Sheffield Hallam University

An eye for the I : preferential attention to the eyes of ingroup members

KAWAKAMI, Kerry, WILLIAMS, Amanda, SIDHU, D, CHOMA, Becky L, RODRIGUEZ-BAILÓN, Rosa, CAÑADAS, Elena, CHUNG, Derek and HUGENBERG, Kurt

Citation:

Copyright and re-use policy

An Eye for the I:

Preferential Attention to the Eyes of Ingroup Members

Kerry Kawakami, Amanda Williams, David Sidhu, (York University),

Becky L. Choma (University of Plymouth),

Rosa Rodriguez-Bailón, Elena Cañadas (University of Granada),

Derek Chung (York University), and Kurt Hugenberg (Miami University)

Author Note

Please note recent affiliation changes: Amanda Williams (Sheffield Hallam University), Becky L. Choma (Ryerson University), and Elena Cañadas (University of Neuchatel). Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kerry Kawakami, Department of Psychology, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Canada, M3J 1P3; email: kawakami@yorku.ca; tel. (416) 736-2100; fax. (416) 736-5814.

Abstract

Human faces, and more specifically the eyes, play a crucial role in social and nonverbal communication because they signal valuable information about others. It is therefore surprising that few studies have investigated the impact of intergroup contexts and motivations on attention to the eyes of ingroup and outgroup members. Four experiments investigated differences in eye gaze to racial and novel ingroups using eye tracker technology. Whereas Studies 1 and 3 demonstrated that White participants attended more to the eyes of White compared to Black targets, Study 2 showed a similar pattern of attention to the eyes of novel ingroup and outgroup faces. Studies 3 and 4 also provided new evidence that eye gaze is flexible and can be meaningfully influenced by current motivations. Specifically, instructions to individuate specific social categories increased attention to the eyes of target group members. Furthermore, the latter experiments demonstrated that preferential attention to the eyes of ingroup members predicted important intergroup biases such as recognition of ingroup over outgroup faces (i.e., the Own Race Bias; Study 3) and willingness to interact with outgroup members (Study 4). The implication of these findings for general theorizing on face perception, individuation processes, and intergroup relations are discussed.

An Eye for the I:

Preferential Attention to the Eyes of Ingroup Members

The human face is arguably the most important of all social stimuli because it is such a rich source of information. Faces, and more specifically the eyes, play crucial roles in social and nonverbal communication, signaling valuable information about others (Adams & Kleck, 2003, 2005; Niedenthal, Mermillod, Maringer, & Hess, 2010). Despite the key role that the eyes play in social cognition, few studies have investigated the impact of intergroup contexts and motivation on attention to the eyes of ingroup and outgroup members. Although research has convincingly demonstrated that perceivers are better at understanding and extracting information from faces that belong to ingroups relative to outgroups (Adams, Franklin, Nelson, & Stevenson, 2010; Chiao et al., 2008; Young & Hugenberg, 2010), it remains unclear *how* people process faces from their own and other categories and whether distinct patterns of attention to specific facial features exist for these groups.

The current research seeks to address this gap directly. To this end, we first provide a general review of the literature regarding the central role of the eyes in social perception, and in particular, their role when perceiving ingroup and outgroup members. Then we move to a discussion regarding the impact of motivation on eye gaze and the relationship between eye gaze, and two important intergroup biases: the Own Race Bias (Hugenberg, Young, Bernstein, & Sacco, 2010; Meissner & Brigham, 2001; Sporer, 2001) and a willingness to interact with outgroup members. Finally, we present four experiments in which we directly measure perceivers' attention to the eye regions of ingroup and outgroup faces using an eye tracker.

The Central Role of the Eyes in Social Perception

The eyes attract special attention when processing faces because they are considered to be the "windows to the soul." People attend to the eyes at least 40% of the time, which is far greater than attention to other principal facial features such as the nose and mouth (Henderson, Williams, & Falk, 2005; Janik, Wellens, Goldberg, & Dell'Osso, 1978). Research has demonstrated that the eyes provide access to data useful for a variety of social judgments (Looser & Wheatley, 2010; Macrae, Hood, Milne, Rowe, & Mason, 2002; Niedenthal et al., 2010). For example, the eyes contain information that allows us to better identify and recognize specific individuals (McKelvie, 1976). They also provide valuable information about the direction of a person's visual attention which has critical implications for understanding intentions, preferences, and approach-avoidance behaviors (Adams & Kleck, 2003, 2005; Hietanen, Leppänen, Peltola, Linna-Aho, & Ruuhiala, 2008; Itier & Batty, 2009; Mason, Hood, & Macrae, 2004; Mason, Tatkow, & Macrae, 2005).

