

	Paper	Authors	Study	IV	Manipulation description	DV	Results
1	A Dynamic Model of Guilt	Amodio, Devine, & Harmon-Jones (2007)	Study 1	--Within subjects manipulation of receiving bogus feedback indicating racism	Fitted female participants with EEG and showed them Asian, White, and African American male faces. Showed them all bogus feedback indicating that they had responded more negatively to the African American faces. It appears that nothing was manipulated.	--Affect --Frontal cortical asymmetry (EEG) —Interest in prejudice reduction articles	-- After receiving feedback indicating they had responded negatively toward Black faces, subjects reported significantly increased guilt, anxiety, sadness, and other-directed negative affect, and reduced positive affect, relative to baseline. -- Significant reduction in left-sided frontal asymmetry following feedback relative to baseline, indicating a reduction in approach motivation. A reduction in left-sided frontal asymmetry was significantly correlated with greater guilt, but not correlated with anxiety, sadness, other-directed negative affect, or positive affect.--The experience of guilt was associated with a stronger desire to read articles about prejudice reduction, but not with a stronger desire to read filler articles.Increased left-frontal asymmetry during viewing of prejudice-reduction titles predicted greater desire to read prejudice-reduction articles, but not filler articles.
2	Do Conscious Thoughts Cause Behavior?	Baumeister, Masicampo, & Vohs (2011)	Review				Our editor mentioned that there were a couple of papers on the benefits of reflection in this review. One was Ansel et al. (2009), in which employees from different organizations completed a task that simulated their work. Those who received feedback and reflected on their performance improved; reflection without feedback and feedback without reflection did not lead to improvement. N.J. Ciarocco, K.D. Vohs, & R.F. Baumeister (unpublished data) had subjects experience an initial failure and then randomly assigned them to reflect on what they might have done wrong, or on the implications of the failure about themselves in general, or on task-irrelevant information. Only the first of these led to improvements on subsequent performance.

3	When Ego Threats Lead to Self-Regulation Failure: Negative Consequences of High Self-Esteem	Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice (1993)	Study 1	--Trait self-esteem --Ego-threat vs. control	Subjects played a video game and then were told that they had passed the "study criterion" on 3/10 trials. They were then told that if they surpassed that criterion on another trial they would earn money. They could also set an even harder criterion, and if they surpassed that they would earn more money. Ego threat manipulation: Experimenters manipulated whether they told the subjects: "If you think you might choke under pressure, you might want to go for the easier criterion."	--amount of money earned (self-management effectiveness) --performance on the task	--Ego threat hurt performance and earnings for subjects with high self-esteem, but not subjects with low self-esteem.
			Study 2	--Trait self-esteem; ego threat	The same procedure as in Study 1, except that the criterion stayed the same and participants bet on their own performance, making more or less risky bets.	--Amount of money earned (self-management effectiveness) --Performance on the task	--Ego threat hurt the performance and earnings of those with high self-esteem, but not those with low self-esteem.
			Study 3	--Trait self-esteem; --Ego-threat	Changed the ego threat manipulation: subjects received false feedback indicating that they had failed a creativity task.	--Amount of money earned (self-management effectiveness) --Performance on the task	--Ego threat hurt the performance and earnings of those with high self-esteem, but not those with low self-esteem.
4	"Prejudiced" Behavior Without Prejudice? Beliefs About the Malleability of Prejudice Affect Interracial Interactions	Carr, Dweck, & Pauker (2012)	Study 1a-1d	--Theories of Prejudice Scale	Subjects completed a survey that tested whether they saw prejudice as relatively fixed or malleable (the Theories of Prejudice Scale)	-- Interest in interracial interactions -- Interest in activities related to race and diversity	Subjects who saw prejudice as relatively more fixed (less malleable) were less interested in engaging in interracial interactions and in activities related to race and diversity.
