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Responses to Interracial Interactions Over Time

E. Ashby Plant  
Florida State University

The current work tested and expanded on Plant and Devine’s (2003) model of the antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety by examining people’s experiences with interracial interactions at two time points. Study 1 explored non-Black people’s responses to interactions with Black people and Study 2 explored Black people’s responses to interactions with White people. Non-Black participants’ expectancies about coming across as biased in interracial interactions and Black participants’ expectancies about White people’s bias predicted their interracial anxiety and whether they had positive interactions with outgroup members during the 2 weeks between assessments. Across both studies, interracial anxiety predicted the desire to avoid interactions with outgroup members. In addition, participants who were personally motivated to respond without prejudice reported more positive expectancies. The findings are discussed in terms of the implications for understanding the course and quality of interracial interactions.
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Interactions between people of different racial groups hold the potential for tension and miscommunication, which may result in awkward, strained interactions as well as the avoidance of interactions with outgroup members. In examining the factors that shape the quality of interracial interactions, anxiety has been theorized to be an important factor in determining people’s responses in such interactions (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Interracial anxiety involves feelings of tension and distress that result when interacting with a person from a different racial group. The current work explores the factors that contribute to anxiety in interracial interactions and the consequences of this anxiety for interracial interactions by testing and expanding on a model of interracial anxiety recently proposed by Plant and Devine (2003). Plant and Devine’s model integrated previous theorizing from both the intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 1985) and social anxiety literatures (Schlenker & Leary, 1982).

In their classic work on intergroup anxiety, Stephan and Stephan (1985) argued that intergroup anxiety occurs when people anticipate that interactions with outgroup members will result in negative consequences. People’s expectations regarding these negative consequences derive in part from their previous experience with outgroup members. Stephan and Stephan (1985) further maintained that intergroup anxiety can result in the avoidance of intergroup interactions. However, in considering anxiety in interracial interactions, it also may be helpful to consider the broader literature on social anxiety. Schlenker and Leary (1982) proposed a model of social anxiety, which argued that social anxiety occurs when people are motivated to make a particular impression but doubt that they will succeed (i.e., possess negative outcome expectancies; also see Leary, 1983). Schlenker and Leary maintained that negative outcome expectancies result if people either believe that they do not possess the skills necessary to make a desired impression or expect that their efforts will not be received well by others. These negative outcome expectancies in turn result in anxiety in interpersonal interactions.

Plant and Devine (2003) proposed a model of the antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety that integrated this previous theorizing. Specifically, they argued that limited positive experiences with outgroup members results in intergroup anxiety because it influences people’s expectations about the course of interracial interactions. That is, because many people (particularly Whites) have less experience with people from...
other racial groups than their own racial group, they are unlikely to have developed clear guides for self-presentation in interracial interactions, which is likely to result in negative outcome expectancies. These negative outcome expectancies were argued to result in anxiety in interracial interactions (also see Britt, Boniecki, Vescio, Biernat, & Brown, 1996; Devine, Evett, & Vasquez-Suson, 1996), which in turn was posited to result in a desire to avoid interacting with outgroup members.

Plant and Devine (2003) presented evidence from two studies supporting this model. In their first study, they examined White people’s self-reported responses to interactions with Black people. They measured each of the factors outlined in the model and found that the relationships between the variables were consistent with the model. For example, the negativity of participants’ outcome expectancies was positively associated with their interracial anxiety and these outcome expectancies mediated the effect of previous contact on anxiety. In addition, participants’ level of interracial anxiety was associated with their desire to avoid interactions with Black people. In their second study, Plant and Devine found that White people who reported high levels of anxiety about an upcoming interaction with a Black person were far less likely to return for the interaction the following week than those who were less anxious. In contrast, anxiety was unrelated to returning for an interaction with a White person. In addition, among those anticipating an interaction with a Black person, their anxiety regarding the upcoming interaction mediated the effect of their outcome expectancies on whether they returned for the interaction.

The current work further tests the tenets of Plant and Devine’s model of interracial anxiety by examining both Black and non-Black people’s experiences with interracial interactions over time. There were three goals for the current work. First, although Plant and Devine’s (2003) findings were highly consistent with their model, the work did not provide strong evidence of the causal relationships outlined in the model. For example, Plant and Devine demonstrated that outcome expectancies were associated with interracial anxiety and that interracial anxiety mediated the influence of expectancies on avoidance. However, because much of their data was collected at the same time, their methodological approaches did not provide direct evidence that negative outcome expectancies cause heightened interracial anxiety. By examining responses longitudinally, the current work sought to clarify the causal relationships outlined in the model.

Second, much of the work on interracial interactions has focused on majority group members’ responses to interactions with minority group members. However, in considering interracial interactions it is critical to understand the experiences, feelings, and motivations that both majority and minority group members bring to such interactions (see Devine et al., 1996; Shelton, 2000). Therefore, the second goal of the current work was to examine Black people’s experiences in interactions with White people to explore whether the model generalizes to Black people’s experiences in interracial interactions.

Individual Differences and Interracial Anxiety

The third goal of the current work is to expand the previous model by exploring whether there are individual differences that may illuminate who is more or less likely to experience interracial anxiety. Schlenker and Leary (1982) argued that motivation to create a positive impression heightens anxiety in social settings. In considering motivation in interracial interactions, it may be particularly important to take into account the degree to which one is motivated to respond without prejudice. Based on Schlenker and Leary’s theorizing, a strong motivation to respond without prejudice should heighten anxiety in interracial interactions (also see Shelton, 2003).

However, recent work indicates that it is important not only to consider whether a person is motivated to respond without prejudice but also the reasons underlying this motivation. Plant and Devine (1998) demonstrated that non-Black people can be motivated to respond without prejudice toward Black people for internal (personal) and external (normative) reasons. Internal motivation reflects the desire to respond without prejudice toward Black people because doing so is an integral part of the self-concept. External motivation reflects the desire to respond without prejudice toward Black people for fear of punishment from others if one were to respond with prejudice. Plant and Devine developed separate scales of internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people (the IMS and EMS, respectively).

