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Introduction

Perceptions of Race Influenced by Individual Interactions: The Ambassador Effect

Ambassador – “An unofficial representative. Ambassador of goodwill.”

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition

Prejudice has been responsible for conflicts and crimes on a personal and global scale. It has been a force throughout history leaving infamous stains on the legacy of men and nations. It has contributed to slavery, lynch mobs, hate crimes, police brutality, ethnic cleansing, the Crusades, suicide car bombings, civilian church bombings, the killing fields of Cambodia, the tribal war between the Hutu’s and Tutsi’s, the Holocaust, and ongoing conflict throughout the Middle East. Whereas many social problems such as food availability and disease transmission are caused by physical conditions, prejudice is unique in that it is exclusively psychological in nature. Prejudice has long been a pertinent and urgent field of research for social psychologists. Prejudice, defined here, is the endorsement of biased views and/or discrimination towards an individual or group based on group membership. Although prejudice is as old as humanity itself, social scientists are just beginning to understand this complex phenomenon. We have made extensive progress towards understanding prejudice, but due to the intricate nature of the phenomenon we are still far from possessing the ability to consistently anticipate and prevent the negative consequences resulting from evaluation based on group membership.

Prejudice is motivated, moderated, and mediated by numerous internal and external forces. Within the last half-century our culture has developed an expectation of
egalitarian values, leaving overt displays of prejudice a socially undesirable act within the
greater community of the United States (Katz & Hass, 1988). This egalitarian view is
commonly internalized, leaving individuals motivated to control prejudiced responses by
both internal and external forces (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Plant & Devine, 1998).
Motivation to control prejudiced responses can be so strong as to make these responses
aversive to the responder (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).

Social contexts can influence one’s likelihood of responding with prejudice. The
contextual information presented along with a target has been shown to interact with race,
causing individuals to perceive Black and White targets differently given the same
background information (Barden, Maddux, Petty, & Brewer, 2004). Participants respond
differently to overt measures of prejudice given the presence of a Black experimenter
(Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995). Perceived similarity with a target decreases
the likelihood of the use of stereotype information when evaluating that target (Ames,
2004).

Research suggests that prejudice levels may be modified after encounters with
members of a target minority group. White participants are less likely to choose to be in
close proximity with a Black confederate after witnessing undesirable behavior from
another Black confederate (Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996). A correlational
relationship has been observed between recent negative encounters with Blacks and
prejudice towards Blacks (Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2001). Survey data has established a
link between a history of negative interaction with Black individuals, expectations
regarding future encounters with Blacks, and anxiety around these encounters (Plant,
2004; Plant & Devine, 2003). Whereas this suggests that a causal relationship may exist
between one time social interactions with a target minority group member and subsequent levels of prejudice towards that group, to date no empirical evidence supports such a relationship.

The purpose of the present study is to test the hypothesis that a one time encounter with a member of a social group can lead to modified levels of racism towards that group. It is hypothesized that White participants experiencing a negative interpersonal interaction with a Black individual will exhibit higher levels of prejudice towards all Blacks. Fazio et al.’s (1995) Bona Fide Pipeline (BFP) priming procedure will be used to measure prejudiced responses after participants have had a positive, negative, or neutral encounter with a Black or White experimenter. The BFP has been chosen because it avoids problems found in explicit measures. Unlike the Implicit Association Test and other priming measures, the BFP has shown a positive relationship with behavioral measures and an ingroup racial preference in both Black and White samples (Fazio et al., 1995; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002).

Background Literature

The United States of America has undergone vast changes in cultural and demographic composition over the last 50 years. The White majority is fading; 1960 census data show a racial distribution of 88.6% White and 10.5% Black, with Hispanics not appearing as a separate category. By the 2000 census, the White population had dropped to 75.16%, the Black population had risen to 12.33% and Hispanics made up 12.6% of the US population (US Bureau of the Census, 2003). Current estimated population statistics for 2050 show White citizens making up only 52.8% of the population, barely a majority (US Bureau of the Census, 2003; Eitzen & Zinn, 2003). The
changing demographics increase exposure between ethnicities and alters the racial homogeneity that for most communities was the rule rather than the exception. Despite these social changes racism still persists and presents a social problem.

Influential cultural changes and events have presented the potential for racial harmony in the United States. The civil rights movement opened legal and social doorways for Blacks. The 1950's and 1960's saw a flourish of political, social, and legislative activity, beginning with the landmark 1954 decision of Brown vs. Board of Education, in which the US Supreme Court banned segregation for US schools. The signing of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act in 1965 by President Johnson stand out as federal legislative actions to try and ensure social and political equality for Blacks as citizens of the United States. In 1965, the civil rights movement was boosted further by President Johnson's executive order outlining and enforcing the practice of affirmative action, federally mandating diversity in businesses and educational institutions (Brunner, 2003).

Many projected that these events would lead towards a dimming of prejudice towards Blacks by the White majority. In response to this projection, Devine and Elliot (1995) reviewed the Princeton Trilogy studies, a repeated stereotype and prejudice exercise recording the belief in and/or knowledge of a Black stereotype. The original studies, conducted in 1933, 1951, and 1969, indicated a declining display of a negative Black stereotype and the results were heralded as support for the belief that the stereotype was actually diminishing in the changing American climate, becoming less negative and less pervasive. However, Devine and Elliot point out several shortcomings of the study, including ambiguous directions, no explicit measure of participants' endorsements of a
stereotype, and the use of an outdated list of adjectives in the later studies. The original 1933 study was reworked with an updated list of adjectives and explicit directions giving the participants both an opportunity to communicate cultural knowledge of the Black stereotype and personal endorsement of the stereotype. Results showed that the modern cultural stereotype is heavily negative and as well known by low prejudiced people (those not endorsing many components of the stereotype) as by highly prejudiced people (those endorsing many components of the stereotype) (Devine & Elliot, 1995). Whereas this study does not compare the beliefs of Americans of 1933 compared to 1995, it does indicate that a cultural stereotype endures, is widely known, and is heavily negative.

Whereas this base of research provides a description of prejudice and stereotypes, there is reason to examine the methods and findings. Overt measures of prejudice, including those used by Devine and Elliot (1995), Katz and Braly (1933), and the McConahay, Hardee, & Batts (1981) Modern Racism Scale (MRS) possess a unique set of problems. Overt measures ask participants questions in a straightforward manner, with questions aimed directly at race issues presented to the participants in an obvious manner. Social norms of egalitarian values, internal motivations to control prejudiced responses, aversive internal consequences of voluntarily prejudiced responses, and the possibility for guilt when responding in a racist manner all compromise the likelihood of participants answering with absolute honestly (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz & Hass, 1988; Kunda & Spencer, 2003; Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink, 1993; Plant & Devine, 1998;; Zuwerink, Devine, Monteith, & Cook, 1996). Not only are overt measures vulnerable to influences that may cause participants to distort responses, overt measures are unable to detect prejudiced responses that participants may not be aware of
or cannot predict. Some participants were found to be most likely to engage in racial
discrimination only when a negative trait would allow these participants to rationalize a
negative reaction (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Unlike overt measures, priming measures
have been shown to correspond to non-verbal measures of prejudiced actions towards
confederates, indicating that some prejudice reactions may be out of awareness and
control (Dovidio, Kawakimi, & Gaertner, 2002; Fazio et al, 1995).

The shortcomings of overt measures indicate that in order to accurately develop a
model of prejudice, other methods of measurement are necessary. Another implication is
that the current model of prejudice and prejudice development has not evolved as quickly
and fully as possible. Most of the research has relied heavily upon survey or
questionnaire based explicit methods of data collection. The last 15 years has seen a large
increase in research aimed at finding implicit priming procedures for measuring
prejudice. With this being a relatively new method of measuring participant prejudice,
much of this 15 years has focused on developing, refining, testing, and validating priming
measures. What the field is left with is a largely static, simple model for a complex and
dynamic phenomenon. It is essential that future research minimize the likelihood of
flawed data collection and work toward a multi-dimensional model of prejudice that
includes the effects of new information, encounters, and changes over time on individual
prejudice.

The purpose of the present study is to use the most accurate method of data
collection to support a dynamic model of prejudice. Specifically, the Fazio et al. (1995)
BFP priming procedure will be used to detect changes in prejudice levels after a positive,
negative, or neutral encounter with a Black or White experimenter. It is believed that
stereotype accessibility and endorsement along with the resulting actions are continually modified by interpersonal encounters and novel information. It is hypothesized that a one time negative encounter with a black individual can lead to an increase in immediate stereotype accessibility. In extremely aversive situations, a one time encounter may lead to increased endorsement of the stereotype and a chronic increase in accessibility. The persistent and pervasively negative nature of the Black stereotype suggests that positive encounters with a Black target will be too incongruent to influence the stereotype’s status and result in subtyping (Brewer & Miller, 1988) leaving negative encounters proprietary rights to stereotype modification. The BFP is considered to measure an affectual approach – avoidance reaction to the category Black (Fazio & Olsen, 2003) and is expected to be able to measure differences in this reaction between groups, and subsequently stereotype accessibility, while subverting reluctance to disclose prejudiced views.