The above research indicates that attending to the eyes can help us form impressions and regulate social interactions (Frischen, Bayliss, & Tipper, 2007; Kleinke, 1986; Nummenmaa, Hyönä, & Heitanen, 2009; Richmond, McCroskey, & Hickson, 2007; Wirth, Sacco, Hugenberg, & Williams, 2010). Recent work, however, has also demonstrated that individuals who do not preferentially attend to others' faces and eyes commonly experience social (Yardley, McDermott, Pisarski, Duchaine, & Nakayama, 2008) and developmental deficits (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001; Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, & Jolliffe, 1997). For example, autism has been linked with a failure to attend to others' eyes and a failure to use eye gaze as a cue in regulating ongoing interpersonal interactions. Given the consistency of this literature in linking attention to the eyes to impression formation processes, it is imperative to better understand how intergroup contexts impact eye gaze. The current research directly

addressed this issue by investigating the extent to which people attend to the eyes of ingroup and outgroup faces.

Attention to Faces and Eyes in an Intergroup Context

Research in social psychology has provided convincing evidence that group membership has profound effects on face processing (Cloutier & Macrae, 2007; Cloutier, Mason, & Macrae, 2005; Stangor & Lange, 1994; Zebrowitz, Bronstad, & Lee, 2007). Even the briefest presentation of a face can provide important social category information related to sex, age, race, and socio-economic status (Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Martin & Macrae, 2010). Furthermore, this category information impacts the neural encoding of faces (Ito & Urland, 2005; Ofan, Rubin, & Amodio, 2011; Ratner & Amodio, 2013; Van Bavel, Packer, & Cunningham, 2008, 2011), our attitudes and behaviors toward social category members (Blair, 2002; Greenwald, McGee, & Schwartz, 1998; Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000; Kawakami, Phills, Steele, & Dovidio, 2007), and our memory for faces (Bernstein, Young, & Hugenberg, 2007; Hugenberg et al., 2010; Sporer, 2001).

Although there has been an increase in empirical activity on face perception and intergroup processes in recent years, researchers have just started to examine how visual attention to ingroup and outgroup faces differ. First, a variety of studies have demonstrated that overall attention to same race versus cross race faces is different in both early and later stages of processing (Vizioli, Rousselet, & Caldara, 2010). Specifically, insofar as Black faces are associated with threat (i.e., a threat that the participant will appear prejudiced or a simple Black-danger association), White perceivers tend to show a general 'vigilance-avoidance' effect. For example, experiments using both a dot-probe detection paradigm (Donders, Correll, & Wittenbrink, 2008; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008; Trawalter, Todd, Baird, & Richeson, 2008) and

an eye tracker (Bean et al., 2012) have shown that although in the first stages of visual attention, White participants attend more to Black faces, in later stages they attentionally prefer White faces. On a similar note, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, and Devine (2003) found that White participants exhibited patterns of startle blink responses to Black faces that reflect early attentional and affective reactions to this category.

A recent study by Van Bavel and Cunningham (2012) is also congruent with the hypothesis that with longer presentation times, perceivers prefer to view same race faces. In this experiment, the researchers investigated attention to an array of category members by presenting a number of faces from two groups on a computer monitor, but only allowing perceivers to attend to one group at a time by toggling between the two. The results indicated that participants consciously chose to attend more to a collection of ingroup relative to outgroup faces. Previous results indicate that this pattern of preferential attention over longer timespans may be moderated by perceiver prejudice. For example, in an early intergroup interaction study by Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, and Howard (1997), White participants' interviews with both a Black and White confederate were videotaped and the amount of time that participants made visual contact with the interviewers was manually coded. The results demonstrated that participants high in implicit prejudice demonstrated no difference in the amount of visual contact with White compared to Black interaction partners. Participants low in implicit prejudice, however, looked *more* at the Black than White interviewer, demonstrating a surprising preference for outgroup faces.

The present research extends this past work on more general processing of ingroup and outgroup faces by investigating differential attention to *specific* facial features as a function of social category membership. Because of the importance of the eyes in particular to inferring

social cognitive processes, this type of research has the potential to inform us about a range of

intergroup biases. Notably, however, only a handful of studies have explored this topic and this

work has provided mixed results. For example, an initial study by Blais, Jack, Scheepers, Fiset,

and Caldara (2008) utilizing an eye tracker found that when presented with White and Asian

faces, White participants fixated more on the eye region and Asian participants fixated more on

the nose, regardless of the group membership of the target face (i.e., whether the face was an

ingroup or outgroup member). In contrast, experiments by Goldinger, He, and Papesh (2009) and

Wu, Laeng, and Magnussen (2012) demonstrated that White participants made more fixations

and spent significantly more time attending to the eyes of White than Asian faces. In an

additional study, Goldinger et al. (2009) found comparable ingroup effects with Asian

participants. Specifically, Asian participants fixated more on the eyes of Asian than White faces.