Plant and Devine (1998) established that the IMS and EMS are reliable and that the scales possess good convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity. For example, they demonstrated that the IMS is strongly related to traditional measures of prejudice with higher levels of IMS being associated with less prejudiced attitudes. The EMS, in contrast, is only modestly correlated with traditional prejudice measures such that higher levels of EMS are associated with more prejudiced attitudes. In addition, the EMS is only modestly associated with measures of social evaluation, suggesting that the EMS taps into a specific concern with how prejudiced responses will be evaluated rather than a general social evaluation concern. Supporting the discriminant validity of the scales,
neither the IMS nor the EMS is related to measures of social desirability.

There is mounting evidence that the source of people’s motivation to respond without prejudice has implications for a broad range of prejudice-relevant behaviors (e.g., Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002; Plant & Devine, 1998, 2001, 2004). Particularly relevant to the current concerns, the source of non-Black people’s motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people has implications for how they approach and respond to interactions with Black people (Plant & Devine, 1998, 2000, 2004). Consider that external motivation reflects a concern with the threat of social disapproval that overtly prejudiced responses would elicit. However, even though externally motivated non-Black people are concerned with appearing biased to others, they report that they are actually more likely to respond with bias toward Black people than are low EMS people (Plant & Devine, 1998, 2000). Furthermore, when they anticipate responding with bias toward Black people, Plant and Devine (1998) found that high EMS people experience heightened anxious, threatened affect. These findings suggest that high EMS non-Black people are likely to have negative outcome expectancies regarding interactions with Black people (i.e., expect to respond with bias). Furthermore, their underlying concern with social disapproval resulting from expressions of prejudice in interracial interactions is likely to result in heightened anxiety regarding such interactions. In addition, recent work has demonstrated that externally motivated people tend to focus on avoidance-related goals and strategies in interracial interactions (Plant & Devine, 2004). As a result, externally motivated people may be particularly likely to want to avoid interracial interactions as a strategy to escape the threat of social disapproval if they were to respond with bias during the interaction.

In contrast, internal motivation reflects the desire to respond in accordance with personally important nonprejudiced standards. Highly internally motivated non-Black people tend to anticipate responding with less bias when interacting with Black people than low IMS people (Plant & Devine, 2000). When internally motivated people fail to meet these self-imposed nonprejudiced standards, they experience guilt and self-criticism rather than anxiety (Plant & Devine, 1998). The guilt resulting from violations of personal nonprejudiced standards has been found to activate a self-regulatory cycle that facilitates bringing responses closer to egalitarian, nonprejudiced standards (i.e., a desired end-state) (Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002). As a result, internal motivation to respond without prejudice is associated with a focus on approaching egalitarianism in interracial interactivations, which tends to result in approach-related goals and strategies (e.g., smiling, being friendly) (Plant & Devine, 2004). Thus, high IMS may result in relatively positive outcome expectancies and low levels of interracial anxiety. Furthermore, due to their focus on approaching egalitarianism, it seems unlikely that high IMS non-Black people would choose to avoid interactions with Black people. In fact, in previous work, when high IMS people were made aware of responding with a subtle bias toward Black people, they actively pursued prejudice-reduction strategies (Plant & Devine, 2004). This finding suggests that even if high IMS people are anxious in interracial interactions, they should actively pursue a positive interaction. To do otherwise would violate their personally important nonprejudiced values and would result in guilt and self-criticism. Therefore, interracial anxiety should only result in avoidance among low IMS people.

It is important to note that the extant work examining internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice has focused on non-Black people’s motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people. However, the second study presented here will examine Black participants’ internal and external motivations to respond without bias toward White people and the implications of these motivations for interactions with White people. Although some Black people are likely to be internally motivated to respond without bias toward White people because they personally believe such bias is wrong, it is less apparent whether a distinct external source of motivation will emerge. For example, it may be that the normative standard discouraging the expression of bias from Black people directed at White people is less salient than the standard discouraging prejudice from non-Black people toward Black people. The history of overt prejudice and discrimination against Black people in the United States may heighten sensitivity regarding this form of prejudice and at the same time may make bias from Black people directed at White people relatively more understandable and, hence, more acceptable. As a result, external motivation to respond without bias toward White people may not be as meaningful a motivational force for Black people. Alternatively, because White people tend to be in positions of power in our society, it may be that Black people are particularly sensitive to potential negative repercussions of responding with bias toward White people. If this is the case, external motivation to respond without bias toward White people should be a salient and distinct construct from internal motivation to respond without bias toward White people. To the extent that Black people experience distinct internal and external motivations to respond without bias toward White people, it seems likely that these sources of motivation should have simi-
lar implications for their responses to interactions with White people as the concomitant motivations do for non-Black people’s motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people. The current work will allow an examination of these issues.

The Proposed Model of Interracial Interactions

Considering both previous work on interracial anxiety and the recent developments assessing the source of people’s motivation to respond without prejudice may help to inform the analysis of interracial interactions. Plant and Devine (2003) demonstrated that positive previous experiences were associated with more positive outcome expectancies, which in turn, was associated with people’s anxiety regarding interracial interactions (see Figure 1). However, by considering the source of people’s motivation to respond without prejudice, it may be possible to identify who is more or less likely to have negative outcome expectancies and respond with anxiety in interracial interactions. That is, as argued previously, because high EMS people tend to expect to respond with bias in interracial interactions, they are likely to have more negative outcome expectancies than low EMS people. In contrast, high IMS people tend to expect to respond with less bias and, thus, should have more positive outcome expectancies than low IMS people.1

In addition, when faced with an interracial interaction, high EMS people may be particularly likely to experience anxiety and express interest in avoiding the interaction because of their concern with the potential of social disapproval resulting from such interactions. In contrast, because high IMS people tend to be focused on approaching egalitarianism, they would seem less likely to experience interracial anxiety or the desire to avoid interracial interactions than those less internally motivated. The reviewed work also indicates that high levels of interracial anxiety are likely to result in the desire to avoid interracial interactions. However, it is argued that interracial anxiety is only likely to result in avoidance of outgroup members among low IMS people. High IMS people are unlikely to respond with avoidance regardless of their level of interracial anxiety. The current work examines these proposed relationships by exploring non-Black participants’ responses to interactions with Black people over the course of several weeks (Study 1). In addition, the responses of Black people to interactions with White people were examined over time (Study 2).