A Portrait of Racism

The current literature on stereotypes makes a distinction between two levels of prejudiced reactions. Stereotype cognition has been divided into two components, activation and application (Devine, 1989; Kunda & Spencer, 2003). During activation, a stimulus presented to an observer brings the cultural stereotype of the target individual or group to mind, allowing access to the components of the stereotype. In application, the activated stereotype is applied to the target individual or group, influencing perception of or actions toward members of that group. Both of these processes are described as moderated by comprehension goals, self-enhancement goals, and motivation to avoid prejudice (Kunda & Spencer, 2003).
Explicit and Implicit Prejudiced Responses. In the application process, two types of prejudiced responses will be discussed, implicit and explicit. Explicit responses include direct verbal or behavioral actions that result from the influence of prejudiced endorsement of a stereotype and clearly indicate the prejudice of the communicator. Explicit measures include questionnaires and behavioral measures in which direct verbal communications are measured, as well as intentional actions towards target minority members (Fazio et al., 1995; Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996; McConahay et al., 1981). Implicitly prejudiced actions are often below awareness, uncontrolled, and do not explicitly communicate prejudice on the part of the communicator. Implicit measures include priming measures and observations of non-verbal interactions with target minority members (Devine, 1989; Dovidio, et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 1995; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwarts, 1998; Plant & Devine, 2003; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997).

An important distinguishing feature between explicit and implicit prejudiced actions is the deliberate communication of prejudiced attitudes or intentions. Explicit prejudice is overt in that the communicator is making prejudiced views obvious to himself (in the case of anonymous questionnaires) or to others (in the case of behavioral measures). Overt measures indicate knowledge of the violation of the cultural norm of egalitarianism and a potential acceptance of this violation (Katz, Wakenhut & Hass, 1986). This explicit display of prejudice indicates that the aversive components of racist actions/remarks do not apply to this individual due to a non-internalization of the norm, or that situational influences override these norms and produce an undesirable response.
Implicit prejudice responses, unlike their overt counterparts, do not involve obvious and easily recognized displays of prejudice. Implicit responses may be subtle, such as faster reaction times to Black faces paired with negative words than to White faces paired with the same word. Some implicit responses are more complex, such as judging one of two targets more favorably due solely to target race (Fazio et al., 1995; Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986;). In each case the reaction does not explicitly indicate prejudice to observers and the actor may not be aware that prejudice was an influence, but we can interpret the action as driven by an underlying negative perception of or attitude towards the derogated group.

Because motivations can inhibit explicit reactions and implicit reactions are seemingly unconscious and automatic in nature, measuring prejudice and predicting prejudiced behavior is a difficult task. Racial ambivalence is an instance of the interaction between racist views and a socially communicated motivation to avoid racism (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986). American Whites have been described as torn by two conflicting values, the Protestant work ethic and egalitarianism (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986). The egalitarianism value urges the acceptance of all individuals regardless of race, creed, gender, or status. The Protestant work ethic stresses the importance and value of hard work and ethical behavior. The Black stereotype depicts and available social information indicates that a disproportional number of Blacks are impoverished and imprisoned, leaving a benevolent view of Blacks in conflict with a disdain for Blacks observed violating the Protestant work ethic. The resolution to this conflict is an
ambivalent, dual response. When observing both a Black and a White target acting in the same positive manner, perceptions of the Black target are more positive than of the White target. When observing both a Black and a White target acting in a socially negative manner, the tendency is to view the Black target more negatively than the White target (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986). These findings indicate that when there is no reason for negative actions towards a Black individual, the tendency is to harbor an overly positive perception of that individual. However, when the situation offers another plausible reason for negative actions towards that Black individual, the tendency is towards discrimination, and the discriminator may not be aware that this is a prejudiced action.

Motivation to Control Explicit Prejudice Actions. The literature has found that there are often observed differences between explicit and implicit measures of prejudice (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio & Dunton, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995). Motivation to control prejudice, measured by the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPR) has been shown to mediate the relationship with individuals who exhibit high overall motivation to control prejudice producing inconsistent explicit and implicit scores (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio & Dunton, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995). The findings to date have indicated that motivation to control prejudice has the ability to influence explicit, but not implicit, actions and measures.

Motivation to respond without prejudice has been found to have both internal and external components (Plant & Devine, 1998). Internal motivation to respond without prejudice, (IMS), is driven by an internalized value. For individuals high in internal motivation alone, prejudiced actions and thoughts will produce high levels of self-
directed negative affect due to personal violation of these internalized social values. Individuals exclusively high in external motivation to avoid prejudice responses (EMS) have not internalized the social value of egalitarianism, but do have a strong desire to not endure the social ramifications of violating the egalitarianism norm. These individuals will only experience negative affect, although not self-directed, if explicit prejudiced actions are executed in a public setting (Plant & Devine, 1998). Individuals high in both IMS and EMS are highly motivated to resist urges to act or respond in prejudiced manners in all settings.

Egalitarianism is a widely communicated and accepted American value, and present in both individuals of high and low prejudice (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986; Monteith, 1993). Motivation to control prejudice has been described as a self-regulatory system that is activated when individual violations of this norm are found to be personally aversive (Monteith, 1993). In spite of an egalitarian value that discourages prejudiced evaluations and actions, negative evaluations of Black targets based on racial prejudice continue to occur.

Motivation to control prejudice results from avoidance of the social consequences and/or the internal negative affect that accompanies violation of the egalitarian norm. Many White Americans hold egalitarian values, believe in equality and non-racist ideals, and believe that they themselves are not racist. These individuals, however, have also been socialized in an atmosphere that culturally transmits negative ideas regarding Blacks, leaving them resisting the impulse to react in a racist fashion towards Blacks (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).
Compunction is described as feelings of guilt and wrongdoing and can occur when an individual who sees himself or herself as low in prejudice acts in a prejudiced manner (Devine et al., 1991; Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink, 1993; Zuwerink et al., 1996). Individuals possessing lower levels of prejudice have been found to be high in egalitarian values, indicating that all individuals exhibit the presence of egalitarian values but those of low prejudice tend to exhibit them with more conviction (Monteith et al., 1993). Individuals who see themselves as having low levels of prejudice experience high levels of self-directed negative affect when violating egalitarian values and responding with prejudice. Individuals who do not see themselves as low in prejudice experience negative affect directed outward (Monteith et al., 1993; Zuwerink et al., 1996). The implication is that not all individuals internalize the egalitarian value and that depending upon the internalization of egalitarianism, individuals will tend to respond in a different manner when violating this value.

Monteith and colleagues (1993) use self-report data to establish would do/should do scenarios in which participants project what should be done in a given scenario involving a target minority member and what would be done by the participants. The discrepancy is used as a measure of norm violation. Also, MRS scores are used to calculate levels of racism (Devine et al., 1991; Monteith et al., 1993; Zuwerink et al., 1996). Fazio and Hilden (2001) found that individuals scoring lower on the MRS experienced more guilt after a seemingly prejudiced attribution was induced, suggesting that explicit methods of measurement might be influenced by internal motivation to avoid prejudiced responses. Whereas explicit methods of measuring prejudice are simple to conduct and easy to interpret, negative affect, guilt, and social sanctions associated with
voluntary displays of prejudice make participant dishonesty inevitable, necessitating less obvious means of prejudice assessment.

The literature indicates that numerous internal and social forces work to discourage prejudiced responses. However, these responses continue to occur with the price of social sanctions and (for some) self-directed negative affect and guilt. The use of stereotypes and the practice of engaging in prejudiced thought and action does not proceed without exacting a price, but it does proceed. Other influences contribute to prejudiced thought and behavior, and it is likely that some may be out of consciousness and control.

The Power of the Environment

Prejudice is influenced by more than internal states. The environment exerts enormous influence over one’s likelihood and ability to access and use stereotypes. Cognitive load, contextual cues, the presence of a minority member, and past experience with members of the target minority group have all been shown to have a relationship with stereotype activation, use, and/or prejudiced thought (Barden et al., 2004; Fazio et al., 1995; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991; Plant & Devine, 2003; Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2001). In each case an individual’s tendency to engage in prejudiced thought or action is influenced by forces encountered in the environment. This suggests that prejudice is a dynamic, interactive system that is influenced by both internal and external forces.