			Study 2	--Race of interaction partner; -- Theories of Prejudice Scale; -- IAT	White subjects completed the Theories of Prejudice Scale and an IAT, and also interacted with a Black or White confederate	-- interpersonal distancing from the interaction partner -- Time desired in the interaction	Believing prejudice is relatively fixed instead of malleable was associated with maintaining more social distance from a Black but not a White interaction partner and wanting to spend less time with a Black but not with a White interaction partner. IAT scores did not moderate the results.
			Study 3	--Theories of Prejudice Scale; --False feedback on level of prejudice (high or low)	Subjects completed the Theory of Prejudice Scale & IAT and received feedback randomly that they were either low or high in prejudice compared with their peers.	-- Interest in activities related to race and reducing prejudice	Those with a more fixed belief about prejudice were less interested in undertaking efforts to reduce their prejudice. There was no effect of the prejudice feedback manipulation on interest in reducing prejudice.

			Study 4	--Prejudice presented as fixed vs. malleable	Subjects read and summarized three news articles, including one that manipulated beliefs about prejudice, presenting prejudice as either fixed or malleable.. They then completed a supposedly independent second study that contained survey assessing interest in interracial interactions.	--Interest in interracial interactions --Concerns about revealing prejudice to oneself and others	Participants in the fixed condition were significantly less interested in engaging in interracial interactions and more worried about revealing prejudice to themselves and others. The former effect was significantly mediated by concerns about revealing prejudice.
			Study 5	--Prejudice presented as fixed vs. malleable --Black vs. white experimenter	Same manipulation as experiment 4, but also manipulated the race of the experimenter and measured the effect of interacting with the experimenter on subjects' heart rate.	--Reported anxiety while interacting with a Black or White experimenter --Friendliness of behavior with the experimenter -- Physiological reactivity during the interaction (as measured by heart rate)	Participants in the fixed condition were more anxious, less friendly, and had more heart rate reactivity when interacting with the Black as compared to the White experimenter; this was not the case for those in the malleable condition.
5	Group-based Differences in Perceptions of Racism: What Counts, to Whom, and Why?	Carter & Murphy (2015)	Review				Whites and Blacks may have different perceptions of racism because they are motivated to attend to different information: whereas Blacks are vigilant for the ambiguous cues that have come to characterize subtle racism, Whites are less vigilant for these subtler behaviors.
6	Standing Up for a Change: Reducing Bias Through Interpersonal Confrontation	Czopp, Monteith, & Mark (2006)	Study 1	--High threat vs. low threat confrontation about having been racist	Subjects believed they were part of a dyad, working together in separate rooms via networked computers. They saw photographs on the computer that were paired with descriptive sentences intended to allow inferences, some of would yield negative stereotypes of Black people. Subjects then received either a low threat or a high threat confrontation from the "partner" accusing them of being racist in their responses.	--Immediate response to confrontation --Partner evaluation --Postconfrontation stereotypic responses on the same task	-- Participants provided more accepting immediate reactions to a low-threat confrontation than a high-threat confrontation. Participants in the high-threat condition experienced more anger and irritation toward the confronter and felt slightly more uncomfortable. -- Participants in the low-threat confrontation condition tended to evaluate their partner more favorably --The number of stereotypic responses provided significantly decreased after confrontation. Threat condition did not influence the effect of the confrontation on stereotypic responding.

			Study 2	--Confrontation vs no confrontation about having been racist --Black vs. White confronter	Similar procedure, except that subjects interacted with either White or Black confederate (who told subjects their race), and subjects received either a moderate confrontation or no confrontation	--Response to confrontation --Postconfrontation stereotypic responses on the same task	--Confronted participants experienced significantly more negative affect toward themselves and discomfort, particularly if confronted by a Black confronter. -- Confronted participants were much more likely to change their responding on the task than nonconfronted participants. Black and White confronters were equally effective in decreasing subsequent stereotypic responding. -- Increased negative affect toward the self was correlated with decreased stereotypic responding.
