2005) highlighted how Latinos with darker skin tones are likely to racially identify as White. However, the mechanism by which this occurs is still not well understood. Future studies are encouraged to use confederate reports of skin
color and self report of skin color in racial identification as well as a mixed methods approach to fully capture Latinos’ experiences with identity, colorism, racism, and privilege. Additionally, future studies are encouraged to explore how variety in skin tone and phenotype impact racial identity development, including attitudes or perceptions of White privilege. As described earlier, Latinos are more likely to focus on ethnic versus racial labels when describing their experiences. Future studies can explore questions such as “Have you ever been praised for having lighter skin and/or European features?” (Organista, 2009). For example, is racial identification associated with social class or skin color or is it a combination of the two? Do Latinos who wish to transition into middle class from lower social class more likely to racially identify as White? Other areas of interest include exploring the Latino family’s role on colorism, racism, and awareness of White privilege. By expanding this work, psychologists can begin to understand the complexity of race within the Latino community and its ramifications on identity development. Future studies are also encouraged to explore the skin color dynamic between a Latino clinician and Latino client. For example, if a client presents with issues around colorism should the differences in phenotype be discussed? Adames et al., (2016) encourage lighter skinned clinicians to be aware of their skin color when addressing impasses in the therapeutic relationship. However, the dynamic between clinician and client in regards to skin tone differences among Latinos has not been studied to any extent.

Future studies are also encouraged to look at the experience of lighter skinned people and within group bias. Robinson and Ward (1995) found that Black adolescents on both ends of the skin color spectrum are likely to experience discrimination because of
their skin tone. Although studies have highlighted the difficulties of darker skinned individuals, lighter skinned individuals present with unique challenges such as being questioned about their group membership loyalty (Hunter, 2008). Future studies are encouraged to explore how lighter skinned Latinos with colorism and identification.

**Clinical Implications**

The current findings provide some insight into the experience of Latinos currently residing in the United States. Similar to the findings on the U.S. Census (2010), the majority of Latinos identify their race as “Other” or “White.” With this understanding of the intersectionality between ethnicity and race, clinicians can began to understand issues of racial classifications that impact Latinos residing in the United States. If a clinician is unaware that a Latino can be White in color and in physiognomy, they may unknowingly oppress the client within the therapeutic relationship and not give clients the space needed to explore the complexity of their racial identity.

Awareness of within group difference among Latinos is another important factor for clinicians to take into consideration. Given that the majority of lighter skinned Latinos are more likely to hold professional jobs (Lopez, 2003; Bonilla-Silva, 2006), darker skinned Latinos are more likely to have a White or lighter skinned Latino as a therapist. The racial awareness of the White Latino clinician is a critical component in the therapeutic relationship. For example, if a White Latina is working with a family who is more indigenous or African, she may project her experiences of being “Latino” onto the client and perhaps unknowingly invalidate the client and their experiences with colorism or racism. This is problematic because it may silence the client from talking about racism as a result making the therapeutic relationship unsafe.
It is also crucial that clinicians are made aware of the preference for Whiteness within the Latino community. For example, lighter skinned Latinos are often times praised for their White skin and European features while darker skinned Latinos are criticized for having “pelo malo”, dark skin, and are often times perceived as unattractive. Issues of colorism are present among Latino families (Chavez et al., 2014). However, it is sometimes difficult for Latinos to address issues of colorism in a culturally congruent way. For example, if a Latino man’s grandmother makes inappropriate statements about his skin color and hair texture, it may be difficult for him to address this for fear that it may be disrespectful or rude. Because there is a great emphasis on respeto, or respect, within many Latino families, addressing impasses like these can create anxiety.

Clinicians are encouraged to use role-plays to assist client in challenging some of these biases in a culturally appropriate manner (Adames, Chavez-Dueñas, & Organista, 2016). Also, for clients who present with difficulties around colorism, psychoeducation on the psychological and physiological effects of colorism and racism are encouraged.

Graduate programs are encouraged to provide trainings to students that foster cultural curiosity regarding the experiences of Latinos, including the relationship between colorblind racial attitudes and internalized racism. Encouraging students to think of the diverse experiences of Latinos’ racial identity can minimize overgeneralizations about Latinos. Additionally, these trainings can highlight the importance of cultural sensitivity when interacting with Latino clients and students alike. Programs are also encouraged to provide a space for students, particularly students of Latino ancestry, to share their experiences with identity and discrimination.