Because the results related to attention to Asian compared to White faces are mixed and

because there are several reasons why the findings associated with these two categories may be

specific to this intergroup context (i.e., eyes are a prototypical feature that distinguishes between

Whites and Asians), it is important to investigate visual attention to alternative social groups as

well. Notably, a recent study by Nakabayashi, Lloyd-Jones, Butcher, and Liu (2012) failed to

report an attentional preference by White participants for specific facial features of White

compared to Black faces.

The results related to a visual preference for the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup

faces are therefore inconclusive. Whereas only two experiments related to Asian targets have

shown that White participants attend more to the eyes of White relative to Asian faces

(Goldinger et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2012), a further study failed to replicate this finding by

demonstrating a Western preference for attention to the eyes of both Asian and White target

faces (Blais et al., 2008). Furthermore, this pattern of results has failed to conceptually replicate with Black faces. A primary goal of the present research, therefore, was to further investigate differential attention to ingroup and outgroup eyes and to extend this work by focusing on an intergroup context and group membership.

In the present studies, we focused on the gaze patterns of White participants in a Western culture and deliberately created an intergroup context by presenting ingroup and outgroup faces simultaneously. In accordance with previous research, we expected this strategy to increase group salience, activate social identities, and serve as a causal factor in determining intergroup differences (Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Inzlicht & Good, 2006). Whereas this procedure has been used in other studies investigating attentional preferences for Black and White faces more generally (Bean et al., 2012; Richeson, Todd, Trawalter, & Baird, 2008; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008; Trawalter et al., 2008), research on visual attention to specific facial features has typically presented target faces individually (Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012; Wu et al, 2012). One plausible reason for inconclusive results in past research on differential attention to ingroup and outgroup eyes may be the salience of the intergroup context. Indeed, the extent to which an intergroup context is salient is critical to the impact of social category membership on social cognitions (Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989). Furthermore, because North American society is becoming increasingly multi-cultural and multi-ethnic, and people are often in situations with both ingroup and outgroup members, it is important to understand attentional preferences in these situations. In the current paradigm, our focus was therefore on perception in an intergroup context and to achieve this goal we presented ingroup and outgroup faces simultaneously.

To examine the generalizability of preferential attention to ingroup eyes, we focused on target categories that have yet to show an ingroup gaze preference. Specifically, the present research explored visual attention by White participants to both the eyes of Black and White target faces and to the eyes of experimentally created ingroup and outgroup faces (Hugenberg & Corneille, 2009; Ratner & Amodio, 2013; Van Bavel & Cunningham, 2012; Young & Hugenberg, 2010). By including two sets of distinct target groups, this strategy allowed us to investigate more general processes related to intergroup face perception and a preference for ingroup over outgroup eyes. We expected that White participants would attend more to the eyes of White and experimentally created ingroup faces than Black and outgroup faces.

Notably, whereas previous social psychological research on whole face processing related to ingroups and outgroups has investigated the time course of general vigilance- and avoidance-based visual patterns (Amodio et al., 2003; Bean et al., 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008), previous cognitive studies on processing of specific facial features has tended to examine visual preference over a more extended period of time (Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2012). Although the former work has provided us with important information about the trajectory of distinct psychological processes related to social categories and about early automatic attentional biases toward outgroup members, because the present research focused on preferential attention to the eyes, we chose to analyze gaze patterns to ingroup and outgroup faces over a more extended period of time. This emphasis allowed us to better compare the present results with previous cognitive research on attention to specific facial features in target groups (Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2012). Because of the potential importance of attention to the eyes to understanding social cognitions in an intergroup context (Adams et al., 2010; Mason et al., 2004; Niedenthal et al., 2010), we

believe that this strategy could provide critical information on the general role of eye gaze to ingroups and outgroups in intergroup relations.

This decision to focus on a more extended period of time, however, has important implications for our ability to infer the timeline of specific early attentional vigilance or avoidance processes related to outgroups Although it is possible that if we restricted our focus to processes during a very short timeframe, we could find results indicative of an attentional preference for outgroups (Amodio et al., 2003; Bean et al., 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008), we are not convinced that this would necessarily be the case. Rather, because our interest is specifically on attention to the eye region, and because eye gaze may reflect a desire to better know or connect with the target person (Baron-Cohen et al., 1997; Mason et al., 2005), even early visual stages may show an avoidance of rather than preference for outgroup eyes. Though the longer timescale typical of the literature on preferential attention to face regions was more appropriate in the current work, it is worth noting that this choice has the tradeoff of making it unclear whether processes related to visual attention during this period are more deliberative or spontaneous. Despite the fact that participants in the present studies may have had the time to control their gaze patterns, it is difficult to determine whether they were consciously and deliberatively directing their attention in these paradigms.