			Study 3	--confrontation: none vs. racial vs. non-racial	Similar to studies 1 & 2. Subjects interacted with a White confederate (whose race was specified) and received: racial, non-racial ("your answers were goofy"), or no confrontation.	-- Response to confrontation -- Partner evaluation -- Postconfrontation stereotypic-responses on the same task -- Racial joke ratings -- Postconfrontation prejudiced attitudes	--Participants confronted with having been racist felt more negative affect toward the self, evaluated their partner less favorably, were more likely to change their responses on the task, evaluated the racist joke as less funny (not significantly though), and reported less prejudiced attitudes. The non-racial confrontation and no confrontation conditions did not differ. - Among those confronted with racial bias, experiencing negative affect toward the self was also correlated with providing fewer stereotypic responses on the task and partially mediated the effect of confrontation on these responses. It was also correlated with evaluating the racial joke as less funny.
7	Confronting Prejudice (Literally): Reactions to Confrontations of Racial and Gender Bias	Czopp & Monteith (2003)	Study 1	--Imagined being racist vs. sexist and then being confronted about it	Subjects imagined that they had provided either racially biased responses or gender-biased responses and were subsequently confronted about those responses by another person. Also completed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Attitudes Toward Blacks Scale.	-- Affective reactions	-- Participants indicated they would feel more negative self-directed affect and greater discomfort when confronted about a racial bias as opposed to a gender bias. -Low-prejudice participants were more likely than their high-prejudice counterparts to imagine experiencing feelings of guilt after confrontation.

			Study 2	--Imagined being racist or sexist, and being confronted about it by a target or nontarget group member	Procedure the same as in Study 1, except that the hypothetical confronter was either a target or a nontarget group member.	-- Affective reactions -- Thought and behavior patterns -- Perceived severity of the biased response -- Perceived legitimacy of the confrontation	-- Participants confronted about a racial bias felt significantly more negative self-directed affect than those confronted about a gender bias; these feelings increased as prejudice decreased; confrontations made by target group members (i.e., Blacks and women) elicited less guilt and self-criticism than the same confrontations by nontarget group members. - Discomfort: participants indicated they would feel much more uncomfortable if confronted about a racial bias than a gender bias, and when confronted by a target group member. - Compunction: participants indicated they would react with more compunction when confronted about a racial bias than a gender bias; low-prejudice participants were more likely to react with compunction than high-prejudice participants; nontargets elicited more compunction than targets. -- High-prejudice participants were more likely than low-prejudice participants to perceive confronters as over-reacting and being unreasonable; all participants perceived target group members as
8	Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components	Devine (1989)	Study 1	--Prejudice level: high vs. low	Subjects listed stereotypes they know of and completed the Modern Racism Scale.	-- Cultural stereotype knowledge	--No difference between the high- and low-prejudice subjects' knowledge of the cultural stereotype
			Study 2	--Prejudice level: high vs. low --Unconscious priming with stereotypes about Blacks	Subjects unconsciously primed with relatively more or fewer words related to stereotypes about Blacks. Subjects then made evaluations (hostility related and unrelated) about a person engaging in ambiguously hostile behaviors.	-- Hostility ratings for an ambiguous event with a person of unspecified race	--Priming with more stereotype-related words increased ratings on the hostility-related scales. The effects of automatic stereotype priming were equally strong for high- and low-prejudice subjects.
			Study 3	--Prejudice level: high vs. low	Subjects were asked to list as many alternate labels as they were aware of for Black Americans. They then listed all of their thoughts in response to the social group Black Americans and to the alternate labels they generated.	-- Proportion of pejorative and nonpejorative labels -- Thoughts in response to Black Americans	-- Proportion of pejorative alternate labels did not differ between high-prejudice and low-prejudice subjects. -- High-prejudice subjects listed more negative than positive thoughts, and low-prejudice subjects listed more positive than negative thoughts. -- High-prejudice subjects most often listed negative traits, and the other three groups did not differ from each significantly.