Gilbert and Hixon (1991) found that both environmental factors and personal states influence individual reactions to minority members. Participants were exposed to an Asian or Caucasian woman and given uncompleted words as cues to complete. Study 1 found that individuals under cognitive load were less likely to spontaneously activate
the Asian stereotype and to respond to items with Asian stereotype consistent adjectives than were individuals who were not under cognitive strain. Study 2 found that when the activation of the Asian stereotype had occurred without cognitive load, stereotype-consistent responses were more likely when cognitive load was later applied during the response phase. This research has two important implications. The first is that environmental cues influence responses; the likelihood of responses using components of the Asian stereotype was dependent upon the circumstances at the time of response. The second is that internal states, in this case the presence or lack of cognitive load, influence prejudiced responses. The findings of Gilbert and Hixon indicate prejudiced responses are not consistent from one minority encounter to the next, but that external influences that affect internal states can have a significant impact on the activation and application of stereotypes, further suggesting that individual stereotype activation and stereotype use should not be viewed as a simple stimulus-response relationship.

Situational influences have control over more than the likelihood of stereotype use or suppression. Brewer and Miller (1988) report that the likelihood of observed information being generalized to an entire demographic group by the perceiver is contingent upon how well the minority target is believed to represent the group. When believed to be highly representative of the group, a target’s behavior and characteristics are likely to be generalized to the group. If the actions and characteristics of the target largely diverge from the established stereotype subtyping is likely to occur, leaving the original stereotype intact but creating a subgroup for the outlying target. In some instances, the demographic identity becomes subordinate to a personalized, individual identity in which case categorical information is waived and information is collected
directly from the target in order to develop an understanding of his or her behavior (Brewer & Miller, 1988). The findings of Brewer and Miller suggest that an interaction between the perceiver’s stereotype of the target group, the target’s actions, and the environment influences the perception of the minority target.

The model for stereotype use and activation presented by Kunda and Spencer (2003) as well as the research of Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) and Katz et al. (1986) indicate that prejudice is dynamic and malleable, taking individual motivations into account when describing the situations that lead to prejudiced responses. Brewer and Miller (1988) found that context not only influences the likelihood of stereotype use, but also influences the type of stereotyped perception that occurs. What the model does not indicate is how responses may change in an individual over time or specifically what can elicit these changes. The basis of the model is that prejudice may not be simply an automatic response or voluntary action, but that internal and environmental influences have an impact on the activation of and endorsement of stereotypes. Components of these drives, such as motivation to avoid prejudice, are largely dependent upon the situation and social surroundings of an individual, and these conditions are transitory states. These environmental changes can lead to changes in prejudiced reactions.

Dasgupta and Greenwald (2001) found evidence that prejudiced reactions to a group are influenced by the mention of a single member of that group prior to evaluation. Using an implicit prejudice measurement technique, shifts in the prejudiced responses of participants were detected dependent upon the characteristics of single target category members presented prior to measurement. Upon exposure to the names of well-known Black and White individuals, participants who received the names of well-known and
liked Black individuals displayed a diminished preference for White individuals. Consistent with prior findings, participants who received neutral targets and negative Black targets displayed a preference for Whites. The results indicate that reactions to group membership are dependent upon environmental cues, including bringing to mind liked or disliked members of a target group.

Implicit and explicit prejudiced reactions have been shown to be influenced by the presence of a target group member (Fazio, et al, 1995; Lowery, Hardin, & Sinclair, 2001). Whereas changes in explicit measures can be attributed to a motivation to avoid appearing prejudiced (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Kunda & Spencer, 2003; Plant & Devine, 1998), changes in implicit responses due solely to the presence of a Black experimenter indicate that environmental cues have a strong impact on even automatic reactions. Lowery, Hardin, and Sinclair (2001) reported that for White participants, the presence of a Black experimenter was sufficient to mute prejudiced responses on paper and pencil versions of the implicit association task (IAT). For Asian participants, this change in automatic responses did not occur until the Black experimenter explicitly instructed participants to avoid prejudiced responses. With the implicit, intuitive nature of reaction-time prejudice measures, it is likely that this change represents an internal response to environmental cues rather than a motivation to avoid appearing prejudiced for reasons of social acceptability pressures. The tendency to use stereotypes in the act of perception of others is guided by environmental cues that we glean, making context a significant contributor to prejudiced reactions.

Perceived characteristics of the target minority member and their similarity to one’s self-concept can influence the likelihood of stereotype activation and application.
Ames (2004) presented participants with vignettes depicting fraternity members, lawyers, and medical students. Prior to reading the vignettes of the individuals, the participant was presented with information indicating that the characteristics of the target under evaluation were either very similar or dissimilar to the characteristics of the participant. After reading a vignette description giving a situation for the target individual (either a lawyer, fraternity member, or medical student) participants were asked to speculate on the intentions and thoughts of the target and the thoughts and intentions of a stereotypical lawyer/fraternity member/medical student in the same situation. Ames found that increasing the perceived similarity between the target and participants decreased the stereotypicality of the attributions made to the thoughts and intentions of the target, whereas decreasing similarity increased the stereotypicality of attributions. When evaluating a target, an individual will first evaluate the characteristics of the target given the available information before making intentional inferences. The minority target, functioning as part of the social environment, influences the likelihood of prejudiced evaluation.

The minority target under evaluation carries more information than similarity to the evaluator or perceived likeness to the minority stereotype. The contextual cues that implicitly relay information regarding social roles, status, and behavior influence prejudiced perception as well (Barden et al., 2004). Using Blacks and Whites in a number of contexts, Barden et al (2004) found that race interacts with context; when a Black target is shown in a context that suggests a positive component of the Black stereotype, he or she is evaluated more positively than a White counterpart, and when a Black target is placed in a context that highlights a negative component of the stereotype, he or she
will be evaluated more negatively than the White counterpart. In the most striking interaction, Study 3 found that given the context of a prison cell, participants rated a Black target dressed as a lawyer more highly than the White target, while rating the Black target dressed as a prisoner more negatively than a White target (Barden et al., 2004). As social perceivers we not only take in information regarding the target and social contexts relevant to us (social vs. private displays of prejudice), but differentially evaluate an individual target minority member given his or her demographic status, cues to the role he or she fills, perceived similarity, and the context in which the target is observed (Ames 2004; Barden et al., 2004).

The use of unrealistic manipulations and reactive measures calls into question the external validity of the literature. The manipulations used have generally relied on questionnaires and vignettes which ask participants to imagine encounters or events with target minority members and guess the intentions of the target. These methods fail to observe or manipulate the most common and meaningful manifestation of prejudice, intergroup interpersonal interactions. Some research within the last decade has included more generalizable manipulations and measures.

Henderson-King and Nisbett (1996) exposed participants to a real-life encounter with a target minority member and measured behavior after that encounter. In Study 1 participants entered the lab and were exposed to a Black or White confederate posing as a fellow participant. This confederate was either confrontational and obnoxious towards a lab assistant, pleasant and amiable towards a lab assistant, or said nothing in a negative/positive/neutral encounter design. After witnessing the behavior of the confederate, participants are then put in a forced choice situation in which they must sit
next to a White or a Black confederate to complete a questionnaire. Participants completed a task rating some characteristics of Blacks following the seating choice. The results indicated that participants exposed to a negative Black encounter were less likely to sit next to a Black individual than participants in a Black neutral or Black positive encounter, and rated Blacks as more hostile than participants in the Black control condition. This negative interaction had no effect on perceptions of Whites as hostile. Study 2 used a similar design and found that after witnessing the negative behavior of a Black confederate, participants voluntarily spent less time interviewing a Black individual; the difference was not significant when participants witnessed negative behavior from a White confederate (Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996). The quality of a real-life encounter with a Black individual can influence subsequent behavioral tendencies to engage in social contact with other Black individuals and post-encounter views of Blacks.

Evidence supports a direct relationship between interpersonal interactions with Blacks and implicit attitudes towards Blacks. Towles-Schwen and Fazio (2001) administered the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Responses (MCPR) questionnaire, the BFP, and the Childhood Experiences Questionnaire to a group of university participants. The results from the self-report questionnaires and the study’s analysis indicated that as children aged, parental input was displaced by interpersonal contact as the most influential force in attitudes towards Blacks. The results of the BFP indicated that those having the least prejudiced implicit BFP scores had had the most positive encounters with Blacks in high school. Due to the age of the population, these encounters were between 1 and 4 years previous, relatively recent, indicating that recent interpersonal interactions
influence implicit prejudiced attitudes (Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2001). Plant and Devine (2003) found negative past contact with Black individuals was related to increased anxiety regarding future contact with a Black individual and more negative expectations for that encounter. Plant (2004) found that previous negative contact with Black individuals predicted future negative contact. The current literature supports that past encounters influence attitudes, but fails to offer evidence of a causal relationship.