STUDY 1

The first study examined non-Black participants’ responses to interactions with Black people over time. Participants completed measures of the factors outlined in the model displayed in Figure 1 at two different times several weeks apart. This approach allowed the examination of which factors at Time 1 (T1) predicted participants’ responses at Time 2 (T2) across each of the variables outlined in the model. Specifically, of interest was which of the T1 variables predicted a given factor at T2 above and beyond the factor itself. For example, to the extent that negative outcome expectancies influence interracial anxiety, then people with negative T1 outcome expectancies should be more anxious at T2 even after controlling for their T1 anxiety. By using this approach, each of the relationships outlined in the model as well as those relationships not predicted by the model were examined in the current study. In addition, by examining the implications of all of the factors simultaneously, it is possible to determine which of the T1 factors exert an independent effect on T2 responses.

Based on the proposed model, participants’ T1 positive previous contact should predict their T2 outcome expectancies. In addition, T1 IMS and EMS should predict participants’ T2 outcome expectancies, interracial anxiety, and desire to avoid interracial interactions. Specifically, high levels of T1 IMS should predict more positive outcome expectancies, less interracial anxiety, and lower avoidance at T2 than low levels of IMS. In contrast, high T1 levels of EMS should result in more negative outcome expectancies, heightened interracial anxiety, and a greater desire to avoid interracial interactions at T2 than low levels of EMS. Outcome expectancies should influence the level of interracial anxiety such that T1 outcome expectancies should predict T2 anxiety but T1 anxiety should not predict T2 expectancies. Similarly, T1 anxiety should predict T2 avoidance but T1 avoidance should not predict T2 anxiety. Furthermore, if interracial anxiety only leads to avoidance among people low in internal motivation to respond without prejudice, then

Figure 1 The proposed model of interracial interactions.
NOTE: IMS = internal motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people, EMS = external motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people.
T1 IMS and anxiety should have an interactive effect on T2 avoidance.

The current study also examined the amount of positive and negative contact with Black people over the 2 weeks between assessments. This allowed the examination of the factors from T1 that led to more positive and more negative interactions with Black people. In addition, examining the source of participants’ motivation to respond without prejudice across the two time points allowed the investigation of whether any of the T1 factors resulted in changes in participants’ source of motivation to respond without prejudice. It was possible, for example, that having negative experiences with Black people would increase participants’ external motivation to respond without prejudice.

Method

Participants and procedure. Respondents were 143 non-Black introductory psychology students (66% women) who participated in exchange for course credit. Seventy-one percent of participants were White, 4% were Asian, 19% were Hispanic, 4% were biracial, and 2% indicated their ethnicity was “other.” Participants came into the lab twice approximately 2 weeks apart and completed a questionnaire packet in group sessions of 8 to 15. To maintain confidentiality, after completing the packet, participants placed it in a drop box.

Materials. The questionnaire packet included the Social Interaction Questionnaire (Plant & Devine, 2003), which assessed participants’ outcome expectancies regarding interactions with Black people, their anxiety resulting from such interactions, and their desire to avoid interactions with Black people. Participants rated the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Items assessing each of the constructs were averaged to create indices. Outcome expectancy items included, “When interacting with a Black person, I would be unsure how to act in order to show him or her that I am not prejudiced” and “When interacting with a Black person, he or she would see me as prejudiced no matter what I did.” The 11 outcome expectancy items were combined such that higher scores indicated more positive outcome expectancies (T1 $\alpha = .83$, T2 $\alpha = .87$). The five interracial anxiety items included “I get anxious when interacting with a Black person” and were combined so that higher scores indicated greater anxiety (T1 $\alpha = .84$, T2 $\alpha = .86$). Finally, the avoidance scale included four items such as, “If I had a choice, I would rather not interact with a Black person.” These items were combined with higher scores indicating a stronger desire to avoid interactions with Black people (T1 $\alpha = .84$, T2 $\alpha = .87$).

Participants next completed the internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice scales (Plant & Devine, 1998). The IMS and EMS each consist of five items rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree) scale. The IMS includes items such as, “Being nonprejudiced is important to my self-concept” (T1 $\alpha = .82$, T2 $\alpha = .86$). The EMS includes items such as, “I try to hide any negative thoughts about Black people in order to avoid negative reactions from others” (T1 $\alpha = .85$, T2 $\alpha = .82$) (see Plant & Devine, 1998, for the full set of IMS and EMS items).

Finally, at T1, participants completed a measure of the amount of recent negative contact with Black people, which assessed the positivity of their experiences with Black people throughout the course of their life, including a typical current week. These eight items were combined so that higher scores indicated more positive contact ($\alpha = .77$). In addition, at T2, participants completed a measure assessing their contact over the previous 2 weeks. Included on this measure were four items assessing the positivity of their recent contact (e.g., “My interactions with Black people over the last couple weeks have been very pleasant,” $\alpha = .85$) and two items assessing the amount of recent negative contact with Black people (e.g., “Over the past couple weeks, I have had many negative interactions with Black people,” $\alpha = .77$).

Results

Correlational analyses. The means and standard deviations for participants’ responses across the factors at both T1 and T2 can be found in Table 1. As a first step in exploring participants’ responses, the zero-order correlations between the different variables across T1 and T2 were examined. In general, the relationships between the different variables were consistent with predictions (see Table 2). Participants who reported more positive previous contact with Black people at T1 reported more positive outcome expectancies, lower levels of interracial anxiety, and less of a desire to avoid interactions with Black people at T2. More positive previous contact also was related to higher levels of IMS and lower levels of EMS at T2. In addition, low levels of IMS and high levels of EMS were associated with more negative outcome expectancies and more anxiety regarding interactions with Black people. Also as anticipated, negative outcome expectancies regarding interracial interactions were strongly related to interracial anxiety and both of these variables were strongly associated with the desire to avoid interactions with Black people. The desire to avoid interactions with Black people also was associated with low levels of IMS.

It is also worth noting that positive contact with Black people over the 2 weeks between the assessments was associated with high levels of IMS, negative outcome expectancies, interracial anxiety, and the desire to avoid interactions with Black people. Negative contact over
the intervening 2 weeks was related to higher levels of negative outcome expectancies, anxiety, and avoidance.

