

ETD Archive

---

2011

## Interracial Interactions and Resource Depletion

Darian E. Johnson  
*Cleveland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

**How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!**

---

### Recommended Citation

Johnson, Darian E., "Interracial Interactions and Resource Depletion" (2011). *ETD Archive*. 437.  
<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/437>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact [library.es@csuohio.edu](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).

INTERRACIAL INTERACTIONS AND RESOURCE DEPLETION

DARIAN E. JOHNSON

Bachelor of Science in Psychology

Cleveland State University

May 2007

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2011

# INTERRACIAL INTERACTIONS AND RESOURCE DEPLETION

DARIAN E. JOHNSON

## ABSTRACT

Self-control/self-regulation depends on a limited resource. It has been suggested that self-presentation may require self-regulation particularly when familiar or dispositional tendencies must be overridden in order to make desired impressions. The more resources used the less a person has control of his or hers executive functioning. This is especially true for some people during interracial interactions. Recent research finds that interracial interactions can negatively impact executive functioning. This study examined whether the anticipation of an interracial interaction would deplete regulatory resources more in an unstructured than a structured (i.e. scripted) condition. Also examined in this study, was whether participants would feel more positive when they anticipated interaction in a structured discussion with people of a different race than when structure is absent. Contrary to our predictions, the present study failed to support either hypothesis. The data revealed that there was no correlation of regulatory resources, nor the creation of positive feelings in regards to having an interracial interaction.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHOD.....	12
2.1 Participants.....	12
2.2 Design.....	12
2.3 Measures.....	13
2.4 Procedure.....	15
III. RESULTS.....	24
IV. DISCUSSION.....	26
REFERENCES.....	30
APPENDICES	
A. Informed Consent Form.....	35
B. Participants Background Questionnaire.....	37
C. Modern Racism Survey.....	38
D. Fitness Survey.....	39
E. Persistence Task Survey.....	40
F. Race Relation Survey.....	41
G. Consent Form Reiterated Instructions.....	43
H. Instructions for Participants' Photos.....	44
I. Ranking Task Instructions.....	45
J. Group Discussion Instruction.....	46

K.	Conversation Instructions.....	47
L.	Persistence Task Instructions.....	49
M.	Study Questionnaire.....	50
N.	Participant Debrief.....	51
O.	Composites Statistics.....	53

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
O1. Feeling Positive Composites.....	53

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

One relatively unique and interesting aspect of the United States population is that it is comprised of people from a large assortment of ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds. This “melting pot” or “salad bowl” representation of U.S. society and the dynamics that accompany these demographics contribute to what it means to be “an American.” Historically, the U.S. has welcomed settlers from around the world and has often relied on immigrants as a source of labor and innovation. It can be argued that without this open-door philosophy the United States would not be as prosperous, powerful, adaptive, or promising as it is today. This is why many Americans have generally placed great value on cultural diversity.

There are several potential benefits that result from cultural diversity. When people interact with others from diverse backgrounds, they have the opportunity to learn about new perspectives and worldviews. For example, through establishing interpersonal relationships with immigrants from Asia or the Middle East, one may be exposed to new religious or political belief systems. Whether adopted or not, access to this new kind of information could possibly improve people’s personal lives and/or their understanding of international relations and dynamics of other cultures. Through this broadened view,

perceptions of the world may become more accurate, and individuals may feel an increased sense of control as situations around them become more predictable.

Through diversity, people are also introduced to new types of leisure activities (e.g., games, music, literature), and these new interests may become passions and hobbies that help improve life satisfaction and well-being. Equally important is the establishment of stable, trusting and close personal relationships. In these close, long-term relationships the potential for benefits associated with diversity increase, and other gains also become possible. For example, in developing close relationships with someone of a different background, an individual may become more understanding, comfortable, and accepting of people of different races, which makes them more effective in social interactions.

While these ideals and desires are a part of American culture, the “American Dream” of a society that has managed to establish harmony among peoples has not been sufficiently actualized. One possible reason the benefits of diversity are not being experienced by some is because interracial interactions can be very difficult to manage (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002). America is a multi-cultural society making interracial interactions practically unavoidable. The failure to understand the dynamics of these interactions can lead to negative outcomes leaving people to feel discouraged about the prospects of harmony. Some may even form or maintain unfavorable attitudes about those who are “different.” Consequences of such an experience could range from preserving distrust, resentment, and hostility among social groups to leading people to avoid interracial interactions in favor of voluntary segregation. The ultimate result of these types of behaviors could lead to the facilitation of discriminatory practices, elimination of opportunities for personal

growth and the loss of enrichment.

Theorists have made many important advances in understanding why interracial interactions are more difficult and anxiety provoking than same-race interactions (Trawalter & Richeson, 2005). The results of their findings are critical to explore because if left unexamined the likelihood of a negative and unsatisfying interracial interaction increases. One reason that interracial interactions are negative and unsatisfying for some is self-presentation. Self-image is important to individuals of all races. Self-presentation is the act of expressing oneself and behaving in ways designed to create a favorable impression or an impression that corresponds to one's ideas about one's self (Baumeister, Ciarocco, & Vohs, 2005). The realization that people must express a positive image of themselves that conforms to their group's standards comes early in life. Most people develop various strategies of presentation (Baumeister et al., 2005). These strategies become automatic patterns of self-presentation. For example, children are taught by their elders that in order to either obtain or maintain a favorable image or increase the likelihood of receiving desired treatment from others, it is important to be polite and courteous. Because these mannerisms are constantly reinforced and practiced, it becomes ingrained in the way they present themselves. As a result, they subconsciously and effortlessly present and maintain a desirable image.

Early establishment of this behavior in combination with repetitive use, results in impression management as an automatic part of the way in which people present themselves (Paulhus, Graf, & Van Selst, 1989). Balancing typical behavior and altering one's behavior to portray a positive socially desirable image is a typical yet critical element of the representation of one's self. Conformity to specific rules that symbolize

how to be perceived favorably by others also plays a role in shaping this activity (Baumister et al., 2005). Practice makes conformity and balance more efficient, leading to the need for less conscious involvement in self-presentation.

