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Race attitudes in cultural context
Explicit prejudice

- Initial increase in bias followed by a gradual decline (Dunham, Baron, & Banaji, 2008)
- Social norms
Implicit prejudice

- **Slow-learning model** (Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995)

- **Developmental stability** (Baron & Banaji, 2006; Banaji, Baron, Dunham, & Olson, 2008)

(Dunham, Baron, & Banaji, 2008)
Race attitudes in cultural context: The view from two Brazilian States

**Goal**

The present research adopts a social cognitive developmental approach to understanding the development of implicit and explicit racial attitudes in White, *Pardo*, and Black Brazilian children from two different contexts, Bahia and Rio Grande do Sul.
Method

Participants

- 542 children

  - RS: 399 (211 girls and 188 boys)
    - 6 to 14 years old, $M = 9.19$ years, $SD = 2.06$

  - BA: 143 (69 girls and 74 boys)
    - 6 to 14 years old, $M = 8.53$ years, $SD = 1.79$
Measures

Explicit measures
- Group identification
- Racial attitude
- Association between race and wealth
- Preference for social status
- Preference for race

Implicit measures
- Evaluative Priming
- IAT
Evaluative Priming (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995)

- Evaluation of targets
  - 25 positive and 25 negative images - *International Affective Picture System* - IAPS (Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 2008)

- Prime
  - Stimulus that can influence subsequent evaluations
    - 30 portraits of children (BIC-Multicor)
    - White, *Pardo* and Black
  - 5 positive and 5 negative standards (IAPS)
    - Reference effects
Evaluative Priming

(De Houwer, Teige-Mocigemba, Spruyt, & Moors, 2009; Hermans, De Houwer, & Eelen, 1996; Klauer, Rossnagel, & Musch, 1997; Wentura, 1999)

Prime (+)

Synergistic effects (facilitation) 😊
- Target (+)
  - Positive
    - +
    - -
  - Target (-)
    - Negative
      - +
      - -

Antagonistic effects (interference)

EP = M(RT)_{INC} - M(RT)_{CON}
Measures

- Implicit Association Test – IAT (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998)
  - Relative strength of implicit associations between pairs of concepts
- Categorization
  - Target stimuli
    - 20 portraits of children
      - 10 Whites and 10 Blacks
  - Attribute stimuli
    - 10 positive and 10 negative images - IAPS (Lang, Bradley & Cuthbert, 2008)
IAT

1st Block Practice

2nd Block Practice

3rd Block Compatible

4th Block Opposite key assignment

5th Block Incompatible
Results
Evaluative Priming

- Standard effect was greater than zero
  - $M = 29\text{ ms} \ (SD = 46\text{ ms}), \ t(475) = 13.76, \ p < .001, \ d = .63$
- No effect of age, race or state
- Valid procedure

- Priming effects
  - White vs. Black
    - $M = 5\text{ ms}, \ SD = 35\text{ ms}, \ t(475) = 3.43, \ p < .01, \ d = .14$
  - *Pardo* vs. Black
    - $M = 4\text{ ms}, \ SD = 35\text{ ms}, \ t(475) = 2.26, \ p < .05, \ d = .11$
Evaluative Priming

- No effect of age or race
- Effect of state on the *Pardo vs. Black* contrast
  - Significant effect only in Bahia
Group identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with White as compared to Black</th>
<th>Identification with White as compared to Pardo</th>
<th>Identification with Pardo as compared to Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- White
- Pardo
- Black
Implicit vs. Explicit measures

Relation between IAT scores and explicit preference for Whites
Discussion

- Implicit vs. explicit measures
- Public policies
- Contextual influences on the development of racial attitudes
- In Brazil, there is a clear association between poverty and race
- Social Experimental Psychology
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