Although the above questions related to very early stage visual processing and the controllability of attention to specific facial features are clearly important and relevant in the present context, the primary goals of the present research were to initially discover if a clear general preference for ingroup eyes exists when measured over a more extended time period and to examine how this preference would relate to current motivations and classic intergroup biases. While it is possible that our predictions and results would differ if we had limited our

investigation to initial orientation toward ingroup and outgroup target faces, we believe that this more general approach is an important first step.

The Impact of Motivation on Attention to Ingroup and Outgroup Eyes

A further aim of the present studies was to examine the extent to which patterns of visual attention are malleable and can be influenced by motivation. Whereas previous research has focused on the impact of more cognitive variables such as verbalization and effort on eye gaze (Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012), we investigated the impact of the goal to individuate outgroup members.

Fiske and Neuberg (1990), in their classic paper on impression formation, describe a model in which people initially form impressions of others on the basis of physical features and immediately noticeable characteristics that cue a specific category. For example, dark skin or large lips cue the category African American and long hair cues the category woman (Blair, Judd, & Chapleau, 2004; Blair, Judd, & Fallman, 2004). If motivated, however, people may subsequently focus on attributes that are more specific to a particular individual. These attributes may be personality traits or behaviors that are not implicated by the category label. For example, they may note that the person is shy or reticent when responding to requests from others. Importantly, a focus on certain physical features may also be indicative of such individuation processes.

Indeed, in the context of face perception, individuation is often defined as attending to and encoding unique physical characteristics of an individual (e.g., characteristics diagnostic of an individual's identity) rather than attending to and encoding category-diagnostic information (Hugenberg et al., 2010, 2012; Levin 1996, 2000). In accordance with this theorizing, we also

conceptualize individuation processes as an attempt to extract information from physical features associated with a target that distinguishes that individual from other members of a category.

Face perception theorists have argued that people are motivated to individuate the faces of ingroup relative to outgroup members (Levin, 1996, 2000; MacLin & Malpass, 2001). Moreover, they have suggested that motivations to individuate can influence attention in face processing. When processing ingroup faces, they propose that people will focus on specific features that can differentiate among category members (Hugenberg, Miller, & Claypool, 2007; Hugenberg & Sacco, 2008; Hugenberg et al., 2010; Pauker et al., 2009; Rhodes, Locke, Ewing, & Evangelista, 2009). Alternatively, when processing outgroup faces, they propose that people will focus on shared categorical features. Past studies, however, have not directly investigated this proposed attentional shift, nor has research demonstrated which specific facial features are implicated by these motivations to individuate in an intergroup context. The present research, therefore, investigated the relationship between motivations to individuate and eye gaze. Specifically, we examined whether motivations to individuate outgroup faces can attenuate the preference for ingroup over outgroup eyes.

Intergroup Biases

A final goal of the present research was to examine the relationship between biased attention to ingroup eyes and common intergroup biases. Across a wide body of research it has become clear that perceivers tend to be better at understanding and extracting information from ingroups relative to outgroups (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2003, 2004; Vorauer, Main, & O'Connell, 1998; Vorauer & Sakamoto, 2006). Despite our increasing knowledge of intergroup misperceptions and misunderstanding (Demoulin, Leyens, & Dovidio, 2009; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, & Dovidio, 2009), little is known

about how basic visual processes are related to such intergroup biases. In the current research, we directly investigated the relationship between preferential attention to ingroup eyes and two common intergroup biases – impaired outgroup recognition and a willingness to interact with outgroup members.

Extensive findings demonstrate that people often have difficulty in identifying and recognizing outgroup compared to ingroup faces (Hugenberg et al., 2010; Meissner & Brigham, 2001; Sporer, 2001). This Own Group Bias has been found with a wide variety of social categories including race (Meissner & Brigham, 2001), sex (Cross, Cross, & Daly, 1971), age (Rodin, 1987), sexual orientation (Rule, Ambady, Adams, & Macrae, 2007), and university affiliation (Bernstein et al., 2007; Hehman, Mania, & Gaertner, 2010; Hugenberg, Wilson, See, & Young, in press; Young, Bernstein, & Hugenberg, 2010). Because previous theorists have suggested that a possible determinant of the Own Race Bias is differential attention to individuating facial features of ingroup compared to outgroup faces (Hugenberg et al., 2010; Levin, 1996, 2000; MacLin & Malpass, 2001), it is plausible that this bias is related to eye gaze. In particular, if important individuating features of the face are the eyes, and if the Own Race Bias is driven in part by a focus on individuating features, preferential attention to the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup members should predict the Own Race Bias.

