# Whiteness Theory in Advertising: Racial Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Ads

Angelica Morris & Lee Ann Kahlor

# Whiteness Theory in Advertising: Racial Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Ads

ANGELICA MORRIS and LEE ANN KAHLOR

*Department of Advertising & Public Relations, University of Texas at Austin,*
*Austin, Texas, USA*

*Research has suggested the race of models in advertisements impacts audience attitudes toward these messages, but how does viewers' race affect attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of the same or a different race? The authors explore the existence of racial identity and color-blind racism across racial groups and examine these constructs as they relate to attitudes toward advertisements and ad models' race. Although the authors found that racial identity and color-bind racism were present across audiences, they did not find significant relationships between race and attitudes toward ads. They did, however, find color-blind racism was significantly related to non-White audiences' opinions of ads featuring Black models.*

*KEYTERMS   ad models, advertising, color-blindness, race, racial identity, Whiteness*

Advertising research has suggested that the race of models appearing in advertisements often impacts audience attitudes toward these messages (White & Harkins, 1994). However, it is unclear whether race of audience members affects their attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of the same or a different race? The matter is difficult to address, in part, because of differences in how race is conceptualized and operationalized; that is, whether race is biological (Foster & Sharp, 2002; Stern, 1999) and therefore determined by physical features (Hirschman, Alba, & Farley, 2000) or a social construct (Hartigan,1997; Lipsitz, 1995). The shift from the physical to the psychosocial characteristics of racial identity has led advertising researchers to recognize that racial attitudes—the feelings one has toward race—have

Address correspondence to Angelica Morris, Department of Advertising and Public Relations, University of Texas at Austin, 300 West Dean Keeton, A1200, Austin, TX 78712. E-mail: angelica.noelle@utexas.edu

a larger effect on attitudes toward advertisements than do physical racial characteristics (Stern, 1999).

Currently, measures commonly used in advertising research to examine the effects of audience race on attitudes toward ads are (a) ethnic identity, which tends to focus on which racial group a respondent most identifies with (e.g., White, Hispanic, African American); and (2) racial bias or prejudice, which tends to focus on opinions of different racial groups (Sierra, Hyman, & Torres, 2009). Unfortunately, the measures have been used in ways that ignore key components of audience racial attitudes and have yielded conflicting results (Green, 1999; Torres & Briggs, 2007; Whittler, 1989; Whittler & DiMeo, 1991). Thus, new measures are needed that can capture a more comprehensive understanding of racial attitudes and better explain the conflicting results in advertising research. As a step in identifying such measures, the present study applies Whiteness theory to the examination of whether viewer race and ethnicity affect attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of the same or a different race.

## AN OVERVIEW OF THE FRAMEWORK OF WHITENESS THEORY

*Whiteness* is an interdisciplinary theory that explores what it means to be identified as a White individual, and the social, economic, and political privileges granted to individuals classified as such. Whiteness theory poses three primary arguments. First, a cultural-racial hierarchy has existed in the United States since the country was founded, and individuals classified as White are positioned at the top (Dyer, 1997; Lipsitz, 1995; Schome, 2000). Second, race is not a biological characteristic, but a social construct, and therefore has no fixed meaning (Dyer, 1997). Third, anything classified as "White" in the United States is viewed as the cultural "norm" (Schome, 2000), whereas traits not associated with White are viewed as "different" or "other" (Hughey, 2009; Dyer, 1997). It is a tremendous advantage for any socially constructed entity to be defined as the American norm, which is referred to as White privilege in the Whiteness theory framework. The most important component of this privilege is the ability of the White-identified culture to remove itself from discussions of race, such as ignoring the absence of non-Whites in advertising or stereotypical portrayals of them. Along with White privilege, Whiteness theory includes the concept of color-blind racism, which is rooted in the contention that racial inequality is no longer an issue that warrants attention because equal opportunities now exist for people of all races. Individuals said to have high feelings of color blindness typically hold three lower-level beliefs: (a) White privilege no longer exists, and Whiteness is the true representation of American cultural norms; (b) institutional racism (i.e., racism in government policies and educational systems; e.g., that can place non-White racial groups at a disadvantage) does not exist; and (c) blatant

racism is no longer a problem in the United States (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). Although individuals with high color-blind beliefs are not considered to be blatant racists, belief in this concept promotes the unconscious execution of racism by ignoring the societal issues that maintain cultural inequalities (Bonilla-Silva, 2003, 2010; DiTomaso, Parks-Yancy, & Post, 2003).