**Predicting T2 responses.** Participants’ T2 responses to each of the indices were examined using hierarchical linear regression controlling for the T1 version of the index with the responses across all of the other T1 indices as predictors. In addition, included in the analyses were the measures of positive recent contact and negative recent contact with Black people over the previous 2 weeks. Because internal motivation to respond without prejudice was predicted to moderate the effect of interracial anxiety on avoidance, an IMS × Anxiety interaction was included in the second step of the analyses. Furthermore, because it was possible that EMS also would interact with anxiety and that IMS and EMS would interact (see Note 1), the EMS × Anxiety and IMS × EMS interactions were included in the analyses. Thus, for example, for T2 interracial anxiety, a regression was conducted with T1 interracial anxiety entered as a control variable and T1 previous contact, IMS, EMS, outcome expectancies, avoidance, recent positive contact, and recent negative contact entered as predictors in the first step. The second step included the two-way interactions involving anxiety, IMS, and EMS. For all analyses, the main effects were examined in the first step and the interactions in the second step. Across the analyses, those effects not explicitly mentioned were not significant. In addition, as would be expected, for each of the analyses, the T1 version of the factor was strongly predictive of the T2 version in the positive direction (e.g., high T1 anxiety predicted high T2 anxiety), all $F$s > 10.40, $p$s < .003. To simplify the presentation of the analyses, the effect of the control variable is not presented for each analysis separately. All other significant effects predicting T2 variables from the T1 factors can be found in Table 3.

None of the T1 factors were predicted to influence T2 IMS and EMS above and beyond T1 IMS and EMS, respectively. However, the analysis of T2 IMS revealed an unexpected IMS × Anxiety interaction. Examination of the predicted values indicated that among high IMS participants, both those with high anxiety ($Y = 8.48$) and low anxiety ($Y = 8.53$) had high levels of T2 IMS. However, among low IMS participants, lower levels of anxiety resulted in higher IMS scores ($Y = 7.07$) than higher levels of anxiety ($Y = 6.26$). Thus, for participants who were low in internal motivation at T1, high anxiety resulted in lower levels of T2 IMS than low anxiety.

For the analysis of outcome expectancies, participants’ IMS, EMS, and previous contact with Black people were all expected to predict T2 outcome expectancies.
However, after controlling for T1 outcome expectancies, only IMS predicted outcome expectancies. Consistent with predictions, high IMS participants reported more positive outcome expectancies than those lower in IMS.

For interracial anxiety, participants’ outcome expectancies, IMS, and EMS were all expected to predict their interracial anxiety. Consistent with this expectation, participants with more negative outcome expectancies were more anxious. Thus, although T1 outcome expectancies predicted T2 anxiety above and beyond T1 anxiety, the reverse was not true. These findings are consistent with the causal relationships outlined in the model and indicate that outcome expectancies influence non-Black people’s interracial anxiety but their anxiety does not influence their outcome expectancies. The analysis of interracial anxiety also revealed an effect of IMS such that higher levels of IMS resulted in less interracial anxiety than lower levels of IMS. In contrast, high EMS participants reported marginally more interracial anxiety than those who were lower in EMS.

Participants’ interracial anxiety, IMS, and EMS were all anticipated to predict their desire to avoid interactions with Black people. It also was expected that IMS would interact with interracial anxiety, predicting avoidance. Consistent with predictions, the analysis of avoidance indicated that high IMS participants reported less of a desire to avoid interracial interactions than those who were lower in IMS. As predicted, participants who reported greater T1 interracial anxiety reported a greater desire to avoid interracial interactions at T2. Finally, the IMS × Anxiety Interaction also predicted avoidance. Examination of the predicted values indicated that among high IMS participants, those with both high anxiety ($Y = 2.77$) and low anxiety ($Y = 2.46$) had relatively low levels of avoidance. However, among low IMS participants, those with higher levels of anxiety reported a stronger desire to avoid interactions with Black people ($Y = 3.51$) than those with lower levels of anxiety ($Y = 2.62$). Thus, as anticipated, anxiety was only related to avoidance among those who were not personally motivated to respond without prejudice.

Examination of participants’ positive contact over the 2 weeks prior to T2 revealed that the positivity of previous contact at T1 was a strong predictor of the amount of positive contact over the intervening weeks. In addition, participants who had more negative outcome expectancies also reported less positive contact than those with more positive outcome expectancies. The amount of negative contact with Black people during the 2 weeks between assessments was predicted by participants’ EMS such that high EMS participants reported less negative contact over the 2 weeks than did low EMS participants. The analysis also revealed that negative outcome expectancies resulted in marginally more negative contact than positive expectancies.

**Discussion**

The findings from the current study were generally consistent with predictions with some exceptions. High levels of external motivation were associated with marginally higher levels of T2 interracial anxiety, even after controlling for T1 interracial anxiety. However, when all of the other factors were included in the regression equations, EMS did not predict outcome expectancies or avoidance. In contrast, as predicted, participants who were highly internally motivated to respond without prejudice at T1 tended to develop more positive outcome expectancies, less interracial anxiety, and less of a desire to avoid interactions with Black people at T2 than people who were less internally motivated. In addition, consistent with expectations, although low IMS participants who were anxious at T1 had a greater desire to avoid interactions with Black people at T2 than less anxious low IMS participants, T1 anxiety did not result in
greater avoidance among high IMS participants. Together, these findings are consistent with previous work indicating that non-Black, internally motivated people are focused on approaching positive interactions with Black people and actively pursue strategies to develop more positive responses in interracial interactions (Plant & Devine, 2004).

These findings indicate that in considering the implications of people's motivation to respond without prejudice for interracial interactions, it is critical to consider the reasons underlying their motivation. Whereas strong motivation to respond without prejudice to avoid social disapproval was related to heightened anxiety in interracial interactions, consistent with Schlenker and Leary's (1982) theorizing (also see Shelton, 2003), strong motivation to respond without prejudice because it is personally important actually resulted in more positive responses to interracial interactions, including less anxiety.