9	Prejudice With and Without Compunction	Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot (1991)	Study 1	--Level of discrepancy between how prejudiced subjects thought they should vs. would be	Subjects completed questionnaire regarding hypothetical reactions toward Black people, and indicated their personal standards (should) and how they would actually respond (would), as well as how they were feeling about how well their actual responses matched their personal standards.	--Affect	Subjects with large discrepancies between how they should and would react reported greater feelings of discomfort and more negative reactions toward the self than subjects with small discrepancies.
			Study 2	--Level of discrepancy between how prejudiced subjects thought they should vs. would be	Same as study 1, except that the target was homosexuals instead of Black people	--Affect	Replicated the results of study 1.
			Study 3	--Prejudice: high vs. moderate vs. low --Standard type: personal vs. society	Subjects answered the same questions used in study 2 about their personal standards for bias toward homosexuals, and also answered the same questions from the perspective of society's standards. Subjects also answered questions about the degree to which they had internalized each set of standards.	--Internalization of personal and social standards for bias against homosexuals	--Low and moderately prejudiced subjects reported substantially greater internalization of their personal standards as compared with society's standards; this difference was much smaller for high prejudiced subjects. Low prejudiced subjects also felt more obligated than high prejudiced subjects to respond consistently with their personal standards.
10	The Regulation of Explicit and Implicit Race Bias: The Role of Motivations to Respond Without Prejudice	Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance (2002)	Study 1	--Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice	Subjects completed a scale of Internal Motivation to Respond without Prejudice (IMS) and External motivation to respond without prejudice (EMS) before the study. In the study they completed a measure of racial bias in the form of a sequential priming task in which they saw faces of Black, White, and Asian males followed by positive or negative words that subjects had to categorize as good or bad.	--Race bias on the priming task	--High IMS, low EMS participants exhibited less facilitation of negative words following Black primes compared with all other groups
			Study 2	-Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice	Subjects completed IMS & EMS before the study and the IAT task during the study.	--IAT scores (racial bias)	-- High IMS, low EMS participants responded with lower IAT scores than did all other participants
			Study 3	-Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice --Cognitive load manipulation	Procedure similar to Study 2, but with the added manipulation of cognitive load during the IAT	--IAT scores (racial bias)	--High IMS, low EMS participants had lower IAT scores compared with all other participants; cognitive load did not alter this pattern.

11	Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes	Greenwald & Banaji (1995)	Review				This is a review of implicit cognition (attitudes, stereotypes, and self-esteem), and my best guess for what the editor might have meant when he referenced "Greenwald" with respect to articles on "automatic egotism."
12	The Concept of Ego Threat in Social and Personality Psychology: Is Ego Threat a Viable Scientific Construct?	Leary, Terry, Allen, & Tate (2009)	Review				The editor recommended this review of the literature on ego threats, which argues that ego threat manipulations usually confound threats to self-esteem with threats to public image or to control over negative events.
13	Ironic Effects of Antiprejudice Messages: How Motivational Interventions Can Reduce (but Also Increase) Prejudice	Legault, Gutsell, & Inzlicht (2011)	Study 1	--Anti-prejudice message emphasizes personal vs. social vs. no motivation to reduce prejudice	Subjects were randomly assigned to one of 3 conditions: autonomy brochure (the value of nonprejudice was emphasized), controlling brochure (urged to combat prejudice and to comply with social norms of nonprejudice), and neutral brochure (introductory information about the definition of prejudice).	-- Explicit prejudice toward Black people	--The autonomy brochure decreased explicit prejudice but the controlling brochure increased prejudice.
			Study 2	--Primed personal vs. social vs. no motivation to reduce prejudice	Subjects randomly assigned to one of 3 conditions: primed self-determined (autonomous) motivation to reduce prejudice, primed controlled motivation to reduce prejudice, and no priming. Priming was achieved using a questionnaire.	-- Explicit prejudice -- Implicit prejudice	--Priming autonomous motivation decreased explicit and implicit prejudice, but priming controlled motivation increased both.