Adherence to color blindness can have a substantial influence on perceptions of society, racial groups, and self (Hall, 2003). In addition, because color-blind racism is socially constructed, individuals of all races can hold these beliefs. These points are important to note, as color blindness may not only impact perceptions of racial representations in advertisements, but may also result in similar perceptions of ads across racial groups.

## Whiteness Theory in Consumer-Related Research

Although Whiteness theory is rarely applied to advertising and other consumer-related research, Burton (2009) argues that the application of Whiteness theory to these fields may reveal missed opportunities of inquiry for both academics and practitioners. Through a textual analysis of 828 published consumer behavior articles, Burton (2009) found that only 1.4% contain challenges to aspects of Whiteness. She described those challenges as being "weak," which she defined as focusing on the consumer perspectives of "othered" racial and ethnic groups. None of the articles strongly addressed issues of Whiteness, defined by Burton as directly confronting aspects of Whiteness through explicitly referencing the power dynamics created through adherence to the ideology. Burton concluded that future consumer research could benefit from directly engaging in aspects of Whiteness, theoretically and methodologically.

The present study attempts to build upon Burton's (2009) suggestions for consumer research by incorporating Whiteness theory into racial attitude measurements in advertising research. The goal of the present research is to address: (a) the treatment of Whiteness as an audience norm; (b) the effects of adherence to colorblindness on attitudes toward advertisements; and (c) the similarities and differences among audience members from different racial and ethnic backgrounds that are not accessible through the use of current racial attitude measurements.

## MEASURING RACIAL ATTITUDES IN ADVERTISING RESEARCH: CURRENT METHODS

### Ethnic Identity

*Ethnic identity* refers to how strongly an individual identifies with a particular group or culture (Sierra et al., 2009) and is currently the racial attitudes

measure most frequently used by advertising researchers. This measure is almost exclusively administered to non-White participants and produces the same general results: Individuals with high ethnic identities (i.e., higher feelings of identification with a race or culture) have more positive attitudes toward ads featuring models from their ethnic group, whereas individuals with low ethnic identities (i.e., lower feelings of identification with a race or culture) have more positive attitudes toward ads featuring White models (Green, 1999; Torres & Briggs, 2007; Whittler, 1989).

Conversely, the results of Torres and Briggs's (2007) exploration of the effect of racial attitudes of Hispanic audiences on their evaluation of print ads featuring White models and featuring Hispanic models suggest that in the case of ads featuring luxury goods, although high ethnic identifiers displayed preferences for ads featuring Hispanic models, both high and low ethnic identifiers had more positive attitudes toward ads featuring White models.

When researchers explore effects of racial attitudes of White audiences on attitudes toward ads featuring models of different races, feelings of racial prejudice are assessed. This measurement is discussed further in the following section.

## Feelings of Racial Prejudice

Another factor in the examination of the effect of racial attitudes on assessment of advertisements is racial prejudice. Toward the end of the 1960s, research exploring White audiences' evaluation of ads featuring non-White models increased as advertisers feared negative attitudes toward such ads (Whittler, 1989). As a result of such expectations, researchers used measures of racial prejudice to assess how the racial attitudes of White audiences may affect ad message processing. The expectation was that highly prejudiced individuals will have more negative attitudes toward ads featuring non-White models than will less prejudiced individuals (Whittler,1989; Whittler & DiMeo, 1991). However, the results have been inconsistent. For example, Whittler (1989) found that both high- and low-prejudice White audiences do not display strong negative attitudes toward ads featuring Black models. Conversely, Whittler and DiMeo's (1991) study on print ads featuring non-White models suggests that regardless of feelings of prejudice, White audiences have more positive attitudes toward ads featuring White models than ads featuring non-White models.

## Weaknesses of the Current Use of Ethnic Identity and Racial Prejudice Measures

Although current measures of racial attitudes can explain some of the ways in which race influences attitudes toward advertisements, the literature

reviewed here suggests a more proficient measure is needed, and it needs to be applied consistently across racial and ethnic groups, including Whites. The new measure should assess ethnic identity and racial prejudice in both non-White and White audiences. The application of a Whiteness theory framework to advertising research may serve to meet these criteria. Whiteness theory provides theoretical support for the importance of assessing measures of ethnic identity in White and non-White racial groups. It also introduces the concept of color-blind racism, which influences individuals across racial groups and in similar ways. Because of this, color-blind racism is an appropriate measure of racial prejudice and ethnic identity that can be administered in advertising research to audiences from different racial backgrounds.

## DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The framework of Whiteness theory suggests that although some White audience members may identify with a European or Anglo heritage, many White audience members may identify most strongly with "American" culture. This American identity qualifies as an ethnic cultural identity that can influence attitudes (Lipsitz, 1995). As a result, the present study contends that strength of ethnic identity should be measured and explored in White audiences as well as non-White audiences. If empirical evidence can show that White individuals do report a measurable ethnic identity, then this identity must be explored further. Thus, our first research question:

> R1: Do individuals classified as White report feelings of ethnic identification?

Building on this research question, we also explore whether White ethnic identity may impact attitudes toward advertisements. Thus, our second research question:

> R2: What is the relationship between White audience's ethnic identity and attitudes toward advertisements featuring models from different racial groups?

In addition, Whiteness theory introduces the concept of color-blind racism, which explains that unconscious feelings of racism can influence interpretations of situations and messages. This concept also explains that both White and non-White audiences are capable of exhibiting feelings of racism. Thus, our third research question:

> R3: Do both White and non-White individuals report feelings of color-blind racism?

Whiteness theory and color-blind racism also suggests that color-blind individuals have more negative attitudes toward messaging contradicting the assumed normalcy of Whiteness. As a result, it is possible that feelings of color blindness could lead to negative evaluations of ads featuring non-White individuals. Thus, our fourth research question:

> R4: What is the relationship between feelings of color-blindness and attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of different races?

## METHODOLOGY

### Participants

Two hundred ninety-four female undergraduate college students from a large Southwestern university participated in this study for course credit. This sample was limited to females to maximize the participants' identification with the female models pictured in the ad stimuli. Thirty-two percent of the sample indicated they were of Hispanic origin. The majority of respondents identified their race as White (67%), followed by Asian (17%), African American (8%), and American Indian or Alaskan Native (1%). Ten percent of the sample self-identified as "other."

### Stimuli

To increase the external reliability of the results (Torres & Briggs, 2007), two real online department store advertisements were used as stimuli. Each advertisement featured one female model wearing a prom dress; in one ad the model was White, and in the other ad the model was Black. The dress featured in each stimulus, as well as the color of each ad, was altered to appear identical to ensure that these factors did not influence respondents' opinions of the ad. These ads are shown in Appendix 1.

A pretest was conducted to confirm that respondents would perceive the ads to be identical with the exception of the models' race. The pretest items included 7-point Likert scales intended to assess how each model was perceived: pretty, stylish, attractive, and like me. The same measures were given to assess perceptions of the dress, with the addition of a 7-point Likert scale "something I would wear" item. Measures of perceived model age and race were also included. The results determined that the race of the dominant model was the only perceived difference between the tested ads ($t = 23.35$, $p < .01$; $M_{\text{White}} = 1.00$, $SD = .00$; $M_{\text{non-White}} = 2.04$, $SD = .20$), and thus the ads proved to be appropriate for use in this study.

### Procedure

A quasi-experiment was developed to assess the independent variables of color blindness and racial identity and the dependent variable of attitudes

toward the ad. Participants were randomly assigned to view one of the two ad stimuli, which were embedded in an online survey. Forty-eight percent of the sample (96 White participants and 44 non-White participants) viewed the ad featuring a Black female model, and 52% (101 White participants and 53 non-White participants) viewed the ad featuring a White female model. After exposure to the stimuli, which occurred at the start of the survey, respondents answered a series of questions intended to access the independent constructs as well as attitudes toward the ads viewed. The researchers chose to feature the ad early in the survey, before the race-related attitude items, to avoid priming effects.

## Independent Variables

*Color blindness,* which refers to participants' strength of color-blind beliefs, was assessed using the Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) developed by Neville et al. (2000). Neville et al. treat this scale as consisting of three subscales: racial privilege, institutional racism, and blatant racial issues ($\alpha$ = .70–.86). The calculated reliability for racial privilege for this study was $\alpha$ = .83 (*M* = 3.74, *SD* = 1.17). Because the reliabilities for the institutional racism and blatant racial issues subscales were low, an additive index that combined both the institutional racism and blatant racial issues subscales was used ($\alpha$ = .83, *M* = 3.54, *SD* = .87). The items were measured with 7-point Likert scales, which are shown in Appendix 2.