The findings from the current study also provided support for the causal relationships outlined in Plant and Devine's (2003) model of interracial interactions. Negative outcome expectancies at T1 resulted in high levels of T2 interracial anxiety. However, the reverse was not true; T1 anxiety did not predict T2 outcome expectancies. Thus, non-Black people who believed that they would not make a desired impression in an interaction with a Black person developed heightened anxiety in response to such interactions. In addition, participants who were higher as compared to lower in T1 interracial anxiety reported a greater desire at T2 to avoid interracial interactions even after controlling for T1 avoidance. T1 avoidance, however, did not predict T2 anxiety after controlling for T1 anxiety. Thus, in response to experiencing high levels of anxiety regarding interracial interactions, people may develop a strategy of avoiding such interactions to evade the source of the threat.

Finally, the current work examined participants' contact with Black people during the 2 weeks between assessments and found that several factors predicted the quality of this contact. As might be expected, participants with more positive previous contact tended to have more positive contact with Black people during the intervening 2 weeks. In addition, participants who had more positive outcome expectancies (i.e., expected interactions with Black people to go well) experienced more positive and marginally less negative contact. Participants' external motivation to respond without prejudice also was predictive of their negative contact. Specifically, high EMS participants had fewer negative interactions than did low EMS participants. This finding suggests that high EMS people may succeed in avoiding negative interracial interactions and, thus, avoid the social disapproval that they fear from such interactions.

**STUDY 2**

The second study examined Black participants' responses to interactions with White people over time. This study used the same approach as Study 1 to examine which T1 factors predicted participants' T2 responses. This approach allowed the examination of whether the relationships found in Study 1 for non-Black participants' experiences with interactions with Black people would be replicated for Black participants' experiences with interactions with White people. Participants completed measures that were highly similar to those used in Study 1 but worded to examine responses to interactions with White people. However, in addition to the outcome expectancies measure used in Study 1, an additional expectancies measure was created for the current study. Outcome expectancies as measured in Study 1 assessed people's expectations about their ability to create a positive, unbiased impression in interracial interactions and the tendency of outgroup members to accept their unbiased impression (i.e., view them as nonprejudiced). However, in considering the history of White people's prejudice toward Blacks, there are alternative expectancies that are likely to be important in considering Black people's interactions with White people. Specifically, it also may be valuable to examine Black people's expectancies regarding White people's racial bias and tendency to respond with prejudice toward Black people.

Recent work confirms that in considering Black people's experiences in interactions with White people it is important to consider their experiences with racism and expectations of bias from White people (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Montefith & Spicer, 2000; Shelton, 2003). For example, Branscombe and her colleagues (1999) found that the tendency among Black people to attribute negative behaviors by White people to prejudice was associated with greater hostility directed at White people. Furthermore, work examining other targets of prejudice and stereotyping (e.g., Hispanics, women) has demonstrated that exposure to and expectations of prejudice and stereotyping have negative implications for intergroup interactions (Pinel, 1999, 2002; Tropp, 2003). Therefore, to explore Black people's expectations that White people are prejudiced against them (i.e., bias expectancies), the current study included a measure of bias expectancies.

Responses in Study 2 were expected to be similar across most of the predictors to findings from Study 1, with some important exceptions. Black participants' bias expectancies were expected to be important in determining their anxiety for interracial interactions. Specifically, negative bias expectancies at T1 (i.e., expecting racism from Whites) were expected to result in higher levels of interracial anxiety than positive bias expectan-
cies. It was also possible that, as in Study 1, outcome expectancies would predict participants’ interracial anxiety. However, based on previous work highlighting the importance of perceptions of bias for Black people’s attitudes and interracial interactions (e.g., Montheith & Spicer, 2000; Shelton, 2003), bias expectancies were expected to be more important in determining Black participants’ responses to interracial interactions than outcome expectancies. Furthermore, in considering the source of participants’ bias expectancies, it seemed likely that participants who had more positive contact with White people would have less negative bias expectancies.

Method

Participants and procedure. Respondents were 52 Black introductory psychology students (85% women) who participated in exchange for course credit (M age = 19.74, SD = 4.42). Participants came into the lab twice approximately 2 weeks apart and completed a questionnaire packet in group sessions of 4 to 10. To maintain confidentiality, after completing the packet, participants placed it in a drop box.

Materials. As in Study 1, participants first completed the Social Interaction Questionnaire (Plant & Devine, 2003), which assessed outcome expectancies regarding interactions with White people, anxiety resulting from such interactions, and desire to avoid interactions with White people. The items on this measure were identical to those used in Study 1 but the target group was changed to White people (e.g., “I get anxious when interacting with a White person”). As in Study 1, the items were rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and the items assessing each of the constructs were averaged to create indices. Reliabilities of each of the scales were as follows: outcome expectancies (T1 α = .70, T2 α = .76); Interracial Anxiety (T1 α = .81, T2 α = .79); Avoidance (T1 α = .64, T2 α = .74).

Participants next completed the IMS and EMS modified for bias against White people. The items were reworded to assess motivation to respond without bias toward White people (e.g., “Being unbiased toward White people is important to my self-concept”). Participants made their responses on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree) scale. The reliability of IMS (T1 α = .64, T2 α = .75) and the EMS (T1 α = .66, T2 α = .75) were somewhat lower, particularly at T1 for the modified versions of the scales. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using a varimax rotation that revealed two strong factors. The first factor accounted for 29% of the variance (eigenvalue of 2.88) and consisted of the five items that reflected external motivation to respond without bias toward White people. The second factor accounted for 16% of the variance (eigenvalue of 1.61) and included the five IMS items. These findings indicate that, similar to the previous work examining motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people, there are distinct internal and external motivations to respond without bias toward White people. However, it is worth noting that there was a moderate, positive correlation between the IMS and EMS at both T1 and T2 (e.g., T1 r = .35, T2 r = .38), indicating that people who reported being internally motivated also tended to report being externally motivated to respond without bias toward White people.