Support for this concept comes from evidence on the automaticity of psychological processes. Automatic processing is activated automatically without the necessity for active control or attention by the subject (Schneider & Shiffrin, 1977). Automatic processing is fast, unintentional and unconscious and therefore is not subject to control, cannot be avoided and cannot be terminated in its course (Schneider et al., 1977; Shiffrin et al., 1977). Automatic processing is the result of extensive training in exactly the same task (Schneider & Fisk, 1982). Take, for example, driving a car. When people learn how to drive a car their focus is primarily on the basic mechanics of driving. This usually consists of an individual focusing on tasks such as how much force should be applied to the gas pedal to maintain or reach a desired speed; or at what degree they should turn the steering wheel to execute a smooth lane change. Initially, these tasks are very difficult and require a significant amount of conscious effort to execute. Once these mechanics are performed repetitiously, they become automatized allowing people both subconsciously and effortlessly to perform these tasks. This also provides them with the ability to do multiple tasks such as eating a meal and holding a detailed conversation with a passenger all while subconsciously performing these very same tasks both accurately and effortlessly. Bargh (1994) has theorized that processes that are frequently engaged become automatized, a transformation that results in greater efficiency. However, social life consists of various irregular encounters, with different social contexts and relationship partners, making it nearly impossible at times for self-presentation to become

entirely automatized (Baumeister et al., 2005). In contrast to the automatization process, whenever people cannot use automatized thoughts or behaviors they must use self-control. Intentional control over behavior to select and articulate the most favorable image requires what is known as self-regulation. Self-regulation is the self's capacity for altering behaviors (Baumeister et al., 2005). It stabilizes negative automatized thoughts and behaviors increasing the flexibility and adaptability of human behavior. It also enables individuals to adjust their actions to a remarkably broad range of social and situational demands (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

Self-regulation is an important basis for the popular conception of free will and for socially desirable behavior. It provides benefits to the individual and to society and indeed good self-control seems to contribute to a great many desirable outcomes, including task performance, school and work success, popularity, mental health and adjustment, and good interpersonal relationships (Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Mischel, Shoda, & Peake, 1988; Shoda, Mischel, & Peake 1990; Tangeney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995). Examples of the use of self-regulation can be found in both professional and private life. Increased attentional and behavioral control is used to enact a desired response and to successfully secure a positive first impression.

Effective self-regulation relies upon self-regulatory resources that provide individuals with the capability to regulate their thoughts from being conveyed and behaviors from being displayed (Baumeister et al., 2005). For example, when people are self-presenting, these resources are recruited from a resource pool in order to assist them in presenting desired image. This regulatory resource reservoir is finite. It can easily be

temporally depleted by self-regulatory demands (for review see Baumeister & Vohs, 2003). This suggests that one may be unable to draw on enough regulatory resources to reach a subsequent goal after having exerted self-control in a prior situational demand (Baumeister et al., 2005). Empirical tests have shown that self-regulatory resources underlie a wide range of behaviors across a variety of domains, including overeating, procrastination, intellectual underachievement, and self-presentation (e.g., Baumeister et al. 1998; Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco 2005; Vohs & Heatherton 2000; Vohs & Schmeichel 2003; Vohs 2006 provides a review).

The requirement for self-regulation varies and requires more effort for some acts of self-presentation than others. Routine or well-learned patterns of behavior require less self-regulation during presentation of self to secure a successful interaction (Baumeister et al., 2005). The opposite is true when one's usual routine is disrupted. Interference in normal routine causes individuals to effortfully plan and modify their behavior to convey their intended image of self (Baumeister et al., 2005). A successful self-presentation depends greatly on effective self-regulation. This effort is then further affected when people's automatized way of self-presentation cannot be displayed. This diminishes their regulatory resources, therefore rendering them less able to produce behaviors that would lead to socially desirable self-presentation (Baumeister et al., 2005).

Research has shown that when people's usual routines are disrupted or when they find themselves in an unfamiliar or uncomfortable situation, they are pulled out of an inattentive, mindless state and must exert increased attentional and behavioral control to enact the desired response successfully (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987). This process is referred to as controlled processing. Controlled processing requires subject effort, permits

a large degree of subject control, but needs little training to develop (Schneider et al., 1977).

An example of this process occurs when people are trying to make a desirable first impression. Whether it is meeting prospective in-laws or presenting oneself before a judge and jury in a court of law, people usually exert increased attentional and behavioral control in order to either obtain or maintain a desirable image, or to increase the likelihood that they will receive desired treatment in return. Compared to automatic processing, controlled processing is slow and serial (Schneider et al., 1977; Shiffrin & Schneider, 1984). Controlled processes are, by definition under active and direct individual control. Thus, they allow for task interruption in the course of performance and are preferable for handling novel or inconsistent situations.

Controlled processing is frequently used during interracial interactions due to the lack of familiarity with interacting with people of a different race. Because of this lack of familiarity in combination with the desire to maintain or obtain a desirable image, some people do not use their automatized way of presenting themselves during this type of interaction. Instead, they use a conscious effort to determine what behaviors are appropriate in order to present themselves in a desirable manner. As a result, this creates anxiety for some and makes interracial interactions difficult to execute.

There are several other reasons that interracial interactions are effortful and anxiety provoking. The fear of being perceived as prejudiced or racially insensitive or presenting oneself in a manner that fits a negative stereotype are three such examples (Trawalter & Richeson, 2005). Stereotypes are a conventional and oversimplified conception, opinion, or image based on the assumption that there are attributes that

members of some “other group” have in common. Individuals often use stereotypes as mental shortcuts to reserve mental resources (The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy [TAHNDCL], 2009). When utilized, stereotypes can instigate false assumptions about a person or an entire group of people including members of different ethnic groups, social classes, religious orders, and the opposite sex ([TAHNDCL], 2009).

Stereotypical thoughts and views become conditioned into the manner in which people analyze others. These thoughts and views are then automatized into a person’s conscious, subconscious, or both (Devine, 1989). Once this takes place the creation of predictable pre-designed lists also known as scripts are referred to making the use of stereotypes difficult to control. Scripts are knowledge structures that define situations and guides behavior (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). They are used to minimize the demand of resources and are relied upon in a variety of situations to assist with behavioral management (Cialdini, Kenrick, & Neuburg, 2004).

Scripts include many types of information such as motives, intentions, goals, and situations that enable (or inhibit) certain behaviors, and the causal sequence of events, as well as the specific behaviors themselves (Baumeister & Buchman, 2008). An example of a script is the meal sequence that people order and eat their food at a restaurant. When dining at a restaurant, the meal sequence typically consists of ordering and eating an appetizer first, followed by the main course, and finally dessert. Because this meal sequence is a part of how people typically order and eat their food, they do not have to use their resources to think about the appropriate sequence of performing these tasks. Instead, they can use their resources to determine what specific meal they would like to eat for each sequence. Scripts are often used in stereotypical thought. Often, people fail to

realize that stereotypical thoughts are present when they are analyzing other people, analyzing situations, or communicating thoughts or opinions.

The recognition of the employment of stereotypes can be beneficial during interracial interaction, for some, because it can lead to successful regulation. This recognition provides individuals with mental cues that help them consciously avoid having stereotypical thoughts influencing their decisions or opinions about a situation, a person, or a group of people. For others, this is quite the opposite.

Awareness of stereotypical thoughts during interracial interactions can require a substantial amount of self-regulation to prevent inappropriate thoughts from being conveyed (Trawalter et al., 2005). The great value that is placed on self-image and others perception of that image directly impacts how an individual expresses him or herself. The importance of maintaining a desirable image necessitates the exertion of a significant amount of effort to plan or modify behavior to convey the intended image of self. Furthermore, it requires that a delicate balance be struck between creating a favorable impression and preserving the realities that correspond to an individual's true ideas.