Social-Cognitive Theoretical Basis

The current literature supplies significant evidence for a dynamic system of prejudice in which stereotypes and beliefs interact with internal motivations, social forces, perceived characteristics of the target minority, contextual considerations, newly introduced information, and personal encounters to produce prejudiced thoughts and actions. In order to make progress that advances our understanding of prejudice while validating past findings, new methods and manipulations must be implemented to better understand the nuances causal relationships of the phenomenon. Whereas numerous researchers have presented evidence that suggests direct interpersonal interactions with target minority members can have a direct impact on an individual’s level of prejudice, no research has passed beyond correlations or causal inferences. There is currently no evidence for a causal relationship between quality of interpersonal interaction with a target minority member and subsequent levels of prejudice. This is an important distinction and can reveal how the effects of interpersonal encounters on prejudice differ from the effects of socially transmitted information.

Interpersonal encounters are expected to influence prejudice in two separate but similar ways. The Black target in an interpersonal encounter may activate the stereotype
due to proximity to the prototype. Over time, repeated encounters of this type could lead to chronic accessibility and more generalized application of the stereotype to all Blacks (Higgins, 1998). A more negative encounter might lead to a chronically accessible exemplar (Smith & Zárate, 1992). An exemplar is a set of trait inferences regarding an individual, shaped by past behavior and able to influence future judgments and/or perceptions. The exemplar may be very broad (e.g. a male) or specific (e.g. Bob). Broad exemplars defined only by demographic traits differ little if any from schemas. More specific exemplars give a more individuated, specific set of expectations when activated. If an individual were the victim of a violent crime committed by a Black male, the intense reaction to this experience could leave that specific exemplar readily available. In contrast to activation of the stereotype when later encountering other Black males, the exemplar with the specific information, Black, male, armed, can victimize me would be activated. This type of exemplar activation would presumable lead to a more negative interaction than stereotype activation. Both stereotype activation and schema activation would produce a negative affectual reaction to the category Black, and result in facilitation on the BFP measure used in this study.

Context can influence what characteristics are seen as salient and consequently what exemplar might be activated. Greenwald et al. (1998) conducted a study in which a Black woman was presented in a group of either all men or all Whites, making either her race or her gender salient. When gender was salient through isolating the target as the only woman, participants reacted favorably to the woman. When race was made salient, participants reacted unfavorably to the Black individual. The Smith and Zárate exemplar-based model illustrates how prejudiced perception can change dependent upon the
The salience of different exemplars that apply to a target individual. When in a gender minority, an individual might see a target as a man. When in need of medical assistance, an individual might see that same target as a doctor. The Smith and Zárate exemplar-based model asserts that given a variety of demographic information concerning a target, a perceiver will exhibit a tendency to consider the information made most salient by the current situation and most useful to the perceiver.

The Black stereotype remains pervasively negative even after a 60 year movement towards equality and egalitarianism. Devine and Elliot (1995) found that in spite of some research indicating that the negative stereotype of Blacks had all but disappeared in the United States, the stereotype very much still exists, and is pervasively negative. Although overt measures such as the MRS indicate that most samples used are not highly prejudiced, internal and external motivations may be discouraging many participants from voluntarily responding to even anonymous questionnaires (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995; Plant & Devine, 1998). There are numerous positive examples of Blacks in the media and society and it is unlikely that many Whites would have a disproportionate number of negative encounters with Blacks, but the stereotype remains negative and prejudice continues to exist. The persistence of negativity in the Black stereotype, despite observed change in the descriptive agents used, indicates that negative information has a disproportionate influence on the nature of the Black stereotype.

Weighting of negative information has been observed in social evaluation, and is one likely contributor to the pervasive, persistent negative quality of the Black stereotype. Mellers, Richards, & Birnbaum (1992) studied perception of distributional information
and the perceiver’s tendency to exhibit a preference for some types of information compared to others. The model derived from the research indicates that an individual strives to reduce his uncertainty when making a social judgment. In order to best reduce uncertainty, a perceiver will disproportionally weight information received, giving information with more certainty more influence upon social judgements. Negative social information is seen as more reliable than positive information, therefore increasing certainty and is disproportionally relied upon (Mellers et al., 1992). This model of information perception indicates that any negative information presented regarding a target minority group or individual minority member is automatically given more input into impression formation than positive information, explaining the pervasiveness and persistence of the negative stereotype.

The activation of the most distinctive exemplar in a social situation and negative nature of the information most likely to be emphasized jointly contribute to the negative nature of the Black stereotype. As previously discussed, the minority status of Blacks makes it likely that in most encounters with Whites, race is one of the most salient characteristics. Mellers et al. (1992) find that social perceivers have a tendency to disproportionally emphasize unfavorable information. Social perceivers simply believe that negative information regarding a target is giving more accurate information than more favorable information. Given the salience of race, the negative nature of the stereotype, and the extra emphasis on negative information and encounters making it likely that negative exemplars are more numerous, we would expect that when a White encounters a Black, negative expectations are readily available.
Some research indicates that attempts to suppress prejudiced reactions might exacerbate prejudiced views. Rebound effects have been repeatedly exhibited when an unwanted thought is intentionally suppressed. After the conscious suppression, an individual is more likely to access the unwanted thought after the suppression period than he or she was before (Wegner, 1987). Similarly, attempts to banish unwanted stereotypes result in a higher incidence of stereotype thoughts after the suppression period has ended (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Wheeler, 1996). This rebound effect leaves motivations to avoid prejudice and retain an egalitarianism perspective possibly resulting in more prejudiced thoughts than they suppress. Even with attempts to avoid prejudiced thoughts and perceptions these thoughts cannot be affectively suppressed or eliminated, allowing for subtle and unintentional influence upon actions toward minority target individuals.

The present study will use a methodology that offers clear evidence of a causal link between the quality of an interpersonal interaction with a minority member and subsequent prejudiced reactions to the category. The methods of measurement are clearly not to be exclusively questionnaire type measures. The ability of implicit measures to detect prejudiced responses while nimbly avoiding motivations to control prejudice make implicit measures suitable for this study. For reasons discussed in the following section the Fazio et al. (1995) BFP procedure has been selected as the implicit priming measure best suited for this research.

Due to the negative nature of the Black stereotype, the tendency to suppress prejudiced reactions, suppression rebound effects, and the disproportional weighting of negative information, it is hypothesized that a negative interpersonal interaction with a
Black individual will result in increased prejudiced responses. It is also hypothesized that positive encounters will have a small effect on prejudice levels or no effect at all because of the negative nature of the stereotype, the tendency to subtype when encountering stereotype inconsistent (positive) information, and the lack of support for rapid changes towards an increase in positive stereotype characteristics in the current literature.

Implicit Priming Measures

Priming tasks were developed in an attempt to collect data on the prejudiced responses of participants while avoiding the numerous pitfalls of explicit measures. Priming tasks present racial information, such as words or pictures, either out of conscious perception or in a manner so that the participant is not aware of the nature of the manipulation. The measures are presented in such a manner that the participant has little or no knowledge of the nature of the measures. Priming tasks help eliminate response bias by leaving the participant unaware of the nature of the racial manipulation and unaware of what type of response might indicate personal prejudice.

In early research using priming techniques, knowledge and endorsement of the Black stereotype were compared using both explicit and implicit measures (Devine, 1989). Using the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) to differentiate between high and low prejudiced participants, Devine found that both high and low prejudiced participants were equally knowledgeable of the cultural stereotype of Blacks. In Study 2, participants were subliminally presented words stereotypically describing Blacks and words containing negative traits from the stereotype. Participants were then asked to read a description of an individual with no specified race who engaged in ambiguously hostile behavior. Both high and low prejudice participants receiving 80% stereotype consistent words in the
primer rated the ambiguous target as more hostile than participants receiving only 20% stereotype consistent words. Study 3 showed that high and low prejudice participants gave differing answers on a survey regarding thoughts toward and descriptions of Blacks. The results suggest that low prejudice individuals have knowledge of the stereotype, suppress its application when able, and apply it when not able to suppress it. The results also suggest that some stimuli can solicit implicit prejudiced responses from explicitly unprejudiced people, indicating both that prejudiced responses are dependent upon environmental factors and that explicit and implicit measures detect different information (Devine, 1989).

Reacting to Devine's (1989) argument that stereotype application is an automatic reaction and must be restrained, Gilbert and Hixon (1991) used a type of priming to support the hypothesis that stereotypes are not necessarily automatically activated but that internal states can influence the activation and endorsement of stereotypes and that these internal states can be influenced by the environment. Gilbert and Hixon asserted that although stereotypes are widely believed to be cognitive shortcuts to evaluation, resources are needed to activate a stereotype before it can be applied, making cognitively busy perceivers less likely to apply a stereotype to a target. In the experiment, participants were given a word completion task. In a 2x2 design, participants were shown images of a White or Asian woman and were or were not given a task to induce cognitive business. As hypothesized, participants exposed to images of an Asian woman were more likely to complete partial words with words associated with the Asian stereotype when not cognitively busy. Further, Gilbert and Hixon supported the hypothesis that when an individual was cognitively taxed and a stereotype had previously been successfully
activated, he or she would be more likely to apply the stereotype. When participants were allowed the resources to activate the Asian stereotype they were more likely to later apply the stereotype to an Asian target when low in cognitive resources. This simplified model of stereotype activation suggests that cognitive conservation may not be the only or main determinant of stereotype application. With evidence for the impact of environmental and internal factors on prejudiced reactions, the question is raised concerning what other factors might contribute to prejudiced responses.