*Ethnic identity,* which refers to the strength of one's self-association with a racial group, was assessed using the Multiethnic Identity Measurement Scale (MEIM) developed by Phinney (1992). Although numerous scales have been created to measure racial and ethnic identity, this scale was chosen because it is not race-specific. Phinney divided this scale into two subscales: ethnic identity and other-group orientation (i.e., attitudes toward and interactions with other ethnic groups outside of one's own). The range of alpha reliabilities reported by Phinney for this scale is $\alpha$ = .81–.90. Because the factors included in the other-group orientation portion of this scale are not related to the definition of ethnic identity posed in this study, only the ethnic identity items from this scale were summed and averaged to create one additive scale. The scale reliability for this study was $\alpha$ = .89 (*M* = 4.89, SD = .98). Items were measured with 7-point Likert scales, which are shown in Appendix 2.

*Ethnicity,* which refers to the racial or ethnic category to which one belongs, was measured with one closed-ended item: "What race do you most identify with?" To ensure that the most current recognized racial groups were included, this item offered respondents choices consistent with the race and ethnicity questions in the 2010 U.S. census. Because the number of reported participants in each non-White racial group was low, this variable was collapsed into two categories: White (67%) and non-White (33%).

## Dependent Variable

*Attitude toward the advertisement* refers to a participant's feelings and perceptions of an ad after exposure. This variable was measured with 17 seven-point semantic differential scale items borrowed from Burke and Edell (1986) and Zaichkowsky (1994); items were summed and averaged to create one additive scale ($\alpha = .92$, $M = 3.70$, $SD = .93$). These items included bipolar adjective pairs intended to assess how each ad was perceived such as important to me/unimportant to me; phony/not phony; ridiculous/not ridiculous; and terrible/not terrible. The complete list of pairs is shown in Appendix 2. A bivariate Pearson correlation revealed no significant relationship between respondent ethnicity and attitude toward the ad ($r = .09$, $p = .14$).

## RESULTS

Our first research question focused on whether individuals classified as White reported feelings of ethnic identification. Results show that the mean strength of ethnic identity reported by White respondents was above the midpoint of the seven-point racial identity scale ($M_{\text{White}} = 4.65$, $SD = .85$, scale midpoint $= 3.5$), which suggests that feelings of ethnic identity do indeed exist in White audiences, although an independent samples $t$-test suggests they are not as strong as among non-Whites ($t = -6.47$, $p < .01$; $M_{\text{non-White}} = 5.39$, $SD = 1.03$).

Our second research question looked at the relationship between White respondents' ethnic identity and their attitudes toward the ad. We ran bivariate correlations between attitude toward the ad and ethnic identity—once on the subsample of Whites who received the White ad and once on the subsample of Whites who received the Black ad. None of the correlations were significant. That is, there was no significant relationship between ethnic identity and attitude toward the ad among White respondents, regardless of whether the respondent was exposed to a White or non-White ad. We also ran those same correlations for the non-White audience. Again, none of the correlations were significant.

Our third research question looked at whether both White and non-White individuals reported feelings of color-blind racism. They both reported moderate levels of color-blind racism. More specifically, we ran independent samples $t$-tests comparing the White and non-White participants on two measures of color-blind racism: racial privilege and institutional and blatant racism. We found significant differences in the case of racial privilege ($t = -4.49$, $p < .01$; $M_{\text{White}} = 3.53$, $SD = 1.12$; $M_{\text{non-White}} = 4.16$, $SD = 1.14$) and institutional and blatant racism ($t = 6.35$, $p < .01$; $M_{\text{White}} = 3.75$, $SD = .81$; $M_{\text{non-White}} = 3.11$, $SD = .84$). That is, non-White participants reported stronger beliefs in the assertion that Whites are privileged over non-Whites and weaker beliefs in the assertion that

Whites are discriminated against or that race is no longer a factor in social inequality.

