

Seka et al + add "exp 2"

Not in (62)
MS

(10) $A/2$ or $B/2$ - ~~page~~ p. 75

(11) aug (2) - p. 79,

(12) att (1), p. 79

(13) ~~att~~ belat (2), p. 79 or att (2) MRS

(14) obs (2), p. 79

(15) obs (5), p. 79

(16) log (2), p. 79

(17) words (0), p. 79

(18) 2 IAT (1), p. 79

(19) IAT 2nd (2), p. 79

(20) Em 3rd (3), p. 79

(21) ~~att~~ B 7st (7), p. 79

(22) after (2), p. 79

(23) att (2), p. 79

(24) same (0), p. 79

(25) same (0), p. 79

(26) 7-sd (29) 3-spec

(27) 7-sd (30) 3-spec

(28) 7-sd (31) ~~comp~~ + 2.5

(29) 6-con (32) raw (1), p. 71

(33) dual (2)

p. 79

✓

Stereotypic explanatory bias: Implicit stereotyping as a predictor of discrimination

Denise Sekaquaptewa,^{a,*} Penelope Espinoza,^a Mischa Thompson,^a
Patrick Vargas,^b and William von Hippel^c

^a Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109, USA

^b Department of Advertising, University of Illinois, IL, USA

^c School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

Received 7 March 2001; revised 11 February 2002

Abstract

Two experiments examined whether a measure of implicit stereotyping based on the tendency to explain Black stereotype-incongruent events more often than Black stereotype-congruent events (Stereotypic Explanatory Bias or SEB) is predictive of behavior toward a partner in an interracial interaction. In Experiment 1 SEB predicted White males' choice to ask stereotypic questions of a Black female (but not a White male or White female) in an interview. In Experiment 2 the type of explanation (internal or external attribution) made for stereotype-inconsistency was examined. Results showed that White participants who made internal attributions for Black stereotype-incongruent behavior were rated more positively and those who made external attributions were rated more negatively by a Black male confederate. These results point to the potential of implicit stereotyping as an important predictor of behavior in an interracial interaction.

© 2002 Elsevier Science (USA). All rights reserved.

Keywords: Stereotyping; Intergroup behavior; Prejudice; Interracial interaction

Stereotyping and prejudice are difficult to measure because people are often unwilling to admit negative attitudes and beliefs about social groups (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995). Additionally, people may sometimes be unable to accurately report on these topics because how they think and feel about social groups may not be consciously accessible to them (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Thus, researchers are faced with a substantial "willing and able" problem when attempting to measure prejudice and stereotyping.

In response to this "willing and able" problem, researchers turned to measures of implicit prejudice and stereotyping. Such measures are thought to tap consciously inaccessible group-based attitudes and beliefs (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Most research attention has focused on implicit prejudice measures, which are intended to assess the degree of positivity or negativity an individual implicitly associates with social groups

(e.g., Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). Somewhat less research attention has focused on implicit stereotype measures (e.g., Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997), and implicit stereotyping, which we define as the unintended influence of stereotypes on information processing (cf. Brewer, 1996). In part, this focus on prejudice rather than stereotypes/stereotyping probably emerged because prejudice has traditionally been thought to be more consequential than stereotyping for behavioral outcomes such as discrimination (Brigham, 1971; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991).

To the extent that measures of implicit prejudice and stereotyping assess important processes relevant to intergroup attitudes and perceptions (von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1995, 1997), it seems reasonable to expect them to relate to intergroup behavior. Yet such demonstrations are rare. In one study, White participants who implicitly favored Whites over African-Americans were rated by observers as having more positive interactions with a White than a Black experimenter (McConnell & Leibold, 2001; see also

* Corresponding author. Fax: 1-734-647-9440.