The present research also investigated the relationship between eye gaze and interpersonal preferences. A willingness to approach, interact with, or live in proximity with a member of a racial outgroup is a classic and long-lived issue in intergroup relations (Bogardus, 1947; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003), and has been linked to both prejudice and discrimination (Allport, 1954; Bogardus, 1947; Word, Zanna, & Cooper, 1974). In the present research we investigated the extent to which race-based differences in attention to the eyes were

related to Whites' willingness to interact with Blacks. Whereas previous research has investigated the relationship between the direction of a person's visual attention and intentions and approach-avoidance behaviors (Adams & Kleck, 2003, 2005; Itier & Batty, 2009; Mason et al, 2004, Mason et al., 2005), we explored whether greater attention to ingroup eyes was related to a greater willingness to interact with ingroup relative to outgroup members.

In summary, the current research directly examined the relationship between preferential eye gaze for ingroup members and two psychologically significant intergroup biases, recognition of outgroups and a willingness to interact with outgroups. Furthermore, we investigated the impact of individuation instructions on attention to the eyes of ingroup and outgroup members. We predicted that decreasing ingroup eye preference would decrease intergroup biases. By exploring attention to the eyes of members from two distinct sets of target groups, investigating the impact of motivation on eye gaze, and by testing the mediating role of preferential attention to ingroup eyes in both the Own Race Bias and a willingness to interact with Blacks, this research meaningfully extends previous investigations.

Overview

The primary goal of the present research was to investigate differential attention to the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup members in an intergroup context. To achieve this goal, in Study 1, we presented White participants simultaneously with faces of Blacks and Whites in an eye tracking task and recorded the extent to which they attended to the eyes of each target. In Study 2, we extended these initial results by investigating eye gaze to experimentally created ingroup and outgroup categories. In particular, after being categorized into one of two groups, ostensibly on the basis of a personality survey, participants were presented with ingroup and outgroup members and their eye gaze was monitored. In Studies 3 and 4, we examined the

impact of motivation to individuate on attention to the eyes and the relationship between eye gaze and common intergroup biases. In particular, prior to being presented with an eye tracking task related to Black and White faces, participants were instructed to individuate Blacks, individuate Whites, or were given no additional instructions. After completing the eye tracking phase in Study 3, participants were presented with a recognition task which included images from the eye tracking task and new images to measure the Own Race Bias. Alternatively, after completing the eye tracking phase in Study 4, participants were presented with a task in which they were asked to choose a partner from an array of images of Black and White faces that included targets from the eye tracking task and new images.

Across all four studies, we predicted that participants would attend more to the eyes of ingroup faces, whether race-based or experimentally created. Specifically, because we concentrated our analyses on the impact of presenting stimuli for a more extended period, we expected that White participants would focus more on the eyes of White and more novel ingroup faces than Blacks and outgroup faces. We also expected, however, that motivation to individuate Blacks would decrease participants' preference for ingroup eyes. Furthermore, we predicted that this decrease in attention to ingroup relative to outgroup eyes in turn would decrease common intergroup biases such as better recognition of ingroup relative to outgroup faces (i.e., the Own Race Bias) and an unwillingness to interact with Blacks. Taken together, we proposed that these studies will consistently demonstrate an attentional preference for the eyes of ingroup faces in an intergroup context and provide new evidence linking this preference to motivation and key intergroup biases.

Study 1

The primary goal of our first study was to investigate possible differential visual processing of facial features related to racial targets in an intergroup context. Specifically, White participants were informed that their eye movements would be recorded with an eye tracker while viewing pairs of faces. To investigate differential attention to own and other race faces, on critical trials a Black and White face were presented simultaneously. Of particular interest in these critical trials was whether perceivers would attend more to the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup faces.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Upon arrival in the laboratory, 29 (23 female) White undergraduates who participated in the study for course credit were presented with an eye tracking task related to Black and White targets. The sample sizes of previous studies investigating visual attention to ingroup and outgroup eyes have ranged from 12-14 per cell (Blais et al., 2008; Nakabayashi et al., 2012) to 18-20 per cell (Goldinger et al., 2009) to 43 per cell (Wu et al., 2012). Based on these latter studies, we initially aimed for 30 participants, however, because gaze patterns of some participants may be difficult to track, there are minor variations in the number of participants across experiments.

Eye Tracking Task. To monitor visual attention, all participants were seated behind an Eyelink monocular eye tracker (SR Research, Mississauga, Canada) with a sampling rate of 2000 Hz. Images were displayed on a 17-inch monitor at a resolution of 1024×768. To standardize the distance from the participants' head to the display monitor (70 cm) and to the eye tracker (55 cm), a chin rest was provided. Eye tracking calibration was established and validated before the presentation of experimental stimuli. After calibration, participants were told that they would be

asked to view a series of facial images on a computer screen and to pay careful attention to the photographs. Specifically, participants' eye movements were recorded while viewing 120 photographs of Black and White male and female undergraduate faces with neutral expressions.

