

Ash - N, K, & M

- (10) run a cell (A12 & B12) p 60
- (11) ~~DN~~ avg (2) ~~p 70~~ ~~error: give~~  
~~Sing (2) before~~
- (12) ~~private regent~~  
~~rest = 4 (untested pub regent) ← masky~~  
~~error: mad~~
- (13) ~~att (2) p 70-71~~  
~~pp 71-72~~
- (14) ~~self (2)~~
- (15) ~~but (2)~~ ~~indirect~~  
~~call~~
- (16) ~~but (2) for all~~ ~~p 70-72~~ ~~could be~~  
~~3 (sub) for~~  
~~some~~
- (17) not (0) p 70
- (18) predicted future (2) p 70 ~~could be (4)~~
- (19) log (1) p 73
- (20) word (0)
- (21) 1 ~~1st~~ p 72
- (22) 1st 2nd (2) p 70
- (23) EM (3), p 71
- (24) B (1), p 70-1
- (25) after (2), p 70-1
- (26) att (2), p 70-1
- (27) some (0) p 70-71
- (28) some (0) p 70-71
- (29) ~~sd (7) p 70-71~~
- (30) ~~sd (5) p 71-72~~
- (31) ~~cont (4) p 70-71~~
- (32) ~~spec (4) p 70-71~~
- (33) ~~spec (3) p 71-72~~
- (34) ~~comp (2.5)~~
- (35) ~~ran (1)~~
- (36) ~~dant (2)~~

perception and intergroup behavior. In C. Sedikides & J. Schopler (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (pp. 27-44). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Winter, L., & Uleman J. (1984). When are social judgments made? Evidence for the spontaneousness of trait inferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 237-252.

Yzerbyt, V., Rogier, A., & Fiske, S.T. (1998). Group entitativity and social attribution: On translating situational constraints into stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1089-1103.

## BLACK AMERICANS' IMPLICIT RACIAL ASSOCIATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERGROUP JUDGMENT

Leslie Ashburn-Nardo  
University of Kentucky

Megan L. Knowles  
Northwestern University

Margo J. Monteith  
University of Kentucky

MAS-  
IAA  
too

2 of 13  
74

Save

Many—though not all—black Americans exhibit an implicit evaluative preference for whites relative to blacks (e.g., Livingston, 2002). Are such biases meaningfully related to blacks' explicit attitudes and actual intergroup judgments? In the present study, 83 black participants who believed they would complete an intellectually challenging task with a partner rated their preferences for (fictitious) black and white potential partners. The less strongly participants implicitly preferred their ingroup, the lower their preference for a black vs. a white work partner. The magnitude of this relationship held even when controlling for explicit attitudes that were related to partner preference. Implicit biases were associated with explicit attitudes regarding black, but not white, persons and with system-justifying ideology (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Livingston → 10  
30

Order of authorship was determined alphabetically. Leslie Ashburn-Nardo is now in the Department of Psychology at Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis.

This manuscript is based on an undergraduate honors thesis submitted by Megan L. Knowles to the University of Kentucky. Portions of this research were presented at the Annual Convention of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Savannah, Georgia, February 2002. The research was supported by a grant from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Grants-in-Aid program. We would like to thank Julietta Rice for her assistance with data collection and Russ Fazio for his comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Address correspondence to: Leslie Ashburn-Nardo, Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis, Department of Psychology, 402 North Blackford Street (LD 124), Indianapolis, IN 46202-3275.

all participants were entered into a lottery and one randomly selected person was awarded the cash prize at the conclusion of data collection for the entire experiment.

Participants then rated their potential partners on the following five 8-point questions regarding *partner preference*: "To what extent would you get along better with one partner over the other?"; "To what extent are you more opposed to working with one partner over the other?"; "To what extent is it more important for you to work with one partner over the other?"; "To what extent do you think one partner is friendlier than the other?"; "To what extent do you think one partner is better at doing anagrams?" The alleged other participants' names served as the anchors for each item (e.g., 1 = get along better with Partner A, Christopher; 8 = get along better with Partner B, James). In addition, whether a black versus white name appeared as the left versus right anchor was randomized. These items assessed participants' overall positivity toward one partner over the other.<sup>2</sup> As a check for the stakes manipulation, participants rated the extent to which they were motivated to choose a successful partner (1 = not at all motivated to 7 = extremely motivated).

*IAT.* After completing this measure, participants were asked to help pilot a "new" measure, the IAT, while the experimenter allegedly set up the room in which the joint task would take place. Participants completed one of two programs that were created in order to control for trial order effects. These programs were identical except for the order in which participants completed the congruent (i.e., black name + pleasant word / white name + unpleasant word) and incongruent (i.e., black name + unpleasant word / white name + pleasant word) trial blocks. Participants were instructed to respond as quickly as possible while making as few mistakes as possible. The experimenter left the room while participants completed this task.

The IAT computer program began with general instructions that explained that participants would be assigning words to categories. The program then presented the categorization task, which contained seven blocks of trials. In each block, the categories (i.e., black, white, pleasant,

2. Participants were also asked to write the name of the partner with whom they would work, providing a dichotomous measure of partner choice. Although the partner preference ratings and partner choice measure were significantly and strongly correlated,  $r = .58, p < .01$ , no other significant results were found for partner choice. The dichotomous partner choice item likely was not a sensitive enough measure.

unpleasant) were presented before the onset of the trials, and they remained on the left and right sides of the screen throughout the block. The stimulus words, which were obtained from Greenwald et al.'s (1998) stimulus lists, appeared in the center of the screen, one at a time in random order. Participants were instructed to assign each stimulus word as quickly as possible to the left or right category by pressing either the "A" key on the left side of the keyboard or the "5" key on the number pad, respectively. Correct categorizations were followed by green circles that appeared below the stimulus word, whereas incorrect responses were followed by red X's that remained on the screen until participants made the correct response. The inter-trial stimulus interval was 150 ms.

