college students to evaluate most other European American and African American college students on a number of positive and negative attributes. Figure 10.2 shows the ratings each group received, with higher numbers signifying more positive evaluations. As you can see, the European American students were very egalitarian: They gave equal evaluations to European American and African American students. The African American students, however, showed ingroup favoritism. They evaluated African American students more positively than they evaluated European American students.

What are we to make of these findings? Should we conclude that European American students are far less prejudiced than African American students? Perhaps. But it’s also possible that the European American students were reluctant to express prejudice toward African Americans. Having been socialized to be fair-minded, they refrained from characterizing African Americans in negative terms. In support of this possibility, the European American students admitted to feeling less positively toward African Americans than toward European Americans. Dovidio and Gaertner (1998; Gaertner and Davidio, 1986) use the term aversive racism to refer to the genuine desire to be nonprejudiced, accompanied by negative feelings (e.g., anger, fear, resentment) toward minority groups. It is aversive in that people wish they didn’t have the negative feelings they do in fact have.

1. Implicit Measures of Racial Prejudice

Like other self-report questionnaires, the scale used by Judd and colleagues (1995) measures people’s explicit attitudes. Explicit attitudes are ones people consciously access and report. As such, they are subject to bias: If people are unable or unwilling to access their real attitudes, their responses will not reflect their true thoughts and feelings. To overcome the potential limitations associated with explicit attitudes, researchers have developed measures that assess people’s implicit attitudes. Implicit attitudes are not accessible to consciousnesses and cannot be measured by self-report. Instead, they are inferred using more indirect methods (W. A. Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001; Fazio & Olson, 2003; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995).

One approach to measuring implicit attitudes uses a semantic priming task developed by Meyer and Schvaneveldt (1971). With this procedure, participants make