The photographs included headshots of 30 Black females, 30 White females, 30 Black males, and 30 White males taken at a Canadian university with a Canon Powershot SX5 digital camera. To focus attention on internal facial features, Adobe Photoshop (San Jose, CA) was used to create oval images that excluded the target's hair. Images were also grey-scaled and standardized for size (360×450 pixels). The mean luminance and contrast for the pictures of Black and White faces (see Figure 1) was set within a restricted range (136.20 to 146.96 pixels per intensity level).

In order to compensate for small head movements and correct for eye drift during the study, each trial began with a drift correction requiring participants to focus on a calibration circle at the center of the screen. Once the calibration was manually accepted by the experimenter, participants were required to fixate on a cross (+) in the middle of the screen for 1000 ms. Whereas the presentation times of single faces in similar paradigms have ranged from 2000 ms (Nakabayashi et al., 2012) to 5000 ms (Wu et al., 2012) to 10000 ms (Goldinger et al., (2009), participants in the present study were presented with a pair of face images for 5000 ms followed by an intertrial interval which ranged up to 500 ms (the average length of the intertrial interval was 262 ms, $SD = 154$). Notably, Goldinger and his colleagues (2009) found that varying target presentation times from 5000 ms to 10000 ms did not influence fixations for facial features. Although our decision to focus on a more extended presentation time limits our ability to infer initial fast face processing related to outgroup vigilance and avoidance (Amodio et al., 2003; Bean et al., 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008), it allows us to better compare our findings

with previous research on attention to specific facial features of target groups (Goldinger et al.,

2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2012). In total, participants were presented with five

blocks of 12 trials with each block including four critical cross-race (two female and two male)

pairs.

On each trial, one face appeared to the left of the fixation point and one face appeared to

the right of the fixation point. In order to prevent participants from habituating to the specific

screen location of the stimuli across trials, the vertical position of the two faces varied both

across and within trials such that any given face (left face, right face) was equally likely to be

presented toward the top, middle, or bottom of the screen (Bean et al., 2012; Blais et al., 2008).

The images were presented in 60 same sex (30 females and 30 males) pairs. The 20 critical trials

presented cross-race pairs (10 Black-White females and 10 Black-White males) and 40 filler

trials presented same race pairs (10 Black-Black females, 10 White-White females, 10 Black-

Black males, 10 White-White males). To minimize confounds related to stimuli presentation,

there were two versions of the task which included different stimuli in the critical cross-race

pairs and a different random order of trials.

Results and Discussion

Before analyzing the data, the principal facial features were defined using

nonoverlapping areas of interest (see Figure 1). Although variability can exist in the

identification of these regions (Caldara & Miellet, 2011), we used standard procedures and

parameters for defining the eye, nose, and mouth regions such that the whole area providing

meaningful information (e.g., corners of the mouth, eyebrows) were included (Goldinger et al.,

2009; Henderson, Falk, Minut, Dyer, & Mahadevan, 2001; Henderson et al., 2005; Nakabayashi,

et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2012). The overall amount of time in milliseconds that participants gazed

at these three features for each face was recorded and the mean gaze latencies were calculated for Black and White faces separately. These mean latencies were divided by the total presentation time for each target set (5000 ms). To examine gaze patterns related to same and other race faces, a Target Race (Black vs. White) × Area of Interest (eyes vs. nose vs. mouth) repeated measures analysis of variance was performed on these gaze latency proportions.[1]

Whereas visual attention did not differ as a function of target race, $F(1, 28) = .01$, $p = .92$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, a significant main effect for Area of Interest was found, $F(2, 27) = 145.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .92$. In accordance with previous research (Henderson et al., 2005), simple effects analyses demonstrated that participants attended more to the eyes ($M = .268$, $SD = .064$) than the nose ($M = .074$, $SD = .044$), $t(28) = 10.04$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.53$, or mouth ($M = .045$, $SD = .024$), $t(28) = 14.96$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.61$. Furthermore, participants attended more to the nose than the mouth, $t(28) = 3.53$, $p = .001$, $d = .82$.

This main effect, however, was qualified by a significant Target Race × Area of Interest interaction, $F(2, 27) = 21.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .61$. Simple effects analyses examined the impact of race on attention to each feature separately. As predicted, participants attended more to the eyes of White ($M = .280$, $SD = .067$) than Black ($M = .255$, $SD = .065$) faces, $t(28) = 4.18$, $p < .001$, $d = .38$. However, participants attended more to the nose of Black ($M = .079$, $SD = .048$) than White ($M = .070$, $SD = .042$) faces, $t(28) = -2.99$, $p = .006$, $d = .20$, and more to the mouth of Black ($M = .052$, $SD = .028$) than White ($M = .037$, $SD = .023$) faces, $t(28) = -4.84$, $p < .001$, $d = .59$.[2]