14	Self-Regulation of Prejudiced Responses: Implications for Progress in Prejudice-Reduction Efforts	Monteith (1993)	Study 1	--Led subjects to believe they had been biased against a gay applicant	Subjects reviewed law school application materials and evaluated the applicant. The applicant was either a homosexual male with weak materials that they were led to reject, or a heterosexual male with strong materials that they were led to accept. Then, subjects were told the application materials were identical and were led to believe based on bogus results from a "past study" that people tend to be influenced by sexual orientation (suggesting to those given the gay applicant that they had rejected him due to prejudice). They then completed an affect questionnaire, read an essay on stereotyping and prejudice, and completed a recall task.	-- Affect-- Time spent reading and recall of an essay about a workshop on how to reduce prejudice --Thoughts about themselves and whether they had been prejudiced (measured after reading the essay)	--Subjects who were led to believe that they had been biased were more uncomfortable and felt more negatively about themselves, spent more time reading the essay on reducing prejudice, and thought more about themselves and about how they might have been prejudiced, but only if they were low in prejudice. Negative self-directed affect mediated the effect of confrontation on reading time for low-prejudiced subjects.
			Study 2	--Let subject to believe that they had been subtly biased against homosexuals	Subjects were led to believe based on a bogus test of "subtle bias" that they were more prejudiced against homosexuals on this subtle test than their explicit attitude test had indicated. Subjects then rated jokes including ones about gay men.	-- Ratings of jokes about gay men	--Subjects told that they were expressing subtle bias against homosexuals rated the jokes about gay men less favorably, but only if they were low in prejudice.
15	Self-Directed Versus Other-Directed Affect as a Consequence of Prejudice-Related Discrepancies	Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink (1993)	Study 1	--Scale about personal and social standards around prejudice	Subjects completed a scale measuring their own personal standards for being prejudiced and their perceptions of society's standards.	--Comparing perceptions of personal and social standards around prejudice.	--High prejudiced subjects' personal standards permitted significantly less prejudice than their perceptions of society's standards.
			Study 2	--Measures of prejudice and feelings around failing to live up to one's standards for avoiding prejudice.	Subjects completed the measure from study 1, and a measure of feeling, thought, or behavioral discrepancies between their standards and actual experience of being prejudice.	--Negative feelings toward self and others	--Low prejudiced subjects with larger discrepancies between their ideals and behaviors around prejudice reported greater negative feelings toward themselves than those with smaller discrepancies; this difference was much smaller for high prejudiced subjects, but high prejudiced subjects with large discrepancies experienced greater negative feelings toward others.

16	Putting the Brakes on Prejudice: On the Development and Operation of Cues for Control	Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp (2002)	Studies 1 & 2	--False feedback about racist physiological responses	Subjects were given false feedback that they had had negative physiological arousal in response to pictures of Blacks. (Control subjects were given false feedback about negative reactions to nonracial stimuli).	--Pausing after getting the feedback (presumably to process it) --Affect --Reflection (through thought-listing)	--Subjects given feedback that they had responded negatively to pictures of blacks paused for longer, felt worse, and listed more thoughts related to concerns about controlling their arousal to the pictures than those given nonracial feedback.
			Experiment 3	--Whether photographs of Black people were paired with stereotypes	Subjects saw photographs of Black people that were either paired with stereotypes or not. They were led to generate the stereotypes, and then had to press the space bar to move on. After this they completed a task that measured their degree of association between Black people and stereotypes (i.e. they were presented pictures of Black or White people, ostensibly for another task, and then given descriptions related to stereotypes about Black people and asked to give their first association).	--Whether subjects listed stereotypical associations after viewing photographs of Black people, and reaction time after giving the stereotypical responses at the beginning of the experiment	--Those led to give stereotypical responses about pictures of Black people completed this task more slowly, which the authors took as evidence of behavioral inhibition. This only applied to subjects low in prejudice. There was not a significant effect on the stereotypical responses that they generated.