The first three blocks of trials were for practice. In the first block, participants categorized names as black versus white. In the second block, participants categorized words as pleasant versus unpleasant. In the third block, the tasks were combined; that is, participants were presented with both names and words and had to assign them to their appropriate categories. Two of the categories (e.g., black name + pleasant word) appeared together on the left and two (e.g., white name + unpleasant word) appeared on the right. This pairing was retained in the fourth block, but those trials served as test—rather than practice—trials. In the fifth (practice) block, the category placement was switched from that of the first block so that the category that had appeared on the left in the first block appeared on the right in the fifth block. This switch was maintained throughout the sixth and seventh blocks. The sixth (practice) block combined the categories (e.g., black name + unpleasant word on the left; white name + pleasant word on the right). The final block was identical to the sixth, but counted as a test block. Test blocks consisted of 40 trials each, and practice blocks consisted of twenty trials each.

When participants finished the IAT, the experimenter returned and informed participants that this part of the study was over and that they would not be working on a joint task with a partner. At this time, participants were asked whether they would be willing to participate in a second, supposedly unrelated study on ethnic attitudes.

*Explicit Measures.* After they provided informed consent, participants were given a packet containing the following questionnaires assembled in a random order. To assess racial identity, participants completed the MIBI (Sellers et al., 1998), a 56-item inventory scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The MIBI

taps various aspects of racial identity, but those most important for the purposes of the present research were private regard (e.g., "I feel good about black people"), public regard (e.g., "Overall, blacks are considered good by others"), and centrality (e.g., "In general, being black is an important part of my self-image").

Attitudes toward whites were assessed using the 20-item JLS (Johnson & Lecci, 2003). Participants made responses on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The JLS includes items that tap blacks' attitudes toward whites (e.g., "I consider myself to be racist toward whites"), perceptions of whites' beliefs about blacks (e.g., "I believe that most whites really believe that blacks are genetically inferior"), and past behaviors regarding whites (e.g., "I have insulted a white person").

SDO was assessed using the 16-item SDO scale (Pratto et al., 1994). Participants responded to the items using 7-point Likert-type scales to indicate their feelings toward each item (1 = very negative to 7 = very positive). The SDO scale included both OEQ (e.g., "We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups") and GBD items (e.g., "To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups").

Participants were instructed to place their completed packets in an envelope to help ensure confidentiality. Upon completion of the measures, the experimenter returned and probed participants for suspicion. We particularly wanted to determine whether participants saw a connection between the IAT and the partner-rating task and between the first part of the study and the questionnaires. No participant verbalized a link between these features of the study in any way. Finally, the experimenter debriefed, thanked, and compensated participants.

## RESULTS

### IAT EFFECT

FIAT for Windows 2.3 (Farnham, 1998) automatically drops the first two trials in each block. These initial latencies tend to be longer as participants are growing accustomed to the task. Similarly, FIAT recodes all response latencies that are less than 300 ms or greater than 3000 ms as 300 and 3000 ms, respectively. These procedures help ensure the validity of the data by eliminating extremely short and long response times that are indicative of participants' momentary inattention. The response laten-

cies were also log-transformed, given that reaction time data tend to be skewed (e.g., Ratcliff, 1993). Analyses were performed using the transformed data, but results are presented in milliseconds for ease of interpretation.

The response latencies were then analyzed in a 2 (participant sex: male vs. female)  $\times$  2 (IAT order: congruent first vs. incongruent first)  $\times$  2 (IAT trial type: congruent vs. incongruent) mixed-model analysis of variance (ANOVA), with repeated measures on the last factor. Results indicated a significant effect of IAT trial type only, such that participants took longer on the congruent ( $M = 889.04$  ms) than incongruent trials ( $M = 811.17$  ms),  $F(1, 78) = 18.46, p < .001, d = .49$ . Thus, participants overall displayed a moderate degree of implicit outgroup favoritism (i.e., more easily associating pleasant concepts with white names and unpleasant with black names).

IAT scores were then calculated by subtracting mean congruent trial latencies from incongruent latencies (see, for example, Greenwald et al., 1998), such that positive scores reflect ingroup favoritism and negative scores reflect outgroup favoritism. Descriptive statistics for the IAT and all other measures are presented in Table 1, and the distribution of IAT scores is depicted in Figure 1. Approximately 40% of the sample displayed implicit ingroup favoritism, responding significantly faster when black names were paired with pleasant words and white names were paired with unpleasant words than the reverse. More strikingly, 60% of the sample displayed implicit outgroup favoritism, responding significantly faster when white names were paired with pleasant words and black names with unpleasant words than the reverse. Indeed, overall the IAT effect was significantly different from zero and in a negative direction,  $t(81) = 3.81, p < .001$ , underscoring the degree to which many black participants in our sample exhibited relatively negative ingroup associations. On one hand, the present findings replicate those of previous studies (e.g., Livingston, 2002) in the high degree of variability among blacks on the IAT, with some participants exhibiting implicit ingroup favoritism and some exhibiting implicit outgroup favoritism. On the other hand, the significant degree of outgroup favoritism in the present study is a departure from previous findings. Specifically, Livingston (2002) found no evidence of ingroup or outgroup preference among black participants in two samples. We will return to this point in the General Discussion.