Limitations
It is pertinent to address the limitations of the current study, including barriers for recruitment and methodological challenges. Sampling strategies, including the use of emails and social media as the main vehicle for recruitment, is a major limitation of the current study. Participants utilized Qualtrics®, an online web based program, to complete survey information. Although using the Internet may make it easier to access individuals across a wide geographical lens, recent studies have found that response rates have diminished since the beginning of the 2000s thus making online surveys a less reliable recruitment tool (Dillaman, et. al, 2010; Frippiat & Marquis, 2010).

In person recruitment could have increased the likelihood of survey completion among participants as well as broadening the scope of the participants surveyed. The use of Qualtrics® could excluded individuals who may not have access to the Internet or who may struggle with computer literacy. Overall, 90% of Latinos residing in the United States have access to the Internet; however, this number decreases by 11% for individuals whose annual income is below $30,000 (Pew Hispanic, 2015). Therefore, the use of web-based surveys may make it difficult to obtain data from individuals who are living near or below the poverty line including lighter skinned, medium, and darker Latinos. (Bonilla-Silva, 2006).

Another limitation, which could perhaps be explained by the use of web-based surveys, was the lack of diversity in gender and education level among the participants. Because a goal of this study was to explore attitudes surrounding White privilege across gender, the perspectives of men and women were crucial in capturing similarities and differences. The recruitment of Latino men for the current study was difficult despite various attempts, such as targeting Latino male college organizations in the New England
area. For example, the Latino organizations were targeted on the Internet and through the researcher’s professional/personal networks. Both flyers and emails were sent to leaders of Latino organizations. These groups were encouraged to send the survey information to prospective participants within their network of family, friends, and colleagues. Also, in person recruitment could have made it easier to recruit male participants. It would have been useful to attend events in cities that are geared towards Latinos. Based on these limitations in recruitment, only 34 Latino men successfully completed the survey.

Diversity of education was another limitation. The majority of participants had a high school degree or higher with the majority of participants possessing graduate degree (60%). Given that nationally, only 14% of Latinos have a Bachelor’s degree or higher, the study's findings need to be interpreted carefully. (Pew Hispanic, 2013).

Of the 260 participants who began the survey, only 151 of the participants successfully completed the survey. Nulty (2008) found that on average, online surveys yield an approximate 33% completion rate. He concluded that computer use and motivation to complete surveys could have contributed to this finding. It is unclear why the participants in the current study did not complete the survey in its entirety. What is known is that 58% of participants who completed the survey were highly educated Latina women, a sub-group of the community that is not representative of the Latino community. Hypothetically, the length of the survey, the survey’s content, as well as time constraints may have influenced participants’ motivation to complete the survey. It is important to note that the aforementioned interpretations are speculative in nature and should be interpreted with that caution in mind.
Other study limitations include the lack of diversity in skin tone, geographical location, racial identification, and gender in the current study. Also, the survey was only available in English. Individuals who were not English literate did not have access to the survey. If surveys had been available in Spanish, recent immigrants and other non-English speaking immigrants could have completed the survey, which might have yielded diversity across nationality, income, education, skin color, and possibly racial identification.

An important characteristic to consider is the participants’ bilingualism, which often requires attention to codeswitch according to the demands of one's environment (LaFramboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993).

The study presents some methodological challenges that could have impacted the findings. As described earlier, the WPAS (Pinterits, et al., 2009) was used to measure White privilege among lighter skinned or White-identified Latinos. Although the WPAS (Pinterits, et al., 2009) is a good measure of White privilege, the scale was normed on the experiences of White European Americans. Because of this limitation, the scale was altered to include “N/A” for items that assessed for participants’ direct experience with White privilege. The majority of the participants selected the “N/A” when given the option. As Organista (2009) suggested, questions such as “Have you experienced better or worse treatment because of your skin color?” would be a better approach of measuring skin color privilege among Latinos. Organista (2009), Chavez at al., 2014 and Adames et al., 2016 believe that White privilege applies to lighter skinned or White Latinos who possess European features. It is believed that the culture’s racial ideology makes it difficult for lighter skinned Latinos to recognize their racial privilege. Therefore, questions should be tailored according to these constraints in mind.
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Table 1.

*Participants’ age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Participants’ Hispanic/Latino Country of Origin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Latin American Countries</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Participants’ Racial Identification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Race Entry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

*Participants’ Skin Tone*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skin Tone</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light (1-3)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (4-7)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark (8-10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Participants’ Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s /Bachelor’s</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.

*Participants’ Marital Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.