Participants at T1 then completed the measure of the positivity of previous contact from Study 1 worded for contact with White people (α = .72). At T2, participants completed the measure assessing their contact over the previous 2 weeks modified to assess contact with White people (positive contact α = .76, negative contact α = .74). To examine participants’ expectations of bias from Whites, participants completed a series of items from Brigham’s (1993) attitudes toward Whites scale. Although some of the items on this scale assess attitudes toward Whites (e.g., “It would bother me if my new roommate is White”), many items assess expectations and responses to White’s prejudice toward Black people (e.g., “Most Whites fear that Blacks will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in”; “Most Whites can’t be trusted to deal honestly with Blacks”). The nine items of this latter type were combined to create a bias expectancies scale (T1 α = .78, T2 α = .82), with higher scores indicating expectations of more bias from White people.

Results

Correlational analyses. The means and standard deviations for participants’ responses across the factors at both T1 and T2 can be found in Table 1. The zero-order correlations between the different variables across the two times were generally consistent with predictions and the findings in Study 1 (see Table 4). Participants who reported more positive previous contact with White people reported more positive bias expectancies and outcome expectancies as well as lower levels of interracial anxiety and less of a desire to avoid interactions with White people at T2. Positive previous contact with White people also was associated with higher IMS scores. In addition, low levels of T1 IMS were associated with more negative bias expectancies and a greater desire to avoid interactions with White people at T2. More negative T1 expectations of bias also were associated with negative outcome expectancies, interracial anxiety, and the desire to avoid interacting with White people. Also as in Study 1, negative outcome expectancies regarding interracial interactions were related to interracial anxiety and both of these variables were associated with the desire to avoid interactions with White people. Examination of the amount of positive contact with White people over
the 2 weeks between the assessments revealed an association with more T1 positive previous contact, positive bias expectancies, less interracial anxiety, and less of a desire to avoid interactions with White people at T1.

**Predicting T2 responses.** As in Study 1, participants’ T2 responses across each of the factors were examined using hierarchical linear regression with their T1 scores on the index as a control variable and their responses across the other T1 indices as predictors. Included in the analyses was the T2 measure of positive recent contact and negative recent contact with White people. Included in the second step were the IMS × Anxiety, the EMS × Anxiety, and EMS × IMS interactions. Across the analyses, those effects not explicitly mentioned were not significant. However, as in Study 1, for each of the analyses, the T1 index was strongly predictive of the T2 version of the index in the positive direction (e.g., high T1 anxiety predicted high T2 anxiety), all Fs > 10.81, ps < .003. To simplify the presentation of the results, the effects of the control variables are not presented for each analysis separately. All other significant effects predicting T2 variables from the T1 factors can be found in Table 5.

As in Study 1, none of the T1 factors were predicted to influence T2 IMS and EMS above and beyond T1 IMS and EMS, respectively. However, of interest, previous contact predicted IMS, such that participants’ positive previous contact with White people predicted stronger internal motivation to respond without bias. Participants’ bias expectancies also predicted their IMS, such that participants who expected White people to be biased toward Black people were less internally motivated than were those with more positive bias expectancies.

Examination of participants’ outcome expectancies revealed that high IMS participants reported more positive outcome expectancies than did low IMS participants. Thus, it appears that IMS and bias expectancies had a reciprocal predictive relationship, such that those who were more internally motivated expected White people to respond with less bias than those less internally motivated. These expectations, in turn, strengthened their internal motivation to respond without bias toward White people. In addition, participants who had more positive experiences with White people over the previous 2 weeks reported more positive bias expectancies than did those with fewer positive experiences.

Examination of participants’ outcome expectancies revealed that, counter to the findings in Study 1, participants’ interracial anxiety predicted their outcome

### TABLE 4: Intercorrelations Between Measures (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>IMS</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>BiasExpect</th>
<th>OutExpect</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>PosExper</th>
<th>NegExper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior contact</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>–.34</td>
<td>–.43</td>
<td>–.30</td>
<td>–.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>–.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>–.18</td>
<td>–.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>–.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>–.15</td>
<td>–.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiasExpect</td>
<td>–.40</td>
<td>–.13</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>–.37</td>
<td>–.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OutExpect</td>
<td>–.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>–.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>–.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>–.32</td>
<td>–.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>–.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>–.48</td>
<td>–.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** N=52; correlations are significant at the .05 level and are in bold type. Both types of expectancies were scored so that higher scores indicated more negative expectancies. IMS = internal motivation to respond without prejudice toward White people, EMS = external motivation to respond without prejudice toward White people, BiasExpect = bias expectancies, OutExpect = outcome expectancies, PosExper = positive experiences, NegExper = negative experiences.

### TABLE 5: Significant Effects Predicting T2 Factors From T1 Factors for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2 Outcome Variable</th>
<th>T1 Predictor</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>Prior contact</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 10.24</td>
<td>&lt; .004</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias expectations</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 6.41</td>
<td>&lt; .02</td>
<td>–.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias expectancies</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 10.32</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>–.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pos rec exper</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 4.72</td>
<td>&lt; .04</td>
<td>–.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome expectancies</td>
<td>Interracial anxiety</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 17.58</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial anxiety</td>
<td>Bias expectancies</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 5.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to avoid</td>
<td>Interracial anxiety</td>
<td>F(1, 40) = 4.66</td>
<td>&lt; .04</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosExper</td>
<td>Prior contact</td>
<td>F(1, 42) = 5.15</td>
<td>&lt; .03</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to avoid</td>
<td>F(1, 42) = 4.97</td>
<td>&lt; .04</td>
<td>–.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias expectancies</td>
<td>F(1, 42) = 2.85</td>
<td>&lt; .10</td>
<td>–.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** IMS = internal motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people, T1 = Time 1, T2 = Time 2, Pos rec exper = positive recent experiences, PosExper = positive experiences.
expectancies, such that heightened interracial anxiety resulted in negative outcome expectancies.

For the analysis of interracial anxiety, it was predicted that participants’ bias expectancies, and possibly their outcome expectancies, would predict their anxiety. Consistent with these predictions, bias expectancies predicted anxiety, such that participants with more negative bias expectancies reported more interracial anxiety than those with more positive bias expectancies. Thus, as anticipated, although T1 bias expectancies predicted T2 anxiety above and beyond T1 anxiety, the reverse was not true. In contrast, outcome expectancies did not predict anxiety and, counter to the findings from Study 1, anxiety actually predicted outcome expectancies. Thus, participants who were anxious developed more negative expectations about their ability to make a positive impression in interactions with White people.