Our fourth research question looked at the relationship between feelings of color blindness and attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of different races. Similar to our approach for ethnic identity, we separated our sample into White and non-White subsamples, then further separated the samples into whether the individual was exposed to a White ad or a Black ad. This created four samples: White respondent/White ad; White respondent/Black ad; Black respondent/White ad; and Black respondent/Black ad. In each of the four subsamples, we then ran bivariate correlations between attitude toward the ad and color blindness (first measured as racial privilege and next measured as institutional and blatant racism). Looking at the White subsample, there was no significant relationship between attitude toward the ad and racial privilege, regardless of whether respondents were exposed to a White or Black ad. However, there was a significant correlation between attitude toward the ad and institutional and blatant racism for individuals who were exposed to the Black ad ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$ one-tailed). That is, more negative attitudes toward the Black ad were reported when respondents were in agreement with beliefs that Whites are discriminated against or that racism is no longer an issue. A closer look at racial privilege and institutional and blatant racism using independent samples $t$-tests comparing exposure to the Black and the White ad revealed significant differences for the non-White audience only. In other words, racial privilege beliefs differed significantly ($t = -2.45$, $p < .05$) ($M_{\text{White ad}} = 4.41$, $SD = 1.21$; $M_{\text{Black ad}} = 3.85$, $SD = 1.00$) among the non-White respondents, as did institutional and blatant racism beliefs ($M_{\text{White ad}} = 2.95$, $SD = .91$; $M_{\text{Black ad}} = 3.30$, $SD = .65$).

## DISCUSSION

Our results suggest (a) ethnic identity does exist among Whites and should be factored into explorations of race and ethnicity; and (b) further exploration is merited to explore and develop a racial identity scale that more fully captures ethnic identity across racial groups, including what it means to be White or identify as White (Phinney, 1992; Avery, Tonidandel, Thomas, Johnson, & Mack, 2007).

In addition, it appears that ethnic identity is not a factor in attitudes toward ads in both White and non-White audiences, at least not in the ads used in this study. Although this conforms to previous research, which suggests that White audiences are not as unreceptive toward models of other races as was assumed in the past, it contradicts past research examining ethnic identity in non-White audiences (Bush, Hair, & Solomon, 1979; Torres & Briggs, 2007; Whittler, 1989). This analysis should be repeated with ads

that feature more race-specific products or brands such as hair-care products aimed at African Americans or cosmetics aimed at women of color. This would help identify whether ethnic identity is more impactful when ethnicity is a more overtly relevant factor in the ad.

Our finding of moderate levels of color-blind beliefs when it came to racial privilege and institutional and blatant racism for both White and non-White individuals should be noted in the context that these beliefs are socially controversial; given the social undesirability of racism, we may have captured a conservative estimate of these beliefs. These feelings were more evident among the non-White audience members, who reported significantly stronger beliefs in the assertion that Whites are privileged over non-Whites and weaker beliefs in the assertion that Whites are discriminated against. This captures the flipside to research suggesting that many White individuals still assert that their success is the result of hard work, and not White privilege (DiTomaso et al., 2003).

For the White subsample, the results suggest that neither racial privilege nor institutional and blatant racism impact attitudes when exposed to a White ad. But because the respondents were shown the ad prior to completing the questionnaire, it is possible that the stimuli worked as a prime for the non-White participants. When they were exposed to an ad featuring a Black model, they reported weaker agreement with beliefs that racism persists and stronger agreement with beliefs that racism is a thing of the past. It is possible that the appearance of a non-White model in an ad for a race-neutral product may have reinforced the message that all races are now on an equal playing field, and therefore, race is no longer an issue. Future research exploring color-blind beliefs will need to control for the priming effects that may have occurred when respondents saw the ad and then answered questions about race. For example, researchers might measure color-blind racism beliefs and then follow up at a later time with the same respondents to measure attitudes toward various ads.

It is important to note that the analysis revealed that there was no real difference in the way in which individuals of different races evaluate ads. This finding suggests to advertising researchers that differences between racial groups should not be the focus of future studies. Instead, discovering the similarities between racial groups in their ethnic identification and in their attitudes toward other races may be more illuminating when exploring the role of race in attitudes toward advertisements. Indeed, our findings suggest that feelings of ethnic identity and color-blindness are present in audiences regardless of their own ethnic or racial identity, and that color-blind racism beliefs may be altered by ad exposure. Because the scales used to capture each of these factors still require more development (Phinney, 1992; Avery et al., 2007; Neville, et al., 2000; Gushue & Constantine, 2007), it is possible that with further investigation, measures of color blindness and racial identity could be used as more accurate predictors of attitudes toward

ads featuring White and non-White models across White and non-White racial groups, and thus aid in the creation of more widely received advertising messages.