In the absence of the use of stereotypes as analytical tools, there is a conscious effort employing mental resources to formulate an accurate diagnosis of a situation or people of a different race. Excessive resource use and the attempt to present oneself in a desirable manner often lead to difficulty in accessing scripts. Lack of scripts for appropriate self-expression and behavioral norms with groups of people from a different race increases tension and extremely limits or completely depletes resources. For example, not knowing whether it is appropriate to say "Black" during an interaction with an African American, or saying "Indian" when conversing with a Native American causes

people to use resources to not only determine what is appropriate; it also makes them use additional effort to then present themselves in a desirable manner. This renders them less able to perform other forms of executive functioning (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). The result is often a negative interracial interaction despite the tremendous amount of effort used to regulate thoughts and self-presentation to prevent negative outcomes.

For positive interracial interactions to occur, regulatory resources must be available for people to effectively and accurately execute executive functioning. The incorporation of structure within the environment where interracial interactions take place could possibly alleviate some of the stressors associated with these interactions. In other words, providing simple guidelines for what one can say (e.g., “it is ok to call Asians Orientals”) or what to talk about may reduce mental load and reduce the perceived threat of making a negative impression. The provision of structure offers predictability and decreases uncertainty about how one should present one’s self. This arrangement should eliminate the work that is usually involved in gauging interracial interactions and provide the availability of mental resources to make these interactions positive experiences for people of all races.

Although diversity is a reality in our society, interracial interactions continue to be extremely difficult to manage. Desire to maintain a favorable image and avoid stereotypical thought increases anxiety and depletes resources. However, providing a structured environment can reduce or eliminate these difficulties and produce positive interracial interactions. The goal of this research is to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: When structure (e.g., a script) is provided, the anticipation of an interracial interaction will not deplete regulatory resources as much as when structure is absent.

Hypothesis 2: When participants anticipate involvement in a structured discussion with people of a different race, they will feel more positive about the upcoming interaction compared to when structure is absent.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODS

#### **2.1 Participants**

Eighty four psychology undergraduates from Cleveland State University who were 18 years or older served as participants. Participants of this study consisted of students of diverse sex (23 males and 61 females) and race (18 African Americans, 52 Whites, 5 Asians, 7 Hispanics, and 2 people of another race). Participants received research participation credit for their participation in this research and were recruited using the research participation web page system (Sona System). All participants were required to read and complete an Informed Consent form that outlined their rights as a research participant before beginning the experiment (See appendix A).

#### **2.2 Design**

The study utilized a 2 (interaction: same race vs. different race) X 2 (conversation: unstructured vs. structured) between-subject design. There were four conditions in total (same race/structured conversation, same race/unstructured conversation, different race/structured conversation, and different race/ unstructured conversation), with a total

of twenty participants per condition. Participants were randomly assigned to conditions with an exception for minority participants. If a minority participant was not African American, because the “supposed” group members they would be paired with were either White or African American, those participants were automatically considered to be in a different race conditions.

### **2.3 Measures**

**The General Background Questionnaire.** The general background questionnaire was designed to gather general information about the participants. An example of what participants were asked was, “What racial/ethnic background do you most strongly identify with?” (See Appendix B for the complete survey)

**Modern Racism Survey** (*McConahay, 1986*) This survey tested for subtle forms of racism prevalent in United States today. The Modern Racism Scale asked questions on the topic of modern racism in a 5-point Likert format (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). One example of a type of questions that was asked was, “Over the past few years, minorities have gotten more economically than they deserve” (See Appendix C for the complete survey).

**The Fitness Survey.** The purpose of this survey was to record participants’ responses to their own feelings on how physically fit and mentally tough they believed they were. This survey consisted of a 6-point Likert rating scale (1=Disagree Strongly to 6=Agree Strongly) in which participants were instructed to read a list of statements and rate how much they agreed with each. One example of a question that was asked was, “I consider myself to be physically fit” (See Appendix D for the complete survey).

**The Ranking Task.** Participants were asked by the experimenter to look at the same-sex photos of the “supposed” other participants and then rank them from one to eight in the order of whom they wanted to have a conversation about race relations with. The eight photos shown to participants included 3 African Americans, 3 Whites, and 2 people of another race.

**Persistence (Handgrip) Task.** The persistence (hand grip) task is a procedure that has been developed and validated in previous work (Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998). The apparatus for this task was a commercially available device used for building physical strength in one's hands. It consisted of two handles separated by a rubber ball. Participants squeezed the handles together, compressing the rubber ball, which created resistance. Maintaining the grip is tiring for the hand muscles, and eventually it becomes necessary to relax them. Insofar as overriding the urge to relax requires self-regulation, the duration of each participant's grip constituted a measure of self-regulatory strength. To determine precisely when the handgrip was released (because some people may relax their grip only gradually), the experimenter inserted a wad of paper between the two handles. When participants squeezed the handles together, the paper remained in place only as long as the handles remained fully pressed together. As soon as the paper fell, the experimenter stopped the stopwatch and recorded the time.

**Persistence Task Survey.** This survey consisted of a 6-point Likert rating scale (1=Disagree Strongly to 6=Agree Strongly) in which participants were instructed to read a list of statements and rate how much they agreed with each. This survey was designed for participants to rate the aspects of their experience during the physical persistence task. One example of a type of question that was asked was, “During the persistence task

(handgrip), I was thinking about the upcoming conversation about race relations” (See Appendix E for complete survey).

**Race Relation Survey.** The purpose of this survey was to record participants’ responses to their own feelings as well as their expectations about their group members prior to the conversation about race relations. Similar to the persistence task survey, all participants received the same race relation survey. This survey consisted of a 6-point Likert rating scale (1=Disagree Strongly to 6=Agree Strongly) in which participants were instructed to read a list of statements and rate how much they agreed with each. An example of a question that was asked was, “I am satisfied with the discussion question my group was assigned” (See Appendix F for complete survey).

## **2.4 Procedure**

Prior to arrival, participants’ conditions were randomly assigned. Random assignment was not possible for all participants, and this will be discussed in further detail later in the method section. Upon arrival, participants were seated at a cubicle that consisted of a computer station (desk, chair, computer, and monitor). Participants were in a room by themselves, and no other participants were physically present (an experimenter was present at times to address questions and provide directions). Participants received the majority of their instructions, stimuli, and the experimental manipulation via computer. Responses from participants were also collected via computer, using a software program designed for such purposes (i.e., Media Lab).