In summary, the current results demonstrated that when presented simultaneously with Black and White targets, White participants attended to these faces differently. As expected, they attended more to the eyes of White than Black targets. Notably, participants did not pay more

attention to all facial features of White compared to Black targets but rather they attended more

to the nose and mouth of Blacks than Whites. Whereas previous studies have shown inconsistent

results related to an attentional preference by White participants' for the eyes of White versus

Asian faces (Blais et al., 2008; Goldinger et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2012), experiments focusing on

White versus Black faces have failed to show a preference for ingroup eyes (Dovidio et al., 1997;

Nakabayashi et al., 2012). The present results, however, indicated that in an intergroup context,

White participants demonstrated a strong preference for the eyes of White compared to Black

faces. To the extent that the eyes provide valuable information about others' social cognitions

(Adams & Kleck, 2003; Macrae et al., 2002; Mason et al., 2004; Mason et al., 2005; Niedenthal

et al., 2010), these findings suggest a greater desire to better understand the ingroup.

Study 2

Whereas the findings from Study 1 provided initial evidence that White participants

attend more to the eyes of White than Black faces, the primary goal of Study 2 was to

conceptually replicate these findings using an alternative, experimentally created ingroup

category. To investigate whether the findings in Study 1 were specific to race-based processes, a

particular target group, or more general intergroup processes, in Study 2 all participants were

initially categorized into one of two color groups based ostensibly on responses to a personality

survey. Although this procedure has been used successfully to activate group related motives

(DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett, & Cajdric, 2004) and create group-based biases in face recognition

(Bernstein et al., 2007; Young & Hugenberg, 2012), its impact on attention to facial features has

yet to be examined.

Once randomly assigned to either a Blue or Purple personality ingroup, participants were

presented with pairs of faces. Although all target faces in this study were White, in each pair one

face was displayed on a blue background and one face was displayed on a purple background. Participants were informed that the background color was indicative of the targets' personality type. This procedure allowed each face to be presented with equal frequency across participants as an ingroup or an outgroup member, thereby controlling for any low-level stimulus effects, differential expertise with ingroup and outgroup faces, or existing group associations. Because the results of previous experiments which included only one population may have been confounded with physical differences in the facial stimuli and findings by Goldinger et al. (2009) which utilized both White and Asian participants may have been influenced by cultural norms (Blais et al., 2008), manipulating group membership and holding both the specific faces and culture constant in the present context is especially important. In accordance with the results of Study 1, we expected participants to focus more on the eyes of ingroup than outgroup members.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Upon arrival in the laboratory, 59 (47 female) White undergraduates who participated in the study for course credit completed a personality survey to manipulate ingroup and outgroup status followed by an eye tracking task that included ingroup and outgroup faces. Although participants were randomly assigned to either the Blue or Purple personality condition, we included approximately 30 participants in each color cell to adequately assess the effect of the specific color condition on attention. As expected, analyses that included categorization into a specific ingroup (either Purple or Blue) as a variable showed no significant interactions with the predicted results.

Bogus Personality Survey. Participants were initially presented with a personality survey to induce ingroup and outgroup category perceptions (Bernstein et al., 2007; Young et al.,

2010). This survey consisted of 20 questions taken from Big Five personality tests (e.g., "I usually place myself nearer to the side than in the center of the room;" "I prefer to isolate myself from outside noises."). Participants were instructed to rate the extent to which each item described them on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*strongly*).

After completing the survey and a brief delay during which the computer ostensibly analyzed their results, half of the participants were informed on the computer monitor that on the basis of their responses they were a member of the blue personality group and half were informed that they were a member of the purple personality group. Participants were instructed to report their personality color to the experimenter and were subsequently given a colored wristband indicative of their group.

Eye Tracking Task. Next, all participants were moved to a different cubicle and presented with a modified version of the eye tracking task used in Study 1. In particular, rather than a mix of Black and White faces, the target stimuli now included only 64 White faces. These images were made up of a subset of 36 White faces (18 females and 18 males) used in Study 1 along with 28 additional White faces (14 females and 14 males) that were created with the same procedure used in the first experiment. All of these photographs, taken at a Canadian university, were presented in same sex pairs. In each pair, one face was presented on a purple background, the other face was presented on a blue background. On the basis of these background colors (which ostensibly represented the personality type of the person depicted in the photograph) and the initial categorization of the participant, each pair included an ingroup and outgroup member.