Although this study provides some valuable insights to advertising disciplines, there are some limitations. First, the individuals who participated in the study were all college students. Sears (1986) found that compared to the rest of the American adult population, college students have an underdeveloped self-identity, strong cognitive skills, and a high desire for the approval of peers, which can all affect the outcomes of experiments. It is possible that these characteristics had an effect on this study's results. It is recommended that future researchers exploring the effects of ad model race on attitudes toward advertisements use a pool of participants more representative of the U.S. adult population.

It is also important to acknowledge that this study is not representative of all of the aspects of Whiteness theory, nor is this approach used to measure the Whiteness construct the only way in which these concepts can be captured in advertising research. Instead, this study is meant to be an initial step in capturing the ways in which racial attitudes may impact attitudes toward advertisements that have been overlooked by popular quantitative measurement methods. Future researchers should explore how the measurement scales used in this study hold up across cultures not only in the United States, but also in other societies across the globe.

In addition, the advertising stimuli used to gauge general feelings for non-White models in general market advertisements included only a White model and Black model. Some scholars argue that referencing only Blacks and Whites in discussions of race is problematic. Although this Black/White paradigm is often used to simplify discussions of race, it ignores the differences between non-White groups and overlooks negative feelings exercised toward non-Black minority groups (Kim, 1999). Similarly, it is also argued that dichotomizing the participant pool by race (i.e., White and non-White) may overlook significant similarities and differences concerning the impact of racial attitudes on advertisements between and within non-White racial groups (Brumbaugh & Grier, 2006).

Future research should explore how audience attitudes toward ads differ among ads featuring non-White prominent models from various racial backgrounds. This research should also include research designs that adequately account for differences within and between non-White racial groups.

## CONCLUSIONS

Unlike previous measures of ethnic identity and racial prejudice, a Whiteness theory framework provides a comprehensive assessment of audience racial attitudes. This framework captures ethnic identity and prejudice (through

the concept of color blindness) across racial groups, and can also be applied to audiences of all races. With further development, the application of this theory may eliminate many errors resulting from attempts to compare racial attitude effects measured in different fashions.

Further exploration of an application of Whiteness theory framework is important to advertising research because it could be a step in better clarifying and predicting audience attitudes toward advertisements featuring models of various races. It could also discover previously overlooked similarities and differences between the attitudes of White and non-White audiences toward these advertisements. Ultimately, this new measure could provide advertising research with a more accurate framework for creating more effective racially targeted advertisements.

## REFERENCES

Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Thomas K. M., Johnson, C. D., & Mack, D. A. (2007). Assessing the multigroup ethnic identity measure for measurement equivalence across racial and ethnic groups. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *67*, 877–888.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). "New racism," color-blind racism, and the future of whiteness in America. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 271–284). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brumbaugh, A. M., & Grier, S. A. (2006). Insights from a "failed" experiment: Directions for pluralistic, multiethnic advertising research. *Journal of Advertising*, *35*(3), 35–46.

Burke, M. C., & Edell, J. A. (1986). Ad reactions over time: Capturing changes in the real world. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *13*, 114–118.

Burton, D. (2009). "Reading" whiteness in consumer research. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, *12*, 171–201.

Bush, R. F., Hair, J. F., Jr., & Solomon, P. J. (1979). Consumers' level of prejudice and response to Black models in advertisements. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *16*, 341–345.

DiTomaso, N., Parks-Yancy, R., & Post, C. (2003). White views of civil rights: Color blindness and equal opportunity. In A.W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of racism* (pp. 189–198). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Foster, M. W., & Sharp, R. R. (2002). Race, ethnicity, and genomics: Social classifications as proxies of biological heterogeneity. *Genome Research*, *12*, 844–850.

Green, C. L. (1999). Ethnic evaluations of advertising: Interaction effects of strength of ethnic identification. *Journal of Advertising*, *28*(1), 49–64.

