

Running head: THE MALLEABILITY OF THE ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOR LINK

Nonverbal friendliness & Black peer  
 facial expressions, p  
 sorted ratings of p

ATB  
 21A - race 21B ethnicity  
 17 p. 6 (0), p. 6  
 18 1 1A (1), p. 6  
 19 2 0-3 (p. 6-7)  
 20 2 0-3 1 p. 6-7  
 21 1st (1), p. 6  
 22 Table 2 (2), p. 6-7  
 23 after B (2), p. 6-7  
 24 same (0), p. 6-7

The Faces of Prejudice: On the Malleability of the Attitude-Behavior Link

Dana R. Carney

Northeastern University

Text and footnote word count: 4989; 3 Tables; 21 references

Direct correspondence to:

Dana R. Carney

Department of Psychology

1570 William James Hall

Harvard University

33 Kirkland Street

Cambridge, MA 02138

e: dcarney@wjh.harvard.edu

26 7 sd, p. 6

27 7 sd, p. 7

28 1 control, p. 7

29 Spu (2.5), p. 6-7

30 spu (2), p. 7

31 opposed 13 ATB (2.5), p. 6

32 race (1), p. 2

33 dual (2), p. 6

Corrections in  
 file 1st 1st  
 3rd, EM 2nd

617  
 497  
 1712

#40 - #146  
 DONE

## Abstract

The Person X Situation framework for investigating social behavior was applied to the behavioral expression of race-bias. The relation between race-bias and observable nonverbal and social behavior was found to be malleable. White participants interacted with Black and White confederates in one of two behavioral contexts: an ordinary movie discussion or a racially imbued movie discussion. Contextual variations changed the behavioral manifestation of implicitly (IAT) and explicitly (ATB) measured anti-Black race-bias. During the ordinary movie discussion, behavioral manifestation of bias was consistent with previous research (higher IAT was related to more eye blinks, more negativity, less expressivity, and more rigidity; higher ATB was related to more pauses during speech). However, during the racially imbued movie discussion, participants appeared to control all behavior and IAT bias only leaked out through behavioral rigidity. An index of bias-behavior consistency showed that the bias-behavior link shifted considerably for both measures of race-bias, but slightly less so for implicitly measured race-bias. Different behavioral correlates were found for implicitly and explicitly measured race-bias.

KEYWORDS: Attitudes, Emotion, Nonverbal Behavior, Social Behavior, Race-Bias, IAT, ATB, Expression, Prejudice

offended by the way race is depicted in the movie? Why?" The two race not salient questions were: "Do you think this movie is an accurate depiction of life? Why?" and "Do you think there was anything offensive about this movie? Why?"

After each 3-min interaction participants completed a mood measure, and confederates completed a partner liking questionnaire taken from Dovidio et al. (1997; 2002) on which ratings of the interaction partner were made on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*) scale of the following adjectives: pleasant, cruel, unfriendly, unlikable, and cold (the term hostile was also added). Positive affect (PA) was comprised of the following self reported 0 (*do not feel*) to 4 (*definitely feel*) affect terms: happy, peppy, content, loving, caring, amused, cheerful, excited, glad, joyful, pleasant, and relaxed ( $\alpha = .81$  and  $.83$  for each the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> interaction). At the end of the second 3-min interaction, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and were introduced to a second experimenter who brought them to ostensibly unrelated experiment.

In the "second experiment" participants engaged in a randomly assigned order of the following tasks.

*The Implicit Association Test (IAT)*. The IAT measures how quickly a person can respond with a key-press to classify items into one of two semantically similar category pairs, as compared to the speed of classifying the same items into one of two semantically dissimilar category pairs. This reaction time task was used to measure participants' automatic, or implicitly measured, attitude toward Black Americans. A relatively more negative attitude toward Blacks was defined as the extent to which Black faces would have a stronger association with evaluatively negative words, and White faces with evaluatively positive words, relative to the reverse (referred to as the IAT D-score). Following Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003), a computer-administered IAT was developed to measure attitudes towards Blacks. Two versions of

algorithm

33

19-25  
(p. 1)

1A

12

17

28

29

26

31

16

the IAT, one in which semantically similar category pairs were presented first and another in which dissimilar category pairs were presented first, were used in a counterbalanced fashion. The Cronbach's alpha on the participants' practice and critical trials was  $\alpha = .42$ .