			Experiment 4	--Affect after a racial IAT (as a pr	Subjects completed a racial IAT	--Liking ratings for historically black names used in the IAT	--Participants who were more biased on the IAT felt more negatively toward themselves, and this negative affect predicted pausing more after the Black names and indicating more liking of the Black names.
17	Reflectivity and Learning From Aversive Events: Toward a Psychological Mechanism for the Syndromes of Disinhibition	Patterson & Newman (1993)	Review				Review cited by reviewer 3 in connection with the claim: "Often, people are initially unaware of their implicitly-held biases; the behavior must first be interrupted (perhaps through confrontation or other means) before 'retrospective reflection' can occur." Posits a psychological mechanism that highlights relations among disinhibition, reflection, and failures to learn from aversive feedback. The hypothesized mechanism is presented as 4 generic stages: the dominant response set, the reaction to an aversive event, the subsequent behavioral adaptation, and the immediate and long-term consequences of reflection, or the lack thereof.

18	Desirable Responding Triggered by Affect: Automatic Egotism?	Paulhus & Levitt (1987)	Study 1	--Whether potentially self-relevant traits were paired with affect-laden words	Subjects responded “me” or “not me” to positive and neutral trait adjectives. Affect was manipulated by whether these traits were paired with affect-laden (e.g. blood) or innocuous (e.g. lake) distractors.	--Endorsement of the positive and neutral traits, and RT	--Affect-laden distractors increased and sped up endorsements of positive traits
			Study 2	--Same as Study 1, but added negative traits	Procedure was the same as study 1, but added negative traits.	--Endorsement of the positive and neutral traits, and RT	--Reaction times to neutral traits slowed down with the affective distractor, whereas reaction times to positive and negative traits sped up slightly. --With the affective distractors, subjects endorsed more positive traits, fewer negative traits, and about the same number of neutral traits.
19	Perceiving Outgroup Members as Unresponsive: Implications for Approach-Related Emotions, Intentions, and Behavior	Butz & Plant (2006)	Study 1	--Whether they thought their future interracial interaction partner expected the interaction to be positive. Also race of participant (Black vs. White)	Subjects were told they would have a same-sex interracial interaction (Black if the participant was White and visa versa). Some were told that their partner was open to the interaction and expected it to be positive, some that their partner was not open to it and expected it to be negative, and some received no feedback from their partner.	-- Expectations and feelings about the upcoming interaction -- Hostile evaluations of interaction partner's photograph -- Anger -- Other-focused blame -- Tendency to approach racial issues -- Desire to avoid the interaction	--Learning that their partner expected the interaction to go poorly led participants to expect the interaction to go more poorly, rate their partner's photograph as more hostile (though only for White subjects—Black subjects showed the reverse pattern on this measure), feel more anger about the interaction, indicate that they would be more likely to blame the other person if the interaction went badly, and were more interested in avoiding the interaction. However, they also chose to ask their partner more race-related questions.
			Study 2	--Different manipulation of whether they thought their future interracial interaction partner expected the interaction to be positive.	Similar to study 1, except all subjects were White, and their Black partner indicated on a video either that he or she generally expected interactions with White people to go badly due to prejudice, or had no particular expectations.	-- Expectations and feelings about the upcoming interaction-- Whether they assigned their partner more difficult letters for an upcoming word-building task --Whether they expected their partner to be angry at them for the letters they assigned	--Participants whose partner anticipated negative interactions with White people expected the interaction to go more poorly, assigned their partner more difficult letters, and assumed that their partner would be angrier at them for the letters they assigned.