Participants’ interracial anxiety, IMS, and EMS were all anticipated to predict their desire to avoid interactions with White people. It also was expected that IMS would interact with interracial anxiety predicting avoidance. Examination of participants’ desire to avoid interactions with White people indicated that, as predicted, higher interracial anxiety resulted in a greater desire to avoid interracial interactions. Therefore, as in Study 1, participants’ T1 anxiety predicted their T2 avoidance but the reverse was not true.

Examination of participants’ positive contact over the 2 weeks prior to T2 revealed that participants who had more positive previous experiences with White people at T1 had more positive experiences with White people during the previous 2 weeks than those with fewer positive previous experiences at T1. In addition, the analysis revealed that participants who wanted to avoid interactions with White people reported less positive contact than those who were less interested in avoiding interactions with White people. Furthermore, participants who expected White people to respond with bias had marginally less positive contact over the intervening 2 weeks than those with more positive bias expectancies. The amount of negative contact with White people during the 2 weeks between assessments was not predicted by any of the T1 factors.

Discussion

Examination of the results from the current study exploring Black participants’ responses to interactions with White people over time revealed some interesting consistencies and discrepancies with Study 1. Black participants who were high on IMS at T1 tended to develop more positive T2 bias expectancies than did low IMS people. Thus, participants who were internally motivated to respond without bias toward White people came to expect White people to respond with less prejudice. Of interest, participants’ bias expectancies also predicted their IMS, indicating that participants who did not expect White people to be biased against them tended to develop stronger personal motivation to respond without bias toward White people.

The findings from the current study provided additional support for the argument that people’s expectancies regarding interracial interactions influence their interracial anxiety, which in turn affects their desire to avoid interracial interactions. However, in the current study, it was participants’ expectations about White people’s racism as opposed to their expectations about their own bias that resulted in interracial anxiety. These findings are consistent with other recent work highlighting the role of Black people’s experiences with racism and expectations of bias from White people in their interracial responses (Branscombe et al., 1999; Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; Shelton, 2003). Furthermore, inconsistent with the findings from Study 1, outcome expectancies did not predict interracial anxiety, but high levels of interracial anxiety resulted in negative outcome expectancies. Thus, Black people who were highly anxious about interacting with White people came to believe that they would make a negative, biased impression in interracial interactions.

However, consistent with Study 1, high levels of interracial anxiety resulted in a greater desire to avoid interracial interactions, but the reverse was not true. Thus, high levels of anxiety regarding interracial interactions seem to encourage the development of an avoidance strategy for Black people’s experiences with White people as it did for non-Black people’s experiences with Black people.

Finally, the current work examined participants’ contact with White people during the 2 weeks between assessments. Participants who had more negative bias expectancies (i.e., expected White people to respond with bias toward them) experienced fewer positive contacts with White people over the next 2 weeks. In addition, participants who wanted to avoid interactions with White people experienced fewer positive interactions with them over the next 2 weeks. Thus, participants who wanted to avoid contact with White people actually succeeded in having fewer positive interactions.

General Discussion

Two studies examined people’s experiences regarding interracial interactions at two time points. There were several goals for the current work. One goal was to examine Plant and Devine’s (2003) model of the antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety longitudinally to test the causal relationships outlined in the model. Another goal was to expand on previous work by examining Black people’s experiences in interactions...
with White people to investigate the similarities and differences between these experiences and non-Black people's experiences in interactions with Black people.

The findings across the two studies generally supported the directional relationships outlined in Plant and Devine's (2003) model. Across both studies, participants' expectancies regarding interracial interactions were important in determining their interracial anxiety, such that participants with more negative expectancies regarding interracial interactions at T1 had higher T2 levels of interracial anxiety. However, the type of expectancy that predicted interracial anxiety differed across the samples. For the non-Black participants' experiences in interactions with Black people, it was their expectancies about the likelihood of coming across as biased that predicted their anxiety (i.e., outcome expectancies). These responses are consistent with previous work and theorizing highlighting how people's beliefs about the impression they will make in interactions determines their anxiety (e.g., Devine et al., 1996; Plant & Devine, 2003). For the Black participants, their anxiety was determined by their expectancies about whether White people would respond with bias against them (i.e., bias expectancies). This latter finding is consistent with recent work highlighting the role of Black people's experiences with racism and expectations of bias from White people in their interracial responses (e.g., Branscombe et al., 1999; Shelton, 2003). However, it should be noted that because bias expectancies were not examined in Study 1, it is unclear whether White participants' expectations about Black people's bias also would have contributed to their interracial anxiety.

Also consistent with Plant and Devine’s (2003) model, in both Studies 1 and 2, T1 anxiety regarding interracial interactions resulted in T2 desire to avoid interracial interactions. These findings are troubling and indicate that, if unchecked, interracial anxiety may result in the avoidance of interracial interactions, which could heighten intergroup tension. Such avoidance also would make it highly unlikely that people would improve their expectancies regarding interracial interactions. Non-Black people who avoid interracial interactions are unlikely to develop the interpersonal skills that may improve their expectancies and decrease their anxiety in interracial interactions. For Black people, a lack of contact with White people will make them unlikely to alter their expectations about White people's racial bias. Therefore, interracial anxiety and the subsequent avoidance of interracial interactions may create a self-perpetuating cycle whereby avoidance of interracial interactions resulting from anxiety regarding these interactions actually sustains and perhaps even exacerbates the interracial anxiety.

**Contact With Outgroup Members**

Given the role of expectancies in predicting people's anxiety and, hence, avoidance of interracial interactions, it is important to determine the factors that influence people's expectancies. The current studies indicate that people's prior contact with outgroup members at T1 was associated with their outcome expectancies. However, it is important to note that these relationships did not persist when the variability due to T1 expectancies was included in analyses. These findings indicate that previous positive contact may have its influence on outcome expectancies at or prior to T1. Consistent with this proposition, mediation analyses indicated that for both samples, T1 outcome expectancies mediated the effect of contact on T2 outcome expectancies (Study 1 Sobel z = 5.43, p < .001; Study 2 Sobel z = 3.43, p < .001).