Questions regarding the validity of these early priming tasks and overt measures led to the development of new priming procedures. The priming task used by Devine (1989) utilized words describing aspects of the negative Black stereotype as part of the primer, leaving the possibility that the stimulus actually primed components of the negative stereotype rather than a reaction to a Black target. The Devine methodology also allows for the possibility that the stereotype consistent adjectives were related to hostility, the focus of the dependent variable, which produced significant results not by priming the Black stereotype but by priming things associated with hostility. This type of priming may have elicited the null difference in the responses between high and low prejudiced participants (Fazio et al., 1995).

Lepore and Brown (1997) examined the nature of priming tasks by exploring the differences between category and stereotype activation. The assertion is that a category consists of only the demographic specification of race, gender, and other characteristics whereas a stereotype includes the valenced assumptions associated with that category. In review of the Devine (1989) priming task, Lepore and Brown observed that both category descriptors and negative stereotype descriptors were included as priming stimuli in the
Devine priming task and may have caused the null difference in the responses of high and
low prejudiced participants. Lepore and Brown found that a task causing automatic
category activation could cause differential high and low prejudiced responses by
allowing participants to respond to the demographic category with their own solicited
implicit reactions, whereas automatic stereotype activation solicits highly prejudiced
reactions from all participants. Lepore and Brown conducted a priming task similar to
Devine’s with only category stimuli and with both category and negative stereotype
stimuli. The results showed individuals designated as highly prejudiced before the
priming task responded in a more negative manner to the category activation task but that
when presented with the negative stereotype priming task, both high and low prejudice
individuals responded similarly. These findings indicate that when the stereotype is
primed all individuals respond with negativity. However, when only the category is
primed some automatic responses can reflect responses to explicit measures. Similar
results were found by Wittenbrink et al. (1997) in that stereotype priming yields similar
results from all participants whereas category priming yields differential results from
high and low prejudiced individuals. Although priming tasks do offer methods to escape
problems inherent in overt prejudice measures, care should be taken not to prime the
negative stereotype along with the target ethnic category.

Greenwald et al. (1998) developed the Implicit Association Task (IAT) as an
implicit method of measuring the participants’ perceived association between two items.
The task initially asks participants to respond with a left side key to one type of item and
with a right side key to a different type of item (e.g. flower vs. insect names). In a second
part of the task participants are asked to use the same keys to identify another set of
words, which was one of two concept valences (e.g. pleasant vs. unpleasant). Next the
two tasks are paired in order to measure implicit association. For instance, a participant
may be asked to use the left key to respond whenever he or she sees an insect name or an
unpleasant adjective. Conversely, a participant would also be instructed to respond with a
specific key when seeing a flower name or a pleasant word. The task works by
introducing concepts believed to be highly associated with one another or not highly
associated with one another, and measuring differences in reaction times of participants
to these different pairings. The hypothesis is that the more strongly associated two
concepts or words are, the more quickly the participant will respond (Greenwald et al.,
1998).

Greenwald et al.’s (1998) IAT task has been successfully used to identify
associations between racial categories and word valence, indicating that respondents may
associate positive or negative connotations with a specific racial group. With Japanese
and Korean participants, the IAT yielded the slowest paired reactions when the outgroup
race of the participant (Japanese or Korean) was paired with a pleasant word, indicating a
preference for the ingroup race category and negative associations with the specified race
category (Greenwald et al., 1998). When the IAT was used to present White participants
with White and Black racial targets paired with positive or negative attributes, a strong
White preference was observed. This preference was present for individuals responding
to explicit measures with both high and low prejudice, indicating that the task is able to
detect associations between the category and descriptors in individuals both high and low
in motivation to avoid prejudice (Greenwald et al., 1998).
The design of the IAT makes it a measure of association, not necessarily personal reactions to a category. As stated by Fazio and Olson (2003):

“...[the] findings imply, the IAT seems to assess associations to the category labels, not automatically activated responses to the individual exemplars. Thus in the context of race, whereas priming procedures provide an estimate of the average evaluation evoked by the Black (versus White) faces, the IAT provides an estimate of the strength of association between the category label “Black” (versus “White”) and negativity. The potential exists for these two estimates to differ, especially in any situation that does not promote categorization of a given person by race”. (p. 315)

The IAT is very effective at finding associations between a social group and characteristics, descriptors, and positive or negative reactions, but may not reflect how an individual will respond to a real world encounter with a member of another race where race is immediately obvious but components of the cultural stereotype may not be. Nosek et al. (2002) found that, although subdued, a preference existed for the White group in Black participants when using an IAT type task. With other measures establishing a Black preference in Black participants, the White preference exhibited in Black participants using the IAT suggests that the IAT measures perceived association but not personal reactions (Fazio et al. 1995). The design of the IAT forces stereotype activation, leaving most participants likely to respond in a manner consistent with the cultural racial stereotype of the group primed rather than an individual reaction to the presentation of a “Black,” stimulus (Fazio & Olsen, 2003; Olsen & Fazio, 2003; Wittenbrink et al., 1997).
Inconsistencies between priming measures should not be seen as a major weakness that warrants undue loss of credibility of associated findings but should be seen as evidence that different types of priming tasks prime different types of reactions. Priming tasks, such as the IAT, have been shown to possess consistency across time and across measures. Further, findings even suggest that multiple implicit measures not only correlate, but form a single latent construct (Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001). Although White preferences across both Black and White respondents indicate that the IAT may be more of a measure of cultural or semantic association, other measures indicate the ability to detect sterile reactions to a category (Fazio et al, 1995; Nosek et al., 2002).

The Fazio et al. (1995) BFP task uses ethnic faces as primes, eliminating the possibility of presenting information to the participant other than racial category that might activate the cultural stereotype. The study focuses on validating the priming measure as a direct means of detecting participant prejudice level, specifically analyzing to see if the priming measure has the ability to detect racial preference in those reacting to overt measures with both high and low levels of prejudice. The measure quantifies response times to word presentations, with participants making a judgment to word valence (bad vs. good) by pressing one of two separate keys. The adjectives used were clearly negative or positive and were not commonly reported components of the Black stereotype. Participants’ responses to the adjectives were measured to obtain a baseline response. Following baseline measures, participants responded to the words in the same manner with pictures of Black or White faces presented before the adjectives were displayed. The presentation of the faces induced the racial manipulation.
Unlike earlier measures, the race prime was presented in the absence of the attached cultural stereotype. Only the category is presented and the adjectives used are valenced but unrelated to the stereotype. This method provided a task that allowed participants reactions to race rather than a culturally held stereotype while preventing response bias. The hypothesis was that faster reaction times would accompany decisions where the word connotation was consistent with stereotype consistent beliefs (i.e. Black and negative), leaving an individual influenced by a negative stereotype to more quickly identify negative words with the correct valence.

The Fazio et al. (1995) priming task showed more rapid identification of negative words from Whites when Black faces were displayed. White participants responded more negatively following Black primes than the Black participants did. There was a positive relationship between an observational measure and the BFP. After the task, a group of participants were exposed to an encounter with a Black confederate. The confederate, blind to any previous scores on overt or priming measures, rated the interactions with participants. Results verified the value of the priming task; individuals who scored high in prejudice on the priming task were rated as having a less personable interaction by the Black confederate (Fazio et al., 1995).

There is evidence that the BFP has the ability to avoid participants' motivation to control prejudiced responses. In Study 4, participants were administered the MRS, the BFP, and a measure of motivation to control prejudice. The results revealed that for those with low motivation to control prejudice, priming scores were strongly related to MRS scores, indicating that those with a low motivation to avoid prejudice answer openly and honestly on questionnaires. However, for those high in motivation to control prejudice
this relationship disappears. These findings suggest that whereas overt measures such as the MRS are affective prejudice measures for individuals unmotivated to control prejudice, they are not affective for individuals highly motivated to control their prejudiced responses. The interaction between motivation to control prejudice and priming scores in predicting MRS scores, along with the positive relationship between the BFP and behavioral measures, indicates that the priming measure more accurately predicts prejudice levels of individuals who are high in motivation to control prejudice than does MRS scores.