*Correlations among internalized racism, WPAS, CoBRAS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WPAS (awareness)</th>
<th>CoBRAS</th>
<th>Internalized Racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Racism</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant, p<.01
Table 8.

*Correlations among internalized racism, WPAS, CoBRAS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WPAS</th>
<th>CoBRAS</th>
<th>Internalized Racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.253**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant, p<.01*
Table 9.

*Predictors of Internalized Racism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skin Color</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPAS</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.252*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant, p<.05*
Table 10.

*White Privilege Attitudes (Pinterits et al., 2009).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWP</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACWP</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPA</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPR</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale 1: ‘Confronting White Privilege’ consists of the following 12 items: 1, 5, 7, 10r, 12, 14, 16r, 18, 20, 23, 26 and 28

Subscale 2: ‘Anticipated Costs of Addressing White Privilege’ consists of the following 6 items: 4, 9, 13, 17, 22 and 27

Subscale 3: ‘White Privilege Awareness’ consists of the following 4 items: 2, 6, 19 and 24

Subscale 4: ‘White Privilege Remorse’ consists of the following 6 items: 3, 8, 11, 15, 21 and 25

The items in bold refer to the N/A items that were excluded from the analysis, included mean and standard deviation totals.
APPENDIX A

Demographics Questionnaire

Please circle and fill out the following items that best describes you.

1. Gender: Male Female

2. Age: _____

3. Please provide information about your ethnic ancestry.
   a. Hispanic/Latino (please indicate your country(s) of ancestry below)

4. Race:
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black/African American
   d. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
   e. White
   f. Other (Please Specify: ________________________________ )
   g. Two or More Races (Please Specify: ________________________________ )

5. Were you born in the United States?
   a. Yes (If yes, please skip question number 6)
   b. No (If no, please specify place of birth and skip question number 7)___

6. If you were born outside of the United States, how old were you when you arrived? ____________

7. If you were born in the United States, which generation do you represent?
a. 1st generation born in U.S. (my siblings and I are first born in the U.S.)
b. 1.5 generation (one parent is U.S. born and one is not)
c. 2nd generation born in U.S. (both parents are 1st generation U.S. born)
d. 2.5 generation born in U.S. (one parent is 1st generation U.S. born and the other is 2nd generation U.S. born)
e. 3rd+ generation born in U.S. (my grandparents were born in the U.S.)

8. What language do you speak at home?
   a. English only
   b. Primarily English, but another language also
   c. Primarily a language other than English
   d. Only a language other than English

9. What city, state and or country did you grow up in?

10. What is the highest degree that you have completed?
   a. High School Degree/GED
   b. Associate’s Degree
   c. Bachelor’s Degree
   d. Master’s Degree
   e. Doctoral Degree
   f. Professional Degree

11. What did you obtain your degree(s) in?

12. Which generation of college student do you represent?
a. 1st generation (I am the 1st generation in my family to go to college)

b. 2nd generation (at least one of my parents went to college)

c. 3rd + generation (at least one grandparent went to college)

13. Mother’s total years of education: __________________________

14. Father’s total years of education: __________________________

15. Please circle your income (if you still live at home include your parent’s/parents’ income)

Less than $25,000  $25,000-$50,000  $50,000-$75,000

$75,000-$100,000  $100,000-$200,000  More than $200,000

16. Please indicate your marital status:

   a. Single

   b. Married

   c. Divorced

   d. Widowed

   e. Re-Married
Instructions: Rate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling the corresponding number.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree  6-strongly agree

1. I intend toward dismantling White privilege.

2. I want to begin the process of eliminating White privilege.

3. I take action to dismantle White privilege.

4. I have not done anything about White privilege.

5. I plan to work to change our unfair social structure that promotes White privilege.

6. I’m glad to explore my White privilege. (Please circle N/A if it does not apply)
1. I accept responsibility to change White privilege.

2. I look forward to creating a more racially equitable society.

3. I take action against White privilege with people I know.

4. I am eager to find out more about letting go of White privilege.

5. I don’t care to explore how I supposedly have unearned benefits from being White. (Please select N/A if it does not apply)

6. I am curious about how to communicate effectively to break down White privilege.
13. I am anxious about stirring up bad feelings by exposing the advantages that Whites have.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

14. I worry about what giving up some White privileges might mean for me.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

15. If I were to speak up against White privilege, I would fear losing my friends.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

16. I am worried that taking action against White privilege will hurt my relationships with other Whites.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

17. If I address White privilege, I might alienate my family.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

18. I am anxious about the personal work I must do within myself to eliminate White privilege.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

19. Everyone has equal opportunity, so this so-called White privilege is really White-bashing.
20. White people have it easier than people of Color.