After participants were seated, they were given a consent form, asked to read it over, and sign and date it if they agreed to participate. Once signed, the consent forms

were collected and the experimenter instructed the participant to click “continue”, at the bottom right corner of the computer screen to begin the study. When participants clicked “continue,” information about the study appeared on the computer screen that reiterated key information from the consent form. Participants read about the “supposed” purpose of the study, learned that they were to be asked to perform a series of tasks, that they were to be paired with a group of two other participants who were currently in other lab rooms, and that they would have a discussion on race relations (See Appendix G).

Once participants read this general information, they were notified via computer, to proceed to the next task by clicking “continue.” The next task that participants had to complete was the general background questionnaire. After participants completed this questionnaire, the experimenter then took a digital portrait picture (a close-up photo that commonly includes head & shoulders, and focuses on the face of the person) of participants using a digital camera. In order to reduce participants’ anxiety and suspicion of this process, the experimenter told them that everyone who participated in this study was asked to have a digital picture of his or her face taken. The experimenter then explained to participants that the purpose of taking the photo was to give all participants an opportunity to see the “supposed” other participants whom they may have a discussion about race relations with. Participants were also informed that their photo would be shown to other participants; however, no one would see their name or know any of the personal information that they have already provided. The experimenter also informed participants that after the experiment was completed, for their protection, any picture taken would be destroyed immediately after the session was finished (See Appendix H). In actuality, the photos were not used, no discussion about race relations took place, and

no interpersonal interactions occurred. The purpose of these experimental procedures was to make participants think these events would actually happen.

After their pictures were taken, the experimenter explained to participants that he must leave the room to upload their digital photo as well as collect and upload the photos of the other supposed participants onto a database. Participants were then instructed to click “continue” on the computer screen and answer more questions (i.e., Modern Racism Survey and Fitness Survey). The experimenter was heard opening and closing doors outside the lab, and mock conversations were staged to create the impression that the experimenter was talking to other “supposed” experimenters and participants. After a short period of time, the experimenter returned to the room to inform participants that all the photos had been successfully uploaded. The experimenter then instructed participants to click “continue” to view the “supposed” other participants. When participants clicked “continue” on their computer screen, a series of texts appeared (Downloading...and Download Successful...). The purpose of these texts was to give participants the impression that the photos were really being downloaded to their computer.

After the “supposed” download was complete, participants were instructed to click “continue” to see eight photos of the other participants who were “supposedly” in other rooms. For this experiment, there were two sets of photos (one consisted of all males, and the other of all females). The rationale for having two sets of photos was to eliminate any potential confounds due to sex composition (same sex versus mixed sex groups).

Same-sex groups were formed, so males saw photos of other males and females saw photos of other females. More specifically male participants were shown photos of

three African-American males, three photos of White males, and two photos of Hispanic males. Female participants were shown photos of three African-American females, three White female photos, and two Indian female photos. By having that exact proportion of races, participants' suspicions were minimized. For example, by including more than two African-American student photos, African-American participants in the "same race" condition were not able to infer the experimenter purposefully assigned all African-American students to the same discussion group.

After being shown the photos of the other "supposed" participants, participants were then informed that the next task that they had to complete was the ranking task. Participants were asked by the experimenter to look at the photos of the "supposed" other participants and then rank them from one to eight in the order of whom they wanted to have a conversation about race relations with. Participants were also informed that all rankings that were made would be totally confidential, so no one would have access to their responses including the experimenter (See Appendix I). Participants were then asked to click "continue" on their computer screen, in order for them to read more detailed instructions about the ranking task. Once participants clicked "continue" on their computer screens, the experimenter took a seat behind a partition located next to the participants' computer stations to ensure participants that their rankings would be confidential.

To complete the ranking task participants first looked at the photos of the eight participants, which were displayed vertically in a column down the middle of their computer screens. A set of eight numbers, not presented in any particular numeric order, was displayed vertically in a column on the far left side of the computer screen.

Participants had to drag each number from the left side of the screen to the right side of each photo that they wished to assign that particular number to. The purpose of this procedure was to collect data to see if participants were more likely to want to engage in race-sensitive discussions with people of their same race.

Upon completion of the ranking task, the experimenter explained to participants that their rankings would be uploaded onto a “supposed” database, and the computer would analyze and compose three person discussion groups based on the rankings they submitted. Participants were also told that because the analysis being made was quick, not everyone’s preferences would be met. Participants were informed they would soon meet their group members and be left alone to talk about contemporary race issues in private (See Appendix J).

After the group composition process was explained, the experimenter then informed participants that he needed to check on the status of the “supposed” other experimenters to see if the other participants rankings were entered into the database. Prior to exiting the room, participants were instructed to upload their rankings by clicking “continue” on the bottom right hand corner of their computer screen. Once participants clicked “continue”, a series of texts (Uploading, Analyzing Data, Composing Groups, Downloading Results, Group Configuration is Complete) appeared on their computer screens to support the cover story.

After a short period of time, the experimenter returned to the room and instructed participants to click “continue” on their computer screen to view their “supposed” group members for the discussion on race relations. Once participants clicked “continue” two photos of the “supposed” group members appeared side by side in the middle of their

computer screen. The two photos that were presented to all participants were either of two African-American students or two White students, as appropriate to same or different race condition. The purpose of presenting those photos was to help determine the experimental condition a participant was assigned to (same race or different race). When a participant's race was the same as the race of the students presented on the photos, that person was assigned to the same race condition. For example, if a participant was White, and the "supposed" group members he or she was randomly assigned to were also White, that participant was assigned to the "same race" condition. When a participant's race was different from the race of the students presented on the photos, that person was assigned to the different race condition. For example, if a participant was African-American, and the "supposed" group members he or she was randomly assigned to were White, that participant was assigned to the "different race" condition. If a participant did not identify himself or herself as being either African-American or White (e.g., Asian-American), because the photos that were presented to participants were students of either African-American or White race, that participant was also assigned to the "different race" condition. To strengthen the believability of the study, the experimenter asked participants if they knew either of the two students because the study required group members to be unacquainted.

After participants learned about their supposed discussion partners (and thus the racial composition of their discussion group), the second experimental manipulation took place (structured conversation vs. unstructured conversation). All participants were reminded about the "supposed" upcoming discussion topic, and that their task was to talk about contemporary race relations. Participants then received instructions for the

“supposed” upcoming conversation via computer. The instructions that were given to participants were dependent upon the condition that they were randomly assigned to (structured conversation or unstructured conversation). For the “structured conversation” condition, participants were instructed to spend some time preparing for the supposed discussion by thinking about, visualizing and reflecting on the things that they wanted to talk about with their group members. Participants were also instructed to visualize how the conversation would turn out and then given an option to use a list of conversation starters. An example of a conversation starter given to participants was, “What social groups, if any, are likely to be targets of prejudice/discrimination today?” (See Appendix K). For the “unstructured” condition, participants were provided the same instructions as the structured condition (think about, visualize and reflect on the things that they wanted to talk about with their group members, and to visualize how the conversation would turn out), except participants were not provided a list of conversation starters (See Appendix K).