20	Why Do Interracial Interactions Impair Executive Function? A Resource Depletion Account	Richeson & Trawalter (2005)	Study 1	--Confederate race: Black vs. White --Feedback: prejudice concerns vs. performance concerns	Completed IAT and received feedback: raising concerns about prejudice ("Several studies have used this task to study racial bias. These studies show that most people are more prejudiced than they think they are") or performance ("Several studies have used this task to study category associations. These studies show that most people perform worse than they think they did"). Subjects met either a White or Black new experimenter for an "unrelated" task (providing their opinions on several topics, one of which was race-related), and were videotaped. They then went back to the first experimenter to complete Stroop task.	--Stroop interference	--Participants who engaged in interracial interactions revealed greater Stroop impairment than participants who engaged in same-race interactions; participants in the prejudice feedback condition revealed greater Stroop impairment than participants in the performance feedback condition. Participants in the prejudice feedback condition for an interracial dyad revealed significantly greater Stroop interference than participants in the performance feedback condition for an interracial dyad.
			Study 2	--Confederate race: Black vs. White; --Script vs. no-script to modulate self-regulatory demands	Subjects engaged with a White or Black confederate about racial profiling. Some were given a script to read from to reduce self-regulatory demands, but others were not. An additional control condition asked subjects to just write down their thoughts on racial profiling instead of interacting with a confederate. All completed the Stroop task.	--Stroop interference	-- Subjects in the no-script, control condition revealed greater Stroop interference after interracial interaction, compared with same-race, dyads; participants in the script condition, however, revealed no differences in Stroop interference as a function of the race of the confederate.

			Study 3	--Confederate race: Black vs. White; --Anxiety attribution condition: misattribution vs. control	--Procedure similar to Study 1. Before the interaction, subjects in the misattribution condition were told "Several previous participants have found that this room makes them anxious because of the one-way mirror and the confined feel of the room." Those in the control condition were given no additional information regarding previous participants' comfort or experiences.	-- Stroop interference	--Whereas participants in the control condition performed worse on the Stroop task if they had engaged in an interracial, rather than a same-race, dyadic interaction, participants in the misattribution condition performed no differently on the Stroop task after interracial and same-race dyads.
21	On the Categorization of Admired and Disliked Exemplars of Admired and Disliked Racial Groups	Richeson & Trawalter (2005)	Study 1	--Exemplar type: admired vs. disliked; --Exemplar race: White vs. Black	White subjects indicated the race of famous liked and disliked people who were either Black or White.	--Response rate when indicating race	Subjects were faster to indicate the race of liked Whites than disliked Whites, but faster to indicate the race of disliked Black than liked Blacks.
			Study 2	--Exemplar type: admired vs. disliked; --Exemplar race: White vs. Black	Same as study 1, except that the photographs were upside-down.	-- Categorization accuracy -- Response rate	--Subjects miscategorized liked Blacks more often than disliked Blacks but they miscategorized liked Whites less often than disliked Whites. --Subjects took longer to indicate the race of liked Blacks than disliked Blacks, but participants did not categorize liked Whites faster than disliked Whites.
			Study 3	--Same as Study 1, adding a measure of racial in-group attitudes	Same procedure as Study 1, but subjects were pretested about their attitudes toward their racial group (by completing the race- specific Collective Self-Esteem Scale).	--Response rate	--Replicated the results of study 1. These results were stronger for those who had more favorable attitudes toward their racial in-group.
			Study 4	--Participant race: White vs. Black; --Exemplar valence: positive vs. negative; --Exemplar race: White vs. Black	Subjects viewed yearbook photos of White and Black people, half of whom were presented as having become ministers who helped the poor, half as ministers who embezzled money (crossed by race). They then indicated the race of the faces, as in the other studies.	--Response rate	--Replicated the results of the past studies with the new exemplars: White participants categorized positive White exemplars faster than negative White exemplars, but they categorized negative Black exemplars more quickly than positive Black exemplars. There was no evidence of differential categorization by the Black participants.