21. Our social structure system promoted White privilege.

22. Plenty of people of Color are more privileged than Whites.

23. I am ashamed that the system is stacked in my favor because I am White. (Please select N/A if it does not apply)

24. I am ashamed of my White privilege. . (Please select N/A if it does not apply)

25. I am angry knowing that I have White privilege. . (Please select N/A if it does not apply)
26. I am angry that I keep benefiting from White privilege. (Please select N/A if it does not apply)

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree  7-N/A

27. White people should feel guilty about having White privilege.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

28. I feel awful about White privilege.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree
APPENDIX C

Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale (2000)

Instructions: Rate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling the corresponding number.

1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

1. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree
6-strongly agree

2. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.

1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree 6-strongly agree

3. Race plays an important role on who gets sent to prison.

1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree 6-strongly agree

4. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.

1-strongly disagree  2-disagree  3-somewhat disagree  4-somewhat agree  5-agree 6-strongly agree

5. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.
1. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.

2. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.

3. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people.

4. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.

5. English should be the only official language in the U.S.

6. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
12. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

13. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.

14. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.

15. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.

16. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.

17. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
18. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.

1- strongly disagree  2- disagree  3- somewhat disagree  4- somewhat agree  5- agree  
6- strongly agree

19. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society’s problems.

1- strongly disagree  2- disagree  3- somewhat disagree  4- somewhat agree  5- agree  
6- strongly agree

20. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.

1- strongly disagree  2- disagree  3- somewhat disagree  4- somewhat agree  5- agree  
6- strongly agree
APPENDIX D

MochihuaTepehuani Scale (2010)

**Instructions:** Rate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling the corresponding number.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

1. Chicanas/os and Latina/os are born with greater sexual desire than White people.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

2. It is difficult to tell one Chicana/o or Latina/o person apart from another Chicana/o or Latina/o person.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

3. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os have more children than Whites.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

4. Chicano and Latino men have greater sexual drive than White men.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree
5. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os have larger families than Whites.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

6. When it comes to figures and figuring, Chicanas/os and Latianas/os seldom are able to measure up to Whites.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

7. Whites are superior to Chicanas/os Latinas/os.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

8. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are sloppy.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

9. All Chicanas/os and Latinas/os act alike.

1-strongly disagree  2- disagree  3-slightly disagree  4-neutral  5- slightly agree  6-agree  7-agree

10. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are not reliable.
11. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are more religious than Whites.

12. The school dropout problem among Chicanas/os and Latinas/os is due to their not having the mental power of Whites.

13. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are born with musical talent.

14. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are mentally unable to contribute towards the progress of the U.S.

15. The higher percentage of Chicanas/os and Latinas/os in jail reflects inborn tendencies towards criminality.
16. Whites are better at reasoning than Chicanas/os and Latinas/os.

17. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are born with greater rhythm than Whites.

18. Inborn physical ability makes Chicanas/os and Latinas/os great soccer players.

19. The high incidence of crime among Chicanas/os and Latinas/os reflects a genetic abnormality.

21. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are carefree, happy-go-lucky.

1-strongly disagree 2- disagree 3-slightly disagree 4-neutral 5- slightly agree 6-agree 7-agree

22. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are better at sex than Whites.

1-strongly disagree 2- disagree 3-slightly disagree 4-neutral 5- slightly agree 6-agree 7-agree

23. Chicanas/os and Latinas/os are more physically skilled than mentally skilled.

1-strongly disagree 2- disagree 3-slightly disagree 4-neutral 5- slightly agree 6-agree 7-agree

24. The number of Chicanas/os and Latinas/os addicted to alcohol and drugs suggests biological weakness.

1-strongly disagree 2- disagree 3-slightly disagree 4-neutral 5- slightly agree 6-agree 7-agree

25. Chicana and Latina women are more sexually open and willing than White women.

1-strongly disagree 2- disagree 3-slightly disagree 4-neutral 5- slightly agree 6-agree 7-agree
APPENDIX E

New Immigrant Survey Scale (2003)

Instructions: Rate your level skin color according to the scale below.
APPENDIX F

Participant Feedback:

How was it taking this survey?

Did you find it easy to follow?

What would you improve or change about this survey?