After receiving instructions for the supposed upcoming conversation on race relations, participants were asked to perform a physical persistence task. Participants were informed that the persistence task was a part of an ongoing study that was being conducted to explore the relationship between one’s ability to persist at physical tasks and to perform various other tasks. The experimenter emphasized the “importance” of this study, and thus, the importance of performing well on the persistence task so that participants tried their hardest (See appendix L). Once participants received the instructions for the persistence task, the experimenter then physically demonstrated how to properly execute the persistence task. Participants were then instructed by the

experimenter to perform the persistence task. The experimenter monitored participants, started participants when they were ready, and stopped the trial when the wad of paper fell to the table.

After the persistence task was completed, the experimenter informed the participant that he had to leave the room to help record more times from the “supposed” other participants and would return momentarily. Before the experimenter left the room, participants were instructed to answer a final series of survey questions (Physical Persistence Task Survey and Race Relation Survey) on their computers (See appendix E and F). After the experimenter left the room, he was heard opening and shutting doors and holding mock conversations to create an impression that they were recording times of other participants.

After the experimenter returned to the room and participants finished their surveys, the experimenter informed them that they, along with their group members would be sitting at the table that was positioned at the back of the room. Participants were then instructed to take a seat at the table. The table at the back of the room had three chairs surrounding it (two chairs were positioned in front of each other on the opposite sides of the table and one chair was positioned at the head). The chair at the head seat was purposefully positioned furthest from the other two seats. Once participants sat at the table, the experimenter recorded where they decided to sit. The reasoning behind this task was to determine whether or not there was a difference in participant’s level of comfort sitting next to group members of either the same or different race when discussing such a sensitive and potentially difficult topic such as race relations.

After participants seating preferences were recorded, the experimenter informed participants that they would return momentarily with their “supposed” group members. Before the experimenter left the room, participants were given a questionnaire to complete (See Appendix M). Once the experimenter returned to the room, participants were informed that there was a complication with something on one of the “supposed” other experimenter’s end of things, and that because of that mix up, they could not finish the rest of the study. At that time the experiment was complete and participants were then given full credit and fully debriefed on the purpose of the study (See Appendix N).

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

To test the hypothesis that the anticipation of an interracial interaction will be less depleting if structure (e.g., a script) is provided than without structure being provided, only participants in the “other race” conditions were selected for the following analysis. A one-way ANOVA with persistence for the handgrip task as the dependent variable showed that participants in the structured condition ( $n=19$ ,  $M=66.89$   $SD=42.36$ ) did not persist significantly longer than those in the unstructured condition ( $n=22$ ,  $M=59.45$ ,  $SD=51.74$ ),  $F(1, 39) = .62$ ,  $p > .05$ .

As a further test, a one-way ANOVA with the depletion composite as the dependent variable was performed, only participants in the “other race” conditions were selected for this analysis. The results presented no significance between the structured ( $n= 19$ ,  $M= 5.47$ ,  $SD= 2.67$ ) and the unstructured conditions ( $n = 22$ ,  $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = 2.20$ ),  $F(1, 39) = .001$ ,  $p = .110$ .

To test the hypothesis that people who anticipate involvement in a structured discussion with people of a different race, will feel more positive about the upcoming interaction compared to when structure is absent, only participants in the “other race” conditions were selected. A one-way ANOVA with the “feeling positive” composites as

the dependent variable was performed. The results presented no difference between the structured and the unstructured conditions (Appendix O/Table O1).

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

Theory suggests that interracial interactions are negative and unsatisfying for some people because they lack of knowledge and/or familiarity as to how to properly present themselves in a favorable manner during such an interaction. Because of this lack of knowledge and/or familiarity, people often increase conscious efforts to present themselves in a favorable manner to either gain or maintain a positive image. This conscious effort requires the use of regulatory resources. People possess a finite amount of regulatory resources. Depending on the amount of resources withdrawn from their resource pool, a person's ability to function appropriately during an interracial interaction may be profoundly affected. The more regulatory resources used, fewer resources are available to efficiently and effectively execute a task. It was hypothesized that this would be especially true for individuals who are aware of stereotypes and/or use stereotypes as an analytical tool because they do not want to be perceived as being prejudiced, racially insensitive, or behaving on the basis of a stereotype.

The opposite can be said about people who are familiar and/or comfortable in an interracial interaction. Theoretical information suggests that interracial interactions are not as negative and/or unsatisfying for those who are comfortable having interracial interactions. Because they are comfortable, they do not have to use conscious effort to

obtain or maintain a desirable image. As a result, they do not have to expend as much regulatory resources, therefore allowing them to conserve regulatory resources and efficiently and effectively continue their executive functioning.

It was hypothesized that when participants anticipate an interracial interaction they would deplete regulatory resources more in an unstructured than structured (i.e. scripted) condition. It was also hypothesized that participants would feel more positive when they anticipated interaction in a structured discussion with people of a different race, than when structure is absent. Contrary to our predictions, the present experiments failed to support either hypothesis. The data revealed that there was no correlation between structure and the reservation of regulatory resources, nor the creation of positive feelings in regards to having an interracial interaction.

There are several possible reasons why both hypotheses were rejected. First, the analysis may not have had enough statistical power. Our sample consisted of 84 participants, which is of sufficient power to detect moderate effect sizes. However, the effect in this instance may have been small, because of the strength of the manipulation.

Another reason why both hypotheses were rejected may be due to the manipulation (handgrip task) used for this study. This type of manipulation was chosen because it has been used successfully in numerous studies to manipulate resource depletion. Despite previous successes of the handgrip task as a manipulation check, our manipulation did not reveal any resource depletion.

Another possible reason why both hypotheses were rejected may be due to the participants' familiarity and comfort with interracial interactions. The sample recruited

for this study was a convenience sample that consisted of undergraduate psychology students from an integrated urban university (Cleveland State University). These factors may have contributed to participants' familiarity and comfort with interracial interactions. According to the participants' responses to the race relation survey questions regarding their familiarity and comfort interacting with people of another race, 86 percent reported that they were familiar and/or comfortable interacting with people of a different race. As a result, a majority of the participants may not have experienced any anxiety during this experiment. If this is true, then the idea of having an interracial interaction had no effect on their resources. This may be the reason why no significant difference was found between any of the conditions for either hypothesis, therefore causing both hypotheses to be rejected.

The design of this study may have also contributed to both hypotheses being rejected. Instead of participants having actual interracial interactions, they were informed by the experimenter that they were going to have a conversation on race relations with "other" participants whose photos were presented on a computer screen. This may not have been realistic enough to participants, reducing believability/credibility of this study, and attenuating the impact of the manipulation.