*Attitudes toward Blacks (ATB).* Brigham's (1993) ATB measured explicit, self-reported, negative attitudes towards Blacks on 20 items anchored on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale. Cronbach's alpha for the current study was  $\alpha = .85$ .

*Behavior assessments.* Eight coders rated the presence of nonverbal and social behaviors. All 3 min of each videotaped interaction were coded. Inter-rater reliability was determined by having a comparison coder code a small portion (2% - 8%) of the participants on the primary coder's designated behavior and then correlating the two coders' data together. Inter-rater reliability was adequate for all behaviors ranging from  $r = .68$  to  $r = .98$  (Mean inter-rater  $r = .81$ ).

Ten seconds surrounding the race-salient and control question were coded with the Facial Action Coding System (FACS; Ekman & Friesen, 1978; Ekman, Friesen, & Hager, 2002). FACS is a coding system that is used to identify the movement of 64 muscle groups (Action Units, or AUs) in the face and neck. For the purposes of this study, only those muscle groups that have been shown to relate to emotional experience were coded (Ekman et al., 2002). For each race-salient and associated control question, the coded 10 seconds began in the middle of the question. Reliability for FACS was determined across all behaviors for a pair of FACS coders on 11% of the stimuli, and the associated average inter-rater agreement was a respectable 71.16% (following Ekman & Friesen, 1978; Ekman et al., 2002).

Because the primary FACS coder (D.R.C.) was fully aware of the hypotheses and nature of the experimental manipulation, four precautions were taken to insure blindness to

27  
E/M  
13  
30  
Beh  
14  
15  
11  
28  
29-30



Table 1

*Across Situational Context – Correlations Between Race-bias (IAT and ATB) and Behavior Toward Blacks and Whites*

|                              | IAT                 |                 |          |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|
|                              | Race not<br>salient | Race<br>salient | <i>z</i> | Race not<br>salient |
| Participants' coded behavior |                     |                 |          |                     |
| Nervous – calm               |                     |                 |          |                     |
| Blinks (#)                   | .36+                | -.17            | 2.05*    | .18                 |
| Nervous                      | -.21                | -.10            | -.42     | .23                 |
| Self-touches (#)             | .10                 | -.21            | 1.17     | .20                 |
| Positive – negative          |                     |                 |          |                     |
| Body and head toward         | .01                 | -.12            | .49      | -.28                |
| Smiles (#)                   | -.09                | -.13            | .15      | .10                 |
| Head nods (#)                | .03                 | -.01            | .15      | .17                 |
| Pleasant                     | -.10                | -.18            | .30      | -.12                |

|   |        |       |        |        |
|---|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| Cold                                    | .61*** | -.10  | 3.02** | -.21   |
| Hostile                                 | .41*   | -.11  | 2.04*  | -.17   |
| Unfriendly                              | .23    | -.00  | .87    | -.43*  |
| Rigid – expressive                      |        |       |        |        |
| Expressive                              | -.48*  | .02   | -2.03* | -.05   |
| Interactionally rigid                   | .45*   | .44*  | .05    | .10    |
| Posturally rigid                        | .36+   | .39*  | -.13   | .12    |
| Verbal fluency – dysfluency             |        |       |        |        |
| Pauses (#)                              | -.05   | -.03  | -.07   | .63*** |
| Response time latency to Q1 (ms)        | -.38+  | -.37* | -.04   | .21    |
| Speaking time (ms)                      | .10    | -.01  | .41    | .25    |
| Speech errors (#)                       | -.27   | -.17  | -.39   | .13    |
| Confederates' and participants' ratings |        |       |        |        |
| Participants' positive feelings         | -.35+  | -.00  | -1.36  | .08    |
| Confederates' negativity ratings        | .36+   | .25   | .45    | .01    |

Note: IAT = Implicit Association Test; ATB = Attitudes Toward Blacks. All values are two-tailed partial cor

Black and White confederates' coded body orientation and friendliness. +  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*