Hall, S. (2003). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media: A text-reader* (pp. 89–93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hartigan, J. H., Jr. (1997). Establishing the fact of whiteness. *American Anthropologist*, *99*, 495–505.

Hirschman, C., Alba, R., &Farley, R. (2000). The meaning and measurement of race in the U.S. census: Glimpses into the future. *Demography*, *37*, 381–393.

Hughey, M. (2009). The (dis)similarities of white racial identities: The conceptual framework of "hegemonic whiteness." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *33*, 1289–1309.

Kim, J. Y. (1999). Are Asians Black? The Asian-American civil rights agenda and the contemporary significance of the Black/White paradigm. *The Yale Law Journal*, *108*, 2385–2412.

Lipsitz, G. (1995). The possessive investment in whiteness: Racialized social democracy and the "white" problem in American studies. *American Quarterly*, *47*, 369–387.

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47*, 59–70.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *The Journal of Adolescent Research*, *7*, 156–176.

Schome, R. (2000). Outing whiteness. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *17*, 366–371.

Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 515–530.

Sierra, J. J., Hyman, M. R., & Torres, I. M. (2009). Using a model's apparent ethnicity to influence viewer responses to print ads: A social identity theory perspective. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, *31*(2), 41–66.

Stern, B. B. (1999). Gender and multicultural issues in advertising: Stages on the research highway. *Journal of Advertising*, *28*(1), 1–9.

Torres, I. M., & Briggs, E. (2007). Identification effects on advertising response: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Advertising*, *36*(3), 97–108.

White, P. H., & Harkins, S. G. (1994). Race of source effects in the elaboration likelihood model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 790–807.

Whittler, T. (1989). Viewer's processing of source and message cues in advertising stimuli. *Psychology and Marketing*, *6*, 287–309.

Whittler, T., & DiMeo, J. (1991). Viewers' reactions to racial cues in advertising stimuli. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *31*, 37–46.

Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1994). The personal involvement inventory: Reduction, revision, and application to advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *23*(4), 59–70.

APPENDIX 1: STIMULUS ADS



APPENDIX 2: SCALE ITEMS FOR COLOR BLINDNESS, RACIAL
IDENTITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD AD

| Index | Items |
|---|---|
| Attitude toward the ad | 1. Very unfavorable/very favorable*<br>2. Believable/unbelievable<br>3. For me/not for me<br>4. Informative/uninformative<br>5. Interesting/boring<br>6. Irritating/not irritating*<br>7. Not stupid/stupid<br>8. Valuable/not valuable<br>9. Convincing/unconvincing<br>10. Important/unimportant<br>11. Relevant/irrelevant<br>12. Exciting/unexciting<br>13. Important to me/unimportant to me<br>14. Phony/not phony*<br>15. Ridiculous/not ridiculous* |

APPENDIX 2: SCALE ITEMS FOR COLOR BLINDNESS, RACIAL IDENTITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD AD *(Continued)*

| Index | Items |
|---|---|
| | 16. Terrible/not terrible* |
| | 17. Worth remembering/not worth remembering |
| | 18. Meaningful to me/not meaningful to me |
| Ethnic identity | 1. I have spent time trying to find out about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. |
| | 2. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. |
| | 3. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. |
| | 4. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life.* |
| | 5. I really have not spent much time trying to learn about the culture and history of my ethnic group.* |
| | 6. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups. |
| | 7. In order to learn about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. |
| | 8. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. |
| | 9. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. |
| | 10. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. |
| | 11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. |
| | 12. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments. |
| | 13. I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group. |
| | 14. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. |
| Racial privilege | 1. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.* |
| | 2. 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. |
| | 3. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not. |
| | 4. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S. |

APPENDIX 2: SCALE ITEMS FOR COLOR BLINDNESS, RACIAL IDENTITY AND ATTITUDES TOWARD AD *(Continued)*

| Index | Items |
|---|---|
| | 5. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin. |
| | 6. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities. |
| | 7. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison. |
| Institutional discrimination and blatant racism | 1. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin. |
| | 2. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin. |
| | 3. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American. |
| | 4. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.* |
| | 5. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S. |
| | 6. English should be the only official language in the U.S. |
| | 7. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people. |
| | 8. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.* |
| | 9. Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today. |
| | 10. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension. |
| | 11. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.* |
| | 12. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.* |
| | 13. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations. |

* Item was recoded.