Future research should increase and heighten the impact of the manipulation by creating a more realistic interaction situation. Future research should also have a larger number of minority participants. Out of the 84 students that participated, 62 percent of them were white, while the other 38 percent were minorities (18 African Americans, 7 Hispanics, 5 Asians, and 2 people of other races). Increasing the number of minority

participants may provide greater insight on how structure affects people of different races during interracial interactions.

Lastly, future research should take in account the pool that subjects are recruited from (i.e. an environment in which interracial interactions is less likely to occur), as well as the subjects being recruited (i.e. subjects that are not familiar or comfortable interacting with people of a different race). This may increase the likelihood of researchers recruiting subjects that are conducive to a study/experiment of this kind.

## REFERENCES

Baumeister, R.F., Heatherton, T.F., & Tice, D.M. (1994). *Losing control; How and why people fail at self-regulation*. San Diego, CA; Academic Press.

Baumeister, R. F.; Bratslavsky, E.; Muraven, M.; Tice, D. M. "Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource?." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. v. 74 p. 1252–1265. 1998

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Self-regulation and the executive function of the self. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangen (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 197-217). New York: Guilford Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Bushman, B. J., (2008). *Social psychology and human nature* (1st ed.) Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Devine, P.G. "Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. v. 56 p. 5–18. 1989.

Devine, P.G.; Vasquez, K.A.; Eberhardt, J.L.; Fiske, S.T. *Confronting racism: The problem and the response*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M., (2005). Self-Discipline Outdoes IQ in Predicting Academic Performance of Adolescents; *Psychological Science*, Vol. 16, Issue: 12, December 2005. pp. 939-944.

Leary, M. R.; Kowalski, R. M. "Impression management: A literature review and two-component model." *Psychological Bulletin*. v. 107 p. 34–47. 1990

Monteith, M.J. "Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice-reduction efforts." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. v. 65 p. 469–485. 1993

Monteith, M.J.; Ashburn-Nardo, L.; Voils, C.I.; Czopp, A.M. "Putting the breaks on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. v. 83 p. 1029–1050. 2002

Muraven, M.; Tice D.M.; Baumeister R.F. "Self-control as a limited resource: Regulatory depletion patterns." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 74-774-789.

Muraven, M.; Baumeister, R. F. "Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources. "Does self-control resemble a muscle?" *Psychological Bulletin*. v. 126 p. 247–259. 2000

Mischel,W, Shoda,Y, Peake,P,K. (1988) The nature of adolescent competencies predicted by preschool delay of gratification. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, vol. 54, no. 4, p. 687,96, ISSN 0022,3514

Paulhus, D. L.; Graf, P.; Van Selst, M. "Attentional load increases the positivity of self-presentation." *Social Cognition*. v. 7 p. 389–400. 1989

Schneider, W., and Fisk, A. D. (1982). Degree of consistent training: Improvements in search performance and automatic process development. *Percept. Psychophys.* **31**: 160–168.

Schneider, W., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search, and attention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 1-66.

Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84, 127-190.

Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1984). Automatic and controlled processing revisited. *Psychological Review*, 91, 269-276.

Shoda, Y., Mischel, M., & Peake, P.K., (1990). Predicting Adolescent Cognitive and Self-Regulatory Competencies From Preschool Delay of Gratification: Identify Diagnostic Conditions. *Development Psychology*, Vol. 26, Issue: 6, November 1990. pp. 978-986.

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. G., & Boone, A. L., (2004). High Self-Control Predicts Good Adjustment, Less Parhology, Better Grades, and Interpersonal Success. *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 72, Issue: 2, April 2004. pp. 271-324.

Vohs, K. D.; Heatherton, T. F. "Self-regulatory failure: A resource-depletion approach." *Psychological Science*. v. 11 p. 249–254. 2000

Vohs, K. D.; Schmeichel, B. J. "Self-regulation and the extended now: Controlling the self alters the subjective experience of time." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. v. 85 p. 217–230. 2003.

Vohs, K.D., R.F. Baumeister, and N.J. Ciarocco. 2005. Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 632–657

Vallacher, R.R., & Wegner, D. M. (1987). What Do People Think They're Doning? : Action Identification and Human Behavior. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 94, Issue : 1, January 1987. pp. 3-15.

Vohs, K.D. (2006). Self Regulatory Resources Power the Reflective System; Evidence From Five Domains. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 16, Issue: 3, July 2006. pp. 217-223

Wolfe, R. N., & Johnson, S. D., (1995). Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 55, Issue: 2, April 1995. pp. 177-185.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### (Informed Consent Form)

I, Darian Johnson, a graduate student at Cleveland State University, ask you to participate in a research study under the supervision of Assistant Professor Dr. Ernest Park of the Psychology Department (e.s.park@csuohio.edu). Participants of this study will perform various tasks. The data being collected from these tasks may be for different studies that have different research questions. One of the tasks for this study will be for participants to help the experimenter gather data about college students' attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs about contemporary race relations. The other task is a part of an ongoing study that is being conducted to explore the relationship between one's ability to persist at physical tasks and various factors.

Participants will be asked to provide some background demographic information, and to pose for a portrait picture to create a student profile for the race relation conversation; rank photos of the other participants to indicate who they would like to interact with during the group discussion about contemporary race relations; and have a private discussion on race relations with two other participants. As a participant in this study, you will be also asked to take a digital portrait picture. Other people in this study may see this picture; however, the other participants will not see your name or know the background information that you have already provided; nor will you see their information. We can assure you that your digital portrait and any images possibly shown to others in this study will be deleted and destroyed at the end of the session that day. Also as a participant, you will be asked to rank the photos of the other participants to indicate who you would like to interact with during the group discussion about contemporary race relations. We can assure you that your rankings will be kept confidential from other participants as well as the experimenter conducting this study.

The other phase of this research study (the physical persistence task), participants will be asked to insert a wad of paper in between the handles of a handgrip; with their arm extended at a 90-degree angle; they must squeeze the handgrip for as long as they can without risking any undue injury. The moment that the wad of paper falls from the handgrip, the experimenter will stop measuring the participant's time and record their results. At both phases of each task participants will also be asked to complete a brief survey of their experience during each phase of the study.

Participation in this study may take up to an hour, and participants will receive one half-hour of credit for each half-hour you participate. The potential risks that participants may experience during this study could possibly be anxiety and mental resource fatigue from the race relation conversation, and physical discomfort from the persistence task. The potential risks associated with participation in this study are minimal and will not exceed beyond a short period of time. **In addition, any participant does not feel comfortable participating or answering particular questions; they can skip questions or stop participating at any time without penalty. Participation for this study is voluntary and for anyone who agrees to participate in this study may withdraw at any time without penalty.** Your completion of the survey indicates that you are 18 years of age or

older and that you agree to participate in this project. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask. You will be provided with information about the nature of this research following completion of today's session.