Because of its qualities the Fazio et al. (1995) measure is ideal for measuring differences between groups after an interpersonal interaction with a Black individual. The priming measure does not prime the stereotype, only the category of Blacks, and has been shown to indicate how an individual will behave during an interaction with a Black group member. The measure has been shown to avoid the entrapments of motivation to control prejudice, a major contributor to response bias. In comparison, overt measures, specifically the MRS, have proven reactive, subject to motivation to control prejudice, and related to political views. The BFP and variations of the BFP have been used to measure prejudiced reactions in a number of relevant studies, with each trial indicating that the BFP does function without priming the Black stereotype and that it does not alert participants to the dependent measures (Barden et al., 2004; Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Fazio, 2001; Fazio & Dunton, 1997; Fazio et al., 1995; Payne, 2001; Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2001; Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2003;). The priming measure will be able to detect if participants in one condition respond to the Black category with more negativity than participants in other groups.
The current priming literature indicates that priming tasks avoid many of the shortcomings of overt measures of prejudice. Priming measures have also proven their ability to glean relevant and even dramatic findings applicable to real-life scenarios. Payne (2001) used a racial priming measure as a means of investigating how stereotype activation might influence object perception. A number of fatal police shootings in which a Black suspect held an object perceived to be a weapon and later found to be an innocuous object have gained national media attention. Payne postulated that the violent component of the Black stereotype could have influenced the misperception of the officers, leaving them to perceive a weapon that was not present. Using a priming task, Payne found that participants more quickly correctly identified a gun when primed with a Black face (compared to a White face) and that participants were more likely to misidentify a tool as a gun when primed with a Black face.

Correl, Park, Judd, and Wittenbrink (2002) approached the issue with similar but more realistic methods. Presenting participants with pictures of Black and White individuals holding a tool or a gun, participants were asked to respond by pressing a “shoot,” or “don’t shoot,” key. Participants more quickly shot the gun-wielding Black targets, and were more likely to wrongly shoot the tool-wielding Black targets than the tool-wielding White targets. Although priming measures might intuitively seem an unorthodox means of measuring reactions and predicting behavior, they have predictive validity and yield applicable, valuable findings.

The findings of Fazio et al. (1995) indicate that their priming measure is resistant to motivation to control prejudice and relates to behavior in actual encounters with a Black individual. The method of priming also ensures that the category is primed in the
absence of the stereotype, giving more accurate measures of beliefs and potential future behavior. These properties make the Fazio et al. priming measure an ideal candidate for measuring differences in prejudice levels among groups after different types of interactions with a Black or White individual.

Research Goals

The purpose of the present research is to support the hypothesis that prejudice can be influenced by one-time interpersonal interactions. Specifically, the current research project’s agenda is to support that when exposed to a negative interpersonal interaction with a Black individual, increases in prejudiced responses are detected through the use of the BFP priming measure (Fazio et al., 1995). It is believed that whereas individual knowledge of a culturally held stereotype is relatively static, beliefs regarding the racial category and reactions to the racial category fluctuate. The Fazio et al. priming technique has been shown to be resistant to a number of the problems that plague overt measures, including motivation to control prejudiced reactions and potential correlation with political ideology. Results showing a strong relationship between scores on the priming measure and behavior during an encounter with a Black individual indicates that the measure does positively relate to manifested behavior towards Blacks. Due to the presentation of only Black or White faces, the task is believed to prime reactions to the category only because it presents no information regarding the negative stereotype. It is believed that this priming task can be used to illustrate differences in prejudice levels between groups who have and have not been exposed to a negative encounter with a Black individual. Specifically, it is hypothesized that when a participant is exposed to a
negative as opposed to a neutral or positive encounter with a Black experimenter prior to the BFP, more negative reactions to the Black category will be observed.

Pilot Methodology

Two pilot studies were conducted in order to test the proposed prejudice measures and population characteristics. Participants were administered a modified version of the MRS (MRS-R) to measure explicit prejudiced responses (Appendix A). The MRS-R includes 7 questions used in the Devine (1989) version of the MRS, as well as 7 filler questions regarding racial questions, a question regarding the political views of the respondent, and an item asking participants to rank African Americans whom they believe to be the most, “high profile,” from among Colin Powel, Mike Tyson, Michael Jackson, Oprah Winfrey, Michael Jordan, and R. Kelly. The ranking component of this questionnaire was added to determine if participants responding in a more prejudiced manner were more likely to rank individuals with negative public images as more prominent. Also, in each of the original MRS questions and the filler questions, the term, “African American/s”, was substituted for, “Black/s,” in an attempt to solicit a closely normal distribution of responses (hoping that the terminology amendment would solicit more moderate responses from participants). The questionnaire was administered during a mass screening in the winter of 2004 to 789 undergraduate students participating for partial class credit, including 252 males, 528 females, and 9 gender unidentified students.

The Fazio et al. (1995) BFP was used to collect baseline data on implicit reactions. Participants included 19 males and 47 females, all participating for partial class credit. This was administered to ascertain that the measure is mechanically working and the sample used is similar to that found in other research pools.
The current use of the BFP mirrors the method of administration used by Fazio et al. (1995). Undergraduate participants volunteered for participation through Ohio University’s Psychpool online participant sign up program. Upon arrival in the laboratory, the experimenter greeted the participant and brought him or her to the testing area. Participants were given instructions and then asked to complete the task.

The BFP consists of a 5 course automated task programmed to run on Medialab and DirectRT software (Jarvis, 2002). Participants were told that they were taking part in a language reaction time study in which the time needed to correctly identify words both with and without visual distracters would be recorded. Course 1 was designed to allow for the calculation of a baseline response for each participant to each adjective in the absence of any stimulus. In Course 1, participants are presented a list of 12 positive and 12 negative adjectives (Appendix B). Adjectives were randomly selected to appear, each adjective appearing twice during the period of Course 1. Participants were instructed to correctly identify the valence of each word as “good” or “bad” by using labeled keys on the keyboard. Courses 2 and 3 were designed to increase the likelihood that participants would attend to the racial manipulations presented in Course 5. In course 2 participants were randomly presented with pictures of 8 Black and 8 White faces, each face being shown twice for 3 seconds. Participants were instructed before viewing the faces that they would be required to identify the faces in the next part of the experiment. In Course 3, participants were randomly shown the 16 faces from Course 2 and an additional 8 Black and 8 White faces not seen before. Participants were instructed to press keys marked “yes” and “no” indicating if they had or had not seen the faces before. Course 4 functioned as practice trials for the implicit measurement (Course 5). In Course 4, 6 good
adjectives and 6 bad adjectives were each paired with 6 pictures of Black faces and 6 pictures of White faces, with each type of word receiving equal numbers of each type of face. The word-face pairs were randomly presented to participants, with each face appearing on screen for 315 milliseconds before the word was displayed on screen and participants were asked to identify if the word was good or bad. Course 5 followed the same method, using the original 24 adjectives and 48 pictures of faces, 24 Black and 24 White. Each word was paired with 4 pictures of Black faces and 4 pictures of White faces, leaving each word presented 8 times. Participants were asked to identify the valence of each word as quickly as possible, word-face pairs were displayed in a block-randomization design, and faces were displayed for 315 milliseconds before the word was displayed. After completing Course 5, participants were debriefed and the experiment was ended.

Pilot Results

MRS-R results were entered into SPSS data analysis software. The analyzed component of the MRS-R study included 8 questions and a ranking task; each question presenting participants with a –2 to +2, five choice Likert scale; the ranking task asked participants to rank how high profile they believed each individual from a list of 6 Black individuals to be. Of the items, 7 were from the Devine (1989) administration of the MRS, and 1 asked participants about their political views on a –2 to 2 scale, -2 being the most highly liberal and +2 being the most conservative. Two items on the MRS were reverse coded. The scores of all participants were summed, leaving each participant with a total response score between –14 and 14, with 14 being the most highly prejudiced
responses to the scale possible. Results on the MRS-R were similar to recent findings, with mean = -4.38, median = -4.00, and standard deviation = 4.24 (Table 1).

Scores on the profile measure were tallied by reverse coding the rankings of Colin Powell, Michael Jordan, and Oprah Winfrey and summing all rankings. Higher scores indicate lower levels of prejudice. A multiple regression analysis was run, regressing MRS scores on political ideology scores and profile ratings. The model was significant, $F(2, 769) = 39.348, p < .05, R^2 = .093$. Political ideology was shown to be a significant contributor to MRS-R variance given prominence score, $t(772) = 8.871, p < .05, \Lambda R^2 = .093$, as well as a zero-order correlation $R^2 = .093$. Prominence ranking scores were not found to be a significant contributor of unexplained variance in the presence of political ideology and was dropped from further analysis.

Facilitation scores on the BFP were derived through a series of data calculations. Participants incorrectly identified the valence of the words at an average rate of 4.22%, and these trials were excluded from the analysis. To derive the facilitation scores, the two baseline trials were averaged for each word to derive an average baseline latency for each word for each participant. For each word, latency scores in the presence of each of the 8 faces presented with the word were subtracted from the baseline latency score to obtain facilitation scores. Averages of positive and negative words were calculated for each face, and then averaged by race to create a 4 cell design (race * valence of word, Figure 1).