However, these findings also may reflect the fact that the correlations between expectancies and contact are due to the impact of expectancies on the quality of the contact (i.e., people with positive expectancies have better interactions). Across both studies, participants with more positive T1 expectancies (outcome in Study 1 and bias in Study 2) tended to have more positive contact with outgroup members during the 2 weeks between assessments. These findings suggest that people's expectancies not only influence their interracial anxiety but also whether they actually have positive contact with outgroup members. It is unclear whether these findings reflect that positive expectancies result in a higher quality of interracial interactions, a tendency to expose oneself to more interracial interactions, or a tendency to perceive that interracial interactions go well. It seems quite possible that a variety of these factors come into play. In future work it will be important to determine whether people with positive expectancies actually have more positive interactions and whether the interactions are also more pleasant for the interaction partner.

**Individual Differences and Interracial Interactions**

The other major goal of the current work was to explore whether there are individual differences that clarify who is more or less likely to possess negative expectancies and experience interracial anxiety. Specifically, it was argued that people's motivation to respond without prejudice would have important implications for their expectancies and anxiety in interracial interactions. However, whether the influence of their motivation would be positive or negative was argued to be the result of the source of the motivation to respond without prejudice. Whereas external motivation to respond without prejudice was argued to result in more negative expectancies and heightened anxiety, internal motivation was argued to result in more positive expectancies and less anxiety regarding interracial interactions.
Consistent with these predictions, in both studies, people’s T1 IMS influenced their T2 expectancies regarding interracial interactions (outcome expectancies for Study 1 and bias expectancies for Study 2). That is, people who were internally motivated to respond without prejudice because it was personally important had more positive expectations about interracial interactions than did low IMS people. Their personal commitment to responding without prejudice may have created a determination to have positive interracial interactions. This determination may have encouraged non-Black participants to be more optimistic about making a positive unbiased impression and may have encouraged Black participants to anticipate less bias from White people.

In addition, in Study 1, participants’ IMS influenced their interracial anxiety and their desire to avoid interracial interactions. That is, non-Black people who were motivated to respond without prejudice because it was personally important were both less anxious about interracial interactions and less interested in avoiding interracial interactions than people who were less internally motivated. In addition, in Study 1, participants’ internal motivation also moderated the influence of interracial anxiety on avoidance. Specifically, interracial anxiety only resulted in heightened avoidance among low IMS participants. High IMS non-Black people were not particularly interested in avoiding interactions with Black people, even if these interactions made them anxious. Such persistence, even in the face of anxiety, is consistent with their commitment to responding without prejudice and may have positive implications for the quantity and quality of their interracial interactions. Consistent with this idea, recent work examining the quality of an interracial interaction revealed that high IMS non-Black participants had more positive interactions with a Black person than did low IMS participants, as rated by both the participants and their interaction partner (Plant & Butz, 2004).

In addition, in Study 1, high EMS participants reported marginally higher levels of T2 interracial anxiety than did low EMS participants, even after controlling for T1 interracial anxiety. High EMS participants were also less likely to report negative interactions with Black people over the 2 weeks between assessments than were low EMS participants. Thus, participants who were motivated to avoid biased responses for fear of social disapproval were able to successfully avoid negative interracial interactions.

In contrast, in Study 2, Black participants’ external motivation to respond without bias toward White people was not related to any of their other responses. This lack of association may indicate that the normative pressure discouraging the expression of bias from Black people directed at White people is less of a salient motivational force than the pressure encouraging prejudice directed at Black people. As noted earlier, sensitivity regarding the history of overt prejudice and discrimination against Black people in the United States may increase attentiveness to this form of prejudice and at the same time provide somewhat of a rationale for a degree of bias directed at White people from Black people. Indeed, examination of the mean levels of EMS across the studies revealed that the level of EMS was higher among the non-Black participants than the Black participants at both time points, t > 3.55, p < .001. The relatively low levels of EMS among the Black participants may have resulted in this factor having a weaker impact on the Black participants’ responses to interracial interactions.

Conclusions

The current studies provided some insight into the factors that determine people’s experiences in interracial interactions. For example, these studies highlight the importance of understanding people’s expectancies regarding interracial interactions to predict their affective and behavioral responses to such interactions. These findings suggest that to reduce people’s anxiety in interracial interactions, it may be helpful to focus on approaches that will improve their expectancies about interracial interactions. In addition, by examining the similarities and differences between majority and minority group members’ experiences in interracial interactions, the current work provides a fuller picture of these interactions and hopefully leaves us better prepared to tackle the complexities of dynamic interracial interactions. Although the current work attempted to expand on previous research by exploring Black people’s experiences interacting with White people, there are many types of interracial interactions (e.g., non-Hispanic White people with Hispanics, Asians with Hispanics) and it will be important in future work to examine other types of interracial interactions.

Notes

1. It also was possible that internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people (IMS and EMS, respectively) would interact to predict outcome expectancies. Previous work has shown that high IMS, low EMS people are less likely to respond with bias on implicit measures of prejudice (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002). High IMS, low EMS participants also tend to report that they anticipate responding with the least amount of bias on self-report measures (e.g., Plant & Devine, 2000). However, results using self-report measures tend to reveal two strong main effects (but no interaction) with high levels of IMS and low levels of EMS each being associated with less self-reported bias than low IMS and high EMS, respectively (also see findings regarding explicit attitude measures, Devine et al., 2002).

2. Participants who were neither White nor Black (e.g., Hispanic) were included in the current study to increase the diversity of the sample and the generalizability of the findings. However, it is worth noting that when the analyses were conducted including a factor that distin-
guished White participants from minority group participants, the only significant effect was a tendency for minority group participants compared to White participants to report more recent positive contact with Black people.

3. In both of the current studies, analyses were conducted including gender and there were no significant effects due to gender. As a result, it was not included in the final analyses.

4. It is possible that participants’ IMS predicted positive responses to interracial interactions because high IMS participants were aware of how to respond to the outcome measures in a politically correct manner. However, the IMS is unrelated to measures of social desirability. In addition, one would expect that participants who were trying to appear politically correct would do so at T1 as well as T2. Thus, the implications of any social desirability concerns should have been captured by their T1 responses, which were statistically controlled in the analyses of T2 responses.
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