All responses will be confidential and will only be accessed by the investigator conducting this research. Your personal identification will not be associated with any of your responses, and will only be listed on this consent form upon agreement of participation. Your data will be stored on password-protected computers and your privacy is guaranteed. Should you decide that you would like to talk with someone about any issues that may arise after participating in this study, please feel free to contact the University Counseling Center at (216) 687-2277, or RT 1235 (located on the twelfth floor of Rhodes Tower).

**Consent**

I agree to participate in this research. I have read and understand the information that has been provided regarding this procedure, my tasks, the purpose of this research, any risks that may be involved, benefits that may result from the research, and educational feedback that will become available to me after participating. I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that I may terminate my involvement at any time without penalty. I understand that if I am under 18 years of age, I am not permitted to participate in this study.

I understand that if I have any questions about my rights as a research subject, I can contact:

Cleveland State University's Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630

Assistant Professor Dr. Ernest Park at (216) 687-9237, or Darian Johnson at [d.e.johnson40@csuohio.edu](mailto:d.e.johnson40@csuohio.edu).

---

Name (Print)

Signature

Date

## APPENDIX B

### (Participants Background Questionnaire)

#### Participants Background Questionnaire (Developed by the authors)

##### Instructions:

- 1) What racial/ethnic background do you most strongly identify with?
  - 1) American Indian or Alaska Native
  - 2) Asian
  - 3) Black or African American
  - 4) Hispanic
  - 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - 6) White
  - 7) Some Other Race
  - 8) Two or More Races
  - 9) Choose Not to Answer
  
- 2) What is your current student status at CSU?
  - 1) 1<sup>st</sup> year
  - 2) 2<sup>nd</sup> year
  - 3) 3<sup>rd</sup> year
  - 4) 4<sup>th</sup> year
  - 5) 5<sup>th</sup> year
  - 6) None of the above
  - 7) I don't know
  
- 3) Do you feel Cleveland is your hometown?
  - 1) Yes
  - 2) No
  
- 4) Relative to others my age and sex, I feel knowledgeable about the history of race relations in Cleveland.
  - 1) Strongly Disagree
  - 2) Moderately Disagree
  - 3) Slightly Disagree
  - 4) Slightly Agree
  - 5) Moderately Agree
  - 6) Strongly Agree
  
- 5) "Is English your native language?"
  - 1) Yes
  - 2) No

## APPENDIX C

### (Modern Racism Survey)

Scale items completed by participants. Sources are included in questionnaire headers.

#### C. Modern Racism Survey ( McConahay,1986)

Instructions: Please mark the response that most accurately represents your views.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	------------------------

1. Over the past few years, minorities have gotten more economically than they deserve.
2. Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect for minorities than they deserve.
3. It is easy to understand the anger of minorities in America.
4. Discrimination against minorities is no longer a problem in the United States.
5. Minorities are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.
6. Minorities should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

## APPENDIX D

### (Fitness Survey)

Scale items completed by participants. Sources are included in questionnaire headers.

#### D. Fitness Survey (Developed by the authors)

Instructions: As you read the following statements, think about how you compare to people of your age and sex and then rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

- 1) I consider myself to be physically fit.
- 2) I have high endurance.
- 3) If I were to exercise, and if things were too easy, I would challenge myself by making the task more demanding.
- 4) If I were to exercise, and I began to feel tired, it is likely that I would give up shortly thereafter.
- 5) I am good at avoiding temptation.
- 6) I can focus on a lot of things at once.

## APPENDIX E

### (Persistence Task Survey)

Scale items completed by participants. Sources are included in questionnaire headers.

#### E. Persistence Task Survey (Developed by authors)

Instructions: Read the following statements and rate how much you agree or disagree with each item.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

- 1) During the persistence task (handgrip), *I* was thinking about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 2) During the persistence task, *I* was thinking about what to say for the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 3) During the persistence task, *I* was thinking about what not to say during the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 4) During the persistence task, *I* completely focused on the task at hand.
- 5) During the persistence task, *I* put forth my best effort.
- 6) During the persistence task, *I* was totally focused on doing my best.
- 7) During the persistence task, *I* was motivated by my drive to outperform other participants.
- 8) I feel energized.
- 9) I feel exhausted.
- 10) I feel drained.
- 11) I couldn't have done any better at the persistence task.
- 12) If I tried a little harder I could have done better at the persistence task.

APPENDIX F

(Race Relations Survey)

Scale items completed by participants. Sources are included in questionnaire headers.

F. Race Relations Survey  
(Developed by authors)

Instructions: Read the following statements and rate how much you agree or disagree with each item.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

- 1) It is important to me to make a good impression on my group members.
- 2) I often interact with people of different races.
- 3) I am comfortable interacting with people of different races.
- 4) Many of my friends are of a different race than me.
- 5) I am satisfied with the discussion question my group was assigned.
- 6) I am content with the group I was assigned to for the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 7) I am anxious about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 8) I am nervous about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 9) I am tense about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 10) I am uneasy about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 11) I am worried about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 12) I am nervous about saying the wrong thing.
- 13) I am confident I won't say anything inappropriate.
- 14) I am eager to have a conversation on race relations.

- 15) I am excited to have a conversation on race relations.
- 16) I think this conversation about race relations will go smoothly.
- 17) I think I will have to censor myself a lot during the upcoming conversation on race relations.
- 18) I think this conversation about race relations will be stressful.
- 19) During this upcoming conversation, I feel that I will not be able to say what I truly think and believe.
- 20) I think my *group members* will be truthful about the upcoming conversation.
- 21) I think my *group members* will be honest during the upcoming conversation.
- 22) I think I will learn a lot from *my group members*.
- 23) I think my group members will be genuine about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
- 24) I think my *group members* will be open-minded people.
- 25) I think my *group members* will say what they actually think and feel about the upcoming race relation conversation.
- 26) I think *my group members* will be comfortable discussing race relations with me.
- 27) I think *my group members* will be tense discussing race relations with me.
- 28) I think my *group members* will be calm discussing race relations with me.
- 29) I think it will be difficult for my *group members* to have a conversation on race relations with me.

## APPENDIX G

### (Instructions)

#### G. Reiterated Information From Consent Form

“In this study you will be asked to perform a series of tasks. The purpose of each task will be explained at the end of the experiment. One general purpose of this study is to gather data about college students' attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs about contemporary race relations. So eventually you will be paired with a group of two other participants who are currently in some of our other lab rooms. We will have you meet as a group to discuss race relations. You will be given more instructions about this later. Some parts of this study will be done on computer. At times you will be asked to answer questions. It's important that you read all instructions carefully and follow all directions. Please click “continue”.

“Before this group discussion about race relations, please provide some general background information. All participants will be asked to provide the same information. All information you provide will be kept confidential. No one other than the experimenter and the other research assistants will see your responses. At any point if you have any questions please feel free to ask. Please click “continue”.

