

Spring 5-2021

## **The Impacts of Race Implicit Association Test Training on Undergraduate Students**

Rachel Norum

*Chapman University*, [norum@chapman.edu](mailto:norum@chapman.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cusrd\\_abstracts](https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cusrd_abstracts)



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Norum, Rachel, "The Impacts of Race Implicit Association Test Training on Undergraduate Students" (2021). *Student Scholar Symposium Abstracts and Posters*. 459.  
[https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cusrd\\_abstracts/459](https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cusrd_abstracts/459)

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Undergraduate Excellence at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Scholar Symposium Abstracts and Posters by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu).



# The Impacts of Race Implicit Association Test Training on Undergraduate Students

Rachel Norum



# Introduction to the Implicit Association Test (IAT)

# Background Literature

- Familiarity and IAT results
  - Faking Success in the IAT (Rohner, Schröder-Abe, & Schutz, 2011)
- Implicit bias training
  - Efficacy of cognitive bias modification interventions: meta analysis (Fodor et al., 2020)
- Individual differences
  - Exploring the association of healthcare worker race and occupation with implicit and explicit racial bias (Tajeu et al., 2018)
- Implicit scores and explicit scores
  - A Unified Theory of Implicit Attitudes, Stereotypes, Self-Esteem, and Self-Concept (Greenwald et al., 1998)

# Hypotheses

1. All participants' IAT scores will be lower if the participant has a greater familiarity with the IAT
2. There will be a decrease in bias scores for those who underwent implicit association training.
3. Overall, White participants will have results of higher White preference on the IAT than Black participants.
4. Participants are likely to have lower scores of bias on their self-reported questionnaires compared to their implicit association test results.

# Participants

Sixteen Chapman University undergraduate students were collected from the undergraduate psychology department participant pool to participate in this study. There were 4 males (25%) and 12 females (75%). The mean age was 19.5 ( $SD = 1.5$ ) years with a range of 18 – 23 years. The race/ethnic breakdown was as follows:

- 10 (62.5%) self-identified as White/European American.
- 6 (37.5%) self-identified as Asian American.

# Tools and Measurements

- Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986)
  - Scale uses a likert-style format
  - 7 statements in total
- Race Implicit Association Test
  - This test has 5 parts
  - Answers range from a strong automatic preference for European Americans compared to African Americans, to a strong automatic preference for African Americans compared to European Americans
- Additional questions
- Implicit association training videos

# Procedure

- Experimental group and control group
- Participants received implicit association test information, questionnaire items, MRS, and informed consent document
- Participants were instructed to complete the questionnaires (and training) in order and in one sitting
- Extra credit provided



# Results

- Hypothesis 1: The bias of all participants' IAT scores will be lower if the participant has a greater familiarity with the IAT.
  - Chi square,  $p = .382$
- Hypothesis 2: There will be a decrease in bias scores for those who underwent implicit association training.
  - Independent samples t-test,  $p = .899$
- Hypothesis 3: Overall, White participants will have a higher White preference than Asian participants.
  - Paired t-test,  $p = .139$
- Hypothesis 4: Participants are likely to have lower scores of bias on their self-reported questionnaires compared to their implicit association test results.
  - Pearson Correlation,  $p = .306$

# Discussion

## Relation of the results to past literature

- Hypothesis 1 (Rohner, Schröder-Abe, & Schutz, 2011)
  - Similar: Instructions
  - Dissimilar: Familiarity vs strategy
- Hypothesis 2
  - Similar: Pre-test and post-test (Chevance et al., 2017)
  - Dissimilar: Types of training (Fodor et al., 2020)
- Hypothesis 3
  - Similarities to current literature on revised hypothesis
- Hypothesis 4
  - Similar: Self-report and IAT (Greenwald et al., 1998)

# Discussion Continued

- Limitations
  - Online limitations
  - Coding the IAT
  - Sample size
  - Sample group
- Future Research
  - Implicit vs explicit bias
  - Individual differences
  - Types of training

# Questions