A mixed ANOVA was run using gender as a between subjects factor and both word valence and race of picture as a within subjects factors. There was not a significant main effect for gender, nor were there any significant interactions involving gender; the
factor was dropped from subsequent analyses. Planned comparison interaction contrasts were calculated, comparing word reaction times for positive words by race and negative words by race; neither contrast approached significance. Omnibus tests were run for all main effects and interactions, finding no main effect for race. A significant main effect was found for word type, $F(1, 66) = 6.596, p = .012$. The test for the race * word interaction was marginally significant, $F(1, 66) = 3.101, p = .083$. The findings replicate the findings of Fazio et al (1995), with trends in the hypothesized directions (Table 2).

Participants reacted faster to White-good pairings than Black-good pairings, and faster to Black-bad pairings than White-bad pairings. A logarithmic transformation was applied to the raw scores due to the negative skew of the distribution of the computed facilitation scores. This transformation has been used in a number of recent priming studies (Correll et al., 2002; Dovidio et al., 2002; Payne, 2001). After the transformation a significant main effect was found for word type, $F(1, 66) = 142.334, p < .001$ and for race of picture, $F(1, 66) = 30.218, p < .001$. The test for the race * word interaction was also significant, $F(1, 66) = 30.444, p < .001$. The pattern was similar to that found by Fazio et al. (1995) (Figure 1).

In order to determine a prejudice score for each participant, the positive and negative adjective response latencies were averaged for each face presented, as described in Fazio et al. (1995). The negative word averages were then taken from the positive word averages for each face. For each participant, a t-score was produced by conducting a paired-comparison t-test between the 24 Black and 24 White faces paired with the same adjectives. This t-score was then converted into a correlation coefficient, which was
converted to a Z-score using Fisher’s r to Z conversion. A histogram representation of the distribution of these scores was produced (Figure 2).

Study 2 Methodology

Study 2 was similar to Study 1 with the addition of manipulation of race of experimenter and the introduction of planned positive, negative, or neutral interactions with the experimenter. Study 2 had a 2 x 3 design. Participants took part under the guise of participating in a study that compared reaction times on 2 different language tasks. Participants were informed that in order to fulfill the hour requirement of the class credit given, an unrelated questionnaire would be administered for another researcher. The questionnaire administered was the MRS-R. Participants were told that component 1 required that they completed a 50 problem word identification task in which words were to be presented on screen at the marginally perceptible threshold (15 msec) and then correctly identified from a choice of similar words. A brief description of the BFP was given to participants to indicate what was required in Course 2. Participants began Course 1, completed word identification items until a planned, apparent computer crash occurred on item 14. At this time, participants were required to get the experimenter and report the crash so that the study could continue.

At this point participants were exposed to the experimental manipulations. Within each condition, the participants encountered either a Black or a White experimenter. In the control condition, the experimenter entered the room and gave short, neutral feedback explaining that the word identification data had been lost, and instructed participants to begin the second component of the study (the BFP). In the positive condition, the experimenter entered the room and apologized for the equipment malfunction, then asked
forgiveness for wasting the participant’s time. The experimenter then explained that the
data from the word identification task has been lost and gave instructions for the
participant to begin the BFP. In the negative condition the experimenter entered the room
visibly angry. The experimenter accused the participant of abusing the equipment and
blamed the participant for the loss of data and the experimenter’s time. The experimenter
then gave instructions for the participant to begin the BFP. In all conditions, after
completion of the BFP the participant was asked to complete the MRS-R under the guise
of an unrelated study. At the completion of the study, participants were debriefed.

Study 2 Results

Sixty-eight male and 124 female undergraduates participated for partial class
credit. Depending upon sign-up times, participants were either run by a Black or a White experimenter; all participants were randomly assigned to the positive, neutral, or negative condition prior to arrival. Of the 192 total participants, 182 were White, 1 was Black, and 9 were designated as other. The small sample size of non-white participants prohibited analyzing these participants as a separate group and the data were dropped from all analyses. Three additional participants were excluded, one due to equipment malfunction, and two due to expression of suspicion regarding the true nature of the experiment leaving 179 participants in the final analysis (see Table 3 for participants in each condition).

A preliminary ANOVA indicated that the priming task was working in the
expected manner, with facilitation being greater for black face – negative adjective pairs
in a marginally significant within-subjects interaction F(1,175) = 3.297, p = .07 (Figure 3). The expected error rate (5.6%) was consistent with the literature. Gender and
experimenter were entered as between subject factors and found to be non-significant as main effects and in interactions for all of the following analyses.

It was hypothesized that race of experimenter and treatment condition would be part of a four-way interaction with within subject factors word valence and race of picture. Specifically, it was expected that participants run by a Black experimenter and experiencing a negative encounter would respond faster to Black face-negative word pairings (after accounting for baseline responses) than any other group. The interaction did not approach significance, and planned comparisons failed to reach levels of marginal or standard significance. The only significant interaction was that already described between word valence and race of picture. A log transformation of the data did not result in a significant increase in any of the F-values. Because experimenter hostility was the key manipulation, facilitation scores to only the adjective “hostile,” were calculated and the analysis was run with no significant findings.

The prejudice index scores were calculated for all participants with a distribution similar to that observed in previous literature (Figure 4). An ANOVA was run with the index score serving as the dependent variable and experimenter race and treatment condition serving as between subject factors; no main effects or interaction approached significance. While visual inspection of the means suggested some pattern of response resulting from the encounter manipulation, the actual mean differences were minute and the significance levels indicated that this was likely a chance finding (Figure 5).

The MRS was given to participants after completion of the BFP task. Participants’ compiled scores were similar to those found in the literature (Figure 6). An ANOVA was run with MRS score as the dependant variable and treatment condition and experimenter
race each serving as a between subjects factor. There were no significant main effects or interactions.

A ranking task was given to participants in which they were asked to rank 6 Black celebrities in order of highest profile; three of these celebrities possessed a positive image and three possessed a negative image. The ranks of the three negative image celebrities were reverse coded and a sum was taken of all rankings leaving higher scores indicating higher levels of prejudice. An ANOVA was run with the rank sum serving as the dependant variable and experimenter race and treatment condition each serving as a between subjects factor. There were no significant main effects or interactions.

A series of zero-order correlations were computed between MRS score, rank sum score, BFP index score, and political affiliation. As observed in the literature, political conservatism was positively correlated to MRS score, $r = .174$, $p < .05$. BFP index score was regressed upon MRS score, rank sum score, and political orientation. There were no significant relationships.

The results indicated that the BFP and MRS were collecting data as anticipated without unexpected error. All distributions, values, and error rates were consistent with the literature. The manipulation of experimenter race and interaction type did not result in the expected change in BFP responses and seemed to have no significant influence on implicit or explicit responses.

Discussion

The results failed to support the hypothesis that participants would respond with more prejudice after a negative encounter with a Black individual. Both implicit and explicit measures were used, both indicated that they were working properly and that the
sample was representative of the greater population, but no expected results were found. The most likely explanation would be failure of the manipulation; participants may have anticipated the true nature of the study and corrected for it, or the differences between the positive and negative conditions were not great enough to change reactions. These explanations seem unlikely for two reasons. First, in the funnel probe and debriefing, experimenters reported very little suspicion of the true nature of the experiment – approximately 3% of the analyzed sample expressed any suspicion at all, and only 1 participant had to be excluded from the analysis due to strong suspicions regarding the true nature of the study.

Further, experimenters noted that the reactions of the participants to the manipulations were unusually strong. In the negative condition, many participants reacted with astonishment and bewilderment. Some participants became verbally defensive, and a small number even verbally aggressive. There were even reports of unprompted false-confessions of pushing a button to crash the computer. Overall, participants seemed to believe the manipulation and experience a strong reaction to it.

One plausible explanation for the lack of expected results may be that the Black experimenters failed to activate the Black stereotype. When a Black target is perceived in an atypical positive role that is inconsistent with the stereotype, observers sometimes have a tendency to create or access a subcategory and rate the target more positively than a comparable white target would be rated (Barden at al. 2004). The experimenters were in a position of social power over the participants; we can assume that the experimenters were correctly viewed by participants as upper level, high performing undergraduate students or may have even been mistaken for graduate students. This makes the
experimenters an upward comparison target and assumed to possess a set of positive
traits inconsistent with the Black stereotype (Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995). The
experimenters may have been too divergent from the Black stereotype to elicit activation.