E-mail address: dsekaqua@umich.edu (D. Sekaquaptewa).

behaviors. Not all explanations are equally potent dis-
missals of the implications of a behavior, however, as
some types of explanations are likely to be more ster-
eotype-maintaining than others. In particular, attribu-
tions to the situation rather than the actor may be
particularly stereotype-maintaining. For example, re-
sponding to, "Shaniqua scored high on the SAT..." by
adding "because she took preparation courses" main-
tains the stereotype that Blacks are unintelligent more so
than the explanation "because she is smart." When SEB
involves primarily internal attributions for stereotype-
inconsistency, SEB may actually promote stereotype
change or reduction, whereas when SEB involves pri-
marily external attributions, it is likely to lead to ster-
eotype maintenance. If SEB predicts discriminatory
behavior due to its stereotype-maintaining properties, a
form of SEB that instead promotes stereotype reduction
may actually predict positive interracial interactions.
Therefore, in Experiment 2, the coding of the SEB
measure included categorization of internal and external
explanations, with the prediction that external SEB may
be more related to negative behavioral outcomes than
internal SEB.

Method

Participants

Seventy-nine White participants (27 male and 52 fe-
male) participated in partial fulfillment of psychology
course requirements.

Procedure

Upon reporting to the lab, the participant was
shown to a cubicle and led to believe other students
occupied the remaining cubicles. It was explained that
participants were to be paired with another participant
for an experiment on game-playing, but that the task
would not take long, so they would also take part in
an unrelated survey on social attitudes to complete the
hour. Participants were randomly assigned to interact
with either a Black male or a White male confederate.

The participant and confederate were escorted to a
larger room for the game-playing task. The participant
and confederate played three rounds of a paper-and-
pencil game similar to an extended version of tic-tac-
toe. Each round was terminated after 3 min regardless
of whether one person had won. The confederate was
instructed to not try to win, nor initiate conversation,
but to respond cordially if the participant initiated
conversation. The experimenter recorded the outcome
of each round of the game. Between the second and the
third round, the experimenter left the room for 2 min,
presumably to attend to other students. This provided
an opportunity for the participant to have an un-
structured interaction and possibly initiate conversa-
tion with the confederate.

After the final round of the game, the participant
returned to the cubicle to complete a filler questionnaire
regarding strategies used during the game. During this
time, the confederate completed the primary dependent
measures. The confederate rated his impression of the
participant, using the following items: I liked the par-
ticipant; the participant was nice; was friendly; was
selfish; was cold towards me; didn't want to play the
game with me (the final three were reverse scored). The
confederate also rated the participant on the positive
behaviors he saw the participant display during the in-
teraction, using the following items: the participant
looked me in the eye; spoke to me before or during the
game; maintained a closed posture by crossing his/her
arms (reverse scored).

After completing the filler questionnaire, participants
were instructed to begin the second study as in Experi-
ment 1. The survey packet instructed the participant to
complete the SEB measure, then use the computer
located in the cubicle for the IAT (the race version of the
IAT was given as in Greenwald et al., 1998), and when
finished to complete the rest of the survey packet, which
contained the MRS.⁴ Participants were then probed for
suspicion, debriefed, and thanked.

Results

The IAT computer program recorded reaction times
in a categorization task wherein participants responded
to Black and White names and pleasant and unpleasant
words. Outliers in the IAT data were trimmed, and the
data log transformed prior to analysis, according to the
procedure described by Greenwald et al. (1998). Aver-
aged reaction times to unpleasant words paired on the
same response key as Black names, and pleasant words
paired on the same response key as White names, were
subtracted from averaged reaction times to unpleasant
words paired on the same response key as White names,
and pleasant words paired on the same response key as
Black names. Higher positive difference scores indicated
more negative associations to Blacks and/or more po-
sitive associations to Whites (see Greenwald et al.,
1998). IAT difference scores ranged from -174.00 to
879.00, $M = 315.14$, $SD = 184.37$, and differed signifi-
cantly from zero, $t(78) = 15.29$, $p < .001$.

The SEB measure was identical to that used in Ex-
periment 1 and responses were again scored as to whe-
ther they explained the behavior in the sentence stem.
(As in Experiment 1, W-SEB was computed and found

⁴ Because responding on the SEB measure may be altered when
participants report racial attitudes first, whereas responding on the
IAT seems largely uncontrollable (Kim & Greenwald, 1998), the SEB
was given first, followed by the IAT, and the MRS was given last, as it
is apparent to participants that it measures racial prejudice (Fazio
et al., 1995).