## APPENDIX H

### (Photo Information)

#### H. Information for participants' photos

“Everyone who participates in this study is asked to have a digital picture of his or her face taken. The purpose of taking this photo is to give all participants an opportunity to see the other participants whom they may have a discussion about race relations with. So your photo will be shown to other participants. However, the other participants will not see your name or know the background information that you have already provided; nor will you see their information. Once your picture is taken, I will show you your photo to make sure you approve. After this experiment is complete, for your protection, any picture taken of you will be destroyed immediately after you complete this experiment”.

## APPENDIX I

### (Information)

#### I. Information Ranking Task for Participants

“The next task I would like for you to complete is the ranking task. I would like for you to look at the eight photos and rank from 1 to 8 in the order whom you would like to have a conversation about race relations with. I want to inform you that your rankings will be totally confidential meaning no one will see your rankings; nor will you see anyone else’s rankings. In fact, not even the experimenters will see the rankings of any of the participants. All rankings will go directly to our main database. Please read and follow the following directions carefully. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask”.

## APPENDIX J

### (Information)

#### J. Information for group discussion

“Let me explain to you how these discussion groups will be composed. Once everyone enters their rankings, their data will then be uploaded into our main database. Our main computer will then analyze that data and compose discussion groups for the upcoming discussion on race relation based on participant’s rankings. There will be 3 discussion groups that will consist of 3 group members per group. This is a quick analysis, not everyone’s preferences will be met. At some point you will meet your group members, maybe in this room or I may end up escorting you into another room in our lab, and then you will be left alone with them so you can talk about contemporary race issues in private with your group members. At this time, I’m going to check on the status of the other experimenters to see if the other participants have entered their rankings into our main database”.

## APPENDIX K

(Instructions for the conversation conditions)

### K.1. Instructions for the “structured conversation” conditions.

“Please spend some time thinking about and visualizing the upcoming discussion. I would like you to prepare for this discussion by reflecting on the things that you might want to talk about with your group members. I would also like for you to visualize how the conversation will turn out, and to picture what the experience will be like.

Below, is a list of conversation starters that you can use to prepare for the upcoming conversation on contemporary race relations. Your fellow group members have also been provided with the same discussion topics as well. You do not have to use these conversation starters, but can if you choose to. Take a couple of minutes to read over each question. If you have any questions, please notify the experimenter.”

- 1) What social groups, if any, are likely to be targets of prejudice/discrimination today?
- 2) Do you think college students believe racial inequality exists today? What gives you this impression?
- 3) Discuss some specific strategies that could be implemented by people/organizations to improve race relations (if improvement is necessary).

## K.2 Instructions for the “unstructured conversation” condition

“Please spend some time thinking about and visualizing the upcoming discussion. I would like you to prepare for this discussion by reflecting on the things that you might want to talk about with your group members. I would also like for you to visualize how the conversation will turn out, and to picture what the experience will be like”.

## APPENDIX L

### (Instructions)

#### L. Instructions for the persistence task.

“We will begin the race discussion shortly but at this time, I would ask that you participate in the physical persistence task. This next task is an important one, and is a part of an ongoing study that is being conducted to explore the relationship between one’s ability to persist at physical tasks. The purpose for performing this task will be disclosed later.

“For this task, with your dominant hand, you’ll be asked to squeeze this plastic handgrip for as long as you can. While squeezing this handgrip, you must also extend your arm, the same arm that the handgrip is held, in front of you at a 90-degree angle over a table. In order to keep the wad of paper in place (between the handles of the handgrip) you must squeeze the handgrip for as long as you can without risking any undue injury. While performing this task, you will be timed. The very moment the wad of paper falls from between the handgrip, your time will be recorded and this task will be complete”.

## APPENDIX M

(Questions)

M. Study Questionnaire  
(Developed by the authors)

Instructions: Read and answer the following open-ended questions. *Please write legibly as possible.*

- 1) What do you think this study was about so far?
  
- 2) Is there anything suspicious about this study so far?

## APPENDIX N

### (Debriefing)

#### N. Participant debrief

I'm sorry but it turns out that there was a complication with something on one of the other experimenter's end of things. Because of this mix up, we can't finish the rest of this study. Don't worry even though we are finishing early you will still receive full credit. Sorry again that you had to prepare for the discussion and now we have to cancel it. At this time I want to debrief you on the purpose of this study. The purpose of this research is to contribute to the existing psychological theories on the relationship between interracial interactions and resource depletion by exploring possible interventions that could affect resource use before interaction even happen.

The objective of this study is to examine whether by providing structure for a discussion about race relations (e.g., suggestions for what to talk about) the anticipation of an interaction will be less depleting. If you want more details about the exact nature of this study, if you leave your e-mail address, I can contact you after the data has been collected and can provide you with more information. I want to remind you that all your responses for this study will be confidential and will only be accessed by me and the other research assistants of this study.

Your personal identification will not be associated with any of your responses. I also want to remind you that should you decide that you would like to talk with someone about any issues that may arise after participating in this study, please feel free to contact the University Counseling Center. It is very important

that you do not discuss any aspects of this study because if anyone knows about this study before they participate, the integrity of this research will be compromised. We appreciate your cooperation. Can I count on you not to talk about this study with anyone else? Again, I would like to thank you for your participation.”

APPENDIX 0

The following are composites created from the race relation survey questions to measure participants’ feelings about their “supposed” upcoming race relation conversation.

1. During this upcoming conversation, I feel that I will not be able to say what I truly think and believe. /I think I will have to censor myself a lot during the upcoming conversation on race relations.
2. I think *my group members* will be comfortable discussing race relations with me. / I think *my group members* will be calm discussing race relations with me.
3. I am anxious about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am nervous about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am tense about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am uneasy about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am worried about the upcoming conversation about race relations.
4. I am eager to have a conversation on race relations. /I am excited to have a conversation on race relations.

Table O1

Feeling Positive Composites

Composites	n	M	Structured		Unstructured		F(1,39)	p
			SD	n	M	SD		
Composite #1	19	4.3684	2.33834	22	4.8182	2.55672	.341	.562
Composite #2	19	9	1.91485	22	8.7273	1.65168	.273	.604
Composite #3	19	12.1053	3.52601	22	12.864	4.31272	.372	.545
Composite #4	19	8.7895	1.93158	22	8.4091	2.87285	.239	.627

*Note.* Composite #1 = During this upcoming conversation, I feel that I will not be able to say what I truly think and believe. /I think I will have to censor myself a lot during the upcoming conversation on race relations. Composite #2 = I think *my group members* will be comfortable discussing race relations with me. / I think *my group members* will be

calm discussing race relations with me. Composite #3 = I am anxious about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am nervous about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am tense about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am uneasy about the upcoming conversation about race relations. /I am worried about the upcoming conversation about race relations. Composite #4 = I am eager to have a conversation on race relations. /I am excited to have a conversation on race relations.