It is also possible that the lack of expected results was due to the research hypothesis being incorrect or not specific enough. The research hypothesis indicated that a one-time negative encounter with a Black individual could lead to higher levels of prejudice. The hypothesis did not specify extremity of the encounter, duration of the encounter, or other contributing factors that likely influence prejudice levels. Prejudice towards a group is the end result of socially communicated information, norms regarding treatment of the group, social tolerance of prejudice towards that group, internalization of norms against or for prejudice, knowledge of and possible endorsement of a stereotype, and personal reactions to first-person encounters. With the large number of influences on personal prejudice reactions, it seems unlikely that one encounter, in the absence of other environmental information or changes, would elicit a change in attitude towards that group. If it did, one would imagine that it would have to be an extremely negative encounter, and this was not mentioned in the hypothesis.

It is even possible that interpersonal encounters have no impact on prejudice levels towards a group. Correlations have been observed between negative encounters and prejudice levels (Towles-Schwen & Fazio, 2003; Plant, 2004; Plant & Devine, 2003), however this relationship could be the result of individuals with negative attitudes towards Blacks seeking out and inciting negative encounters that fulfill their negative expectations. Despite a changing social climate, egalitarian values, and decreases in the relative isolation of the Black and White populations, the stereotype continues to exist.
and is pervasively negative (Devine & Elliot, 1995). This suggests that socially communicated may be the main catalyst of intolerance, and not interpersonal encounters.

Future research will need to focus more on stereotype consistent negative encounters. Although it was postulated that any negative information is consistent with the negative Black stereotype, it is likely that a negative encounter with an uptight senior bound for graduate school is vastly different than being victim of a violent crime perpetrated by a Black individual. Subsequent research should take care to use interactions suggestive of the stereotype. Henderson-King and Nisbett’s (1996) success may have been partly due to the peer status of the Black individual acting in a negative manner and the somewhat stereotype consistent nature of the angry, defiant action. Actions of a peer may be more likely to elicit stereotype activation than actions of a superior. Considering the stereotype, future manipulated encounters might involve theft or dishonesty scenarios that are more relevant.

In future prejudice research behavioral measures should be more heavily utilized. Implicit priming measures are difficult to conduct and even more difficult to interpret when compared to behavioral measures. Although the BFP and other implicit measures have been shown to correlate with non-verbal gestures and interactions (Dovidio et al. 2002; Fazio et al. 1995) choices to engage in interactions with a Black individual, length of these interactions, and ratings of a Black individual in an interview-like situation would give a better predictive power and external validity. Further discouraging the use of priming measures, the mechanisms behind reactions to implicit measures are altogether unclear. In the current literature, distinctions between association, category and stereotype activation, approach-avoidance reactions with and without stereotype
activation, and extremity and/or accessibility of a stereotype are murky at best, leaving extensions to more realistic situations and behaviors risky. Behavioral measures are able to avoid these problems and provide a more accurate view of behavior in real-life scenarios.

Future research should attempt to develop more accurate explicit questionnaires. The MRS functioned better to establish that our sample was similar to past samples than as a measure of prejudiced reactions (as expected). The measure has been shown to be subject to motivations to avoid prejudice (Fazio et al. 1995) making it difficult to obtain results that indicate even moderate levels of prejudice. The ranking item manufactured for this study worked on an interesting principle but failed to yield any meaningful data. The premise was that when thinking of individuals from a specific group, thinkers with more negative views of the group would more easily bring to mind examples with negative characteristics. For instance, under this assumption we would expect that an individual who reacts in a highly prejudiced manner to Blacks would more easily bring Michael Jackson to mind than Colin Powell. This could be potentially due to the negative examples containing information consistent with the activated stereotype, or due to a tendency to bring negative exemplars to mind rather than positive exemplars. Future research may ask participants to rate characteristics of a group on traits such as honesty, friendliness, and helpfulness in an attempt to find differences between groups directly applicable to the manipulated encounter. Follow up measures to this study will also ask participants to rate the characteristics of the individual encountered to confirm that the encounter type changes perceptions of that specific individual.
The author still believes that one-time negative encounters with Black individuals can increase prejudice towards that group through chronic stereotype accessibility or increased endorsement of the stereotype that consequently leads to increased accessibility, but that not all negative situations are sufficient to elicit this type of attitude shift. It appears that the interaction target must not diverge too far from behavior consistent with the stereotype, or subtyping and/or non-activation of the stereotype is likely to occur. It is also believed that in order for a one-time encounter to have a significant impact on an individual’s prejudice levels, it would have to be profoundly negative. Whereas the manipulation used was undoubtedly unpleasant, it holds little similarity to the experience of being the victim of a crime or the recipient of a threat. Although exploring the effects of perceived threats to personal safety on shifts in prejudice levels would be likely to yield strong, consistent results, the ethical considerations of such research are highly prohibitive.

The current research has indicated that shifts in prejudice can be difficult to elicit and to measure. It remains uncertain if there was failure to incite a shift in prejudice levels, or failure to detect a shift. Effects on implicit measures are notoriously subtle, but the meager F-values indicate that this was not a problem of power – if there was an effect the implicit and explicit measures did not detect it. This study was useful in illustrating the difficulties of prejudice research. Prejudice is difficult to detect due to self-monitoring, and even when interacting with a Black individual participants may engage in subtyping and there will be no definite evidence of it unless it is planned for and addressed. Although implicit measures offer routes around self-monitoring and egalitarian values that may interfere with honest reactions, they are difficult to conduct,
difficult to interpret, and significant effects can be hard to obtain. These challenges are
daunting, but advancing our understanding of prejudice is beneficial to psychology and
society, necessitating that we continue to develop our capabilities.
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Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.S. # ___________________</th>
<th>Name ____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
For each question, please answer the question as honestly as possible. All answers will be kept confidential.

In your current area of residence, African Americans make up a significant percentage of the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African Americans have historically been underrepresented in the United States government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy to understand the anger of African Americans in America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many people feel uncomfortable in the presence of a large group African Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African Americans have more influence upon school desegregation plans than they ought to have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stereotypes are gross overgeneralizations of African Americans, and absolutely no part of the stereotype is ever true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
African Americans are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I may or may not disagree with individuals who are prejudiced towards African Americans, it is their right to hold prejudiced views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past few years African Americans have gotten more economically than they deserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past few years the government and news media have shown more respect to African Americans than they deserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although neither good nor bad, there are differences between African Americans and White Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African Americans should not push themselves where they're not wanted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private organizations, such as country clubs, service organizations, and freemasons, have the constitutional right to exclude African Americans if they so choose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discrimination against African Americans is no longer a problem in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following list contains the names of well-known African Americans. Using the list, please rank who you think to have the highest profile on the list, highest to lowest, using the numbers 1 to 6 (1 being the highest profile, 2 the second highest, and 3 the third highest, etc.).

__Colin Powel__
__Mike Tyson__
__Michael Jackson__
__Oprah Winfrey__
__Michael Jordan__
__R. Kelley__

My political views are…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Liberal</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Strongly Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Negative Adjectives
Rotten
Dangerous
Hostile
Inferior
Offensive
Terrifying
Disturbing
Horrible
Foolish
Repulsive
Annoying
Disgusting

Positive Adjectives
Agreeable
Attractive
Delightful
Honest
Intelligent
Likeable
Reliable
Superior
Wonderful
Appealing
Charming
Desirable
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Table 1

*MRS-R Pilot Means and Previous MRS Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-4.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. McConahay et al (1981) MRS scale used only 6 items and was subsequently on a – 12 to 12 scale. The findings represented were those from Study 1 participants being administered the MRS by a White experimenter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good – White</th>
<th>Good – Black</th>
<th>Bad – White</th>
<th>Bad - Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Findings</td>
<td>10.546</td>
<td>-2.218</td>
<td>83.652</td>
<td>97.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fazio et al (1995) Findings</td>
<td>-44.5*</td>
<td>-117.25*</td>
<td>-21.6*</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Because they were not published within the article, these numbers have been estimated through the use of graphs and figures published in the article.
Table 3

*Sample Size by Experimenter Race and Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Encounter</th>
<th>Neutral Encounter</th>
<th>Negative Encounter</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Experimenter</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Experimenter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56 (31%)</td>
<td>59 (33%)</td>
<td>64 (36%)</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitation Scores *higher values denote faster responses

1 = White
2 = Black

Figure 1. BFP Facilitation Scores (untransformed).
Distribution of Individual Prejudice Scores

More negative scores indicate more negativity towards blacks

Figure 2. Individual Prejudice Z-Scores.
Study 2 Facilitation Scores *higher values denote faster responses

Figure 3. BFP Facilitation Scores (untransformed).
Distribution of Individual Prejudice Scores

More negative scores indicate more negativity towards Blacks.

*Figure 4.* Individual Prejudice Z-Scores.
More negative scores indicate more negativity towards Blacks

*Figure 5.* Prejudice Z-Scores by Condition and Experimenter Race.
More positive scores indicate more prejudiced responses towards blacks

*Figure 6.* MRS Compiled Scores (range -14 to +14).