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The Benefits of Confronting

• Prejudiced interactions have been found to result in threats to psychological well-being for children, adolescents, and adults (Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014)

• Confrontations lead to a decrease in future prejudiced responses (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Dickter, 2012)

• Nontargets may be more effective in challenging prejudiced attitudes than targets (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dickter, Kittel, & Gyurovski, 2012)
Methods

• Critical literature review was performed on studies exploring the confrontation of interpersonal discrimination

• Conducted with a feminist framework guiding the interpretation of results, such that the data were interpreted for application to create social change and compatibility with other studies

• Key words included: prejudice, discrimination, confrontation, bystander, target, nontarget/non-target, social backlash
Results
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What Happens During a Confrontation of Discrimination?

• Target
  • Attribution $\rightarrow$ hypersensitive & complainer (Kaiser & Miller, 2001)
  • No confrontation $\rightarrow$ guilt and shame (Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, & Hill, 2006)

• Nontarget
  • Less likely to receive same severity of backlash (Czopp & Monteith, 2003)
  • More effective in challenging prejudiced attitudes than targets (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dickter, Kittel, & Gyurovski, 2012)
    • Surprise message leads to an increase in cognitive processing (Petty, 1997)
What Happens During a Confrontation of Discrimination?

• Perpetrator
  • High and Low prejudice (Monteith, 1993)
  • When confronted, perpetrators are less likely to repeat similar expressions of prejudice in the future (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Dickter, 2012)

• Bystander(s)
  • Often overlook everyday prejudice (Ashburn-Nardo, et al., 2008)
  • Bystanders are influenced to condone or condemn prejudice based on responses of others (Blanchard, Crandall, Bringham, & Vaughn, 1994)
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Influencing Factors

- Group Identity (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012)
- Personal commitment to confronting (Shelton, et al., 2006)
- Communal relationship orientation (Clark & Mills, 1979)
- Competence (Clark & Mills, 1979; Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010)
- Relationship with Target group member (DiStafano, Croteau, Anderson, Kampa-Kokesch & Bullard, 2000)
- Empathy (King, 1995)
Implications for FLEs and Family Therapists

• A systemic view of the presented literature can inform FLEs and family therapists in their work during therapy sessions with clients exposed to discrimination of others, prejudice reduction trainings, and anti-bullying programs in schools
  - Psychoeducation with clients
  - Training/educational programs that focus on social justice or prosocial behavior

• The current review suggests an urgent need for future research to better understand and increase nontarget confrontations of discriminatory behaviors
  - Confrontation strategies
  - Factors that encourage confrontation
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