In total, participants were presented with 32 pairs (16 females and 16 males) of faces while their eye movements were recorded with the same Eyelink eye tracker used in Study 1. However, to facilitate calibration processes, the sampling rate was now reduced to 1000 Hz. A

drift correction requiring participants to focus on a calibration circle at the center of the screen

preceded each trial. Once the calibration was manually accepted by the experimenter,

participants were required to fixate on a cross for 1500 ms before a pair of face images was

presented. In accordance with previous findings (Goldinger et al., 2009), we did not expect that

changing the target presentation time would influence the pattern of results. However, to

examine whether our initial findings replicate when stimuli are presented for longer durations,

face pairs were presented for 7000 ms in Study 2. The intertrial intervals ranged from 1500 ms to

2000 ms.

Specifically, participants were presented with two blocks of sixteen trials. As in Study 1,

for half of the trials ingroup faces appeared at the top, middle, or bottom location on the left side

of the screen and outgroup faces appeared at the top, middle, or bottom location on the right side.

The opposite positioning was used for the other half of the trials. The order of the trials within

each block was random.

Results and Discussion

In accordance with Study 1 procedures, the mean gaze latencies for the eyes, nose, and

mouth were calculated for ingroup and outgroup faces separately. These latencies were divided

by the total presentation time for each target set (7000 ms). To examine gaze patterns related to

ingroup and outgroup faces, a Target Group (ingroup vs. outgroup) $\times$ Area of Interest (eyes vs.

nose vs. mouth) repeated measures analysis of variance was performed on these latency

proportions.

A significant main effect for Target Group was found in which participants attended

more to ingroup ($M = .126$, $SD = .014$) compared to outgroup ($M = .117$, $SD = .017$) faces, $F(1,$

$58) = 9.49$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$. A significant main effect for Area of Interest was also found,

$F(2, 57) = 240.77$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .89$. Analogous to the results in Study 1, simple effects

analyses demonstrated that participants attended more to the eyes ($M = .259$, $SD = .074$) than the

nose ($M = .067$, $SD = .043$), $t(58) = 13.11$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.17$, or mouth ($M = .040$, $SD = .025$),

$t(58) = 18.06$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.97$. Furthermore, participants attended more to the nose than the

mouth, $t(58) = 5.36$, $p < .001$, $d = .77$.

Importantly, these main effects were qualified by a marginally significant Target Group $\times$

Area of Interest interaction, $F(2, 57) = 2.88$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. Simple effects analyses

examined the impact of Target Group on attention to each feature separately. Conceptually

replicating the findings in Study 1, participants attended more to the eyes of ingroup ($M = .267$,

$SD = .077$) compared to outgroup ($M = .250$, $SD = .078$) faces, $t(58) = 2.82$, $p = .007$, $d = .22$.

Participants also attended more to the mouth of ingroup ($M = .042$, $SD = .027$) compared to

outgroup ($M = .038$, $SD = .026$) faces, $t(58) = 2.63$, $p = .01$, $d = .15$. Participants, however, did

not differ in the extent to which they attended to the nose of ingroup ($M = .068$, $SD = .046$) and

outgroup ($M = .065$, $SD = .042$) faces, $t(58) = 1.35$, $p = .18$, $d = .07$.

Although participants attended more to ingroup than outgroup faces in general, and this

pattern held for all facial features (though differential attention to the nose was not significant),

the two-way interaction suggests that the size of this ingroup preference differed depending on

the particular area of interest. To further investigate if intergroup categorizations influenced

attention to the eyes more than the other features, we computed difference scores related to gaze

latencies proportions to ingroup and outgroup faces for each feature separately. As expected, the

size of the ingroup preference related to the eyes ($M = .017$, $SD = .047$) was larger than the

ingroup preference related to the nose ($M = .003$, $SD = .018$), $t(58) = 2.31$, $p = .02$, $d = .39$, and

the mouth (*M* = .004, *SD* = .012), *t*(58) = 2.41, *p* = .02, *d* = .38. The size of the ingroup

preference for the nose and mouth, however, did not differ, *t*(58) = .45, *p* = .65, *d* = .07.

In summary, the results from Study 2 conceptually replicate the findings in Study 1 by

demonstrating that participants attended more to the eyes of ingroup than outgroup faces. These

findings also extended our initial results by showing that even when the ingroup/outgroup

distinction was not related to race, participants gazed longer at the eyes, in comparison to the

other facial features, of members of their own group relative to other groups. These results

provide evidence that the findings in Study 1 are not simply due to differences in physical

features related to the stimuli, differential expertise with own race faces, or existing race-related

associations. Despite the fact that all of the targets in Study 2 were White faces and that

participants were randomly assigned to either a blue or purple color category (and therefore had

an opposing set of faces as ingroup and outgroup members), the results related to the eyes in this

study conceptually replicated the pattern of results in Study 1. In contrast to the first study, when

presented with experimentally created ingroups, participants also attended more not less to the

mouth of their own than other group members but did not differ in attention to the nose. Because

the focus of the present research is on eye gaze, we will save further exploration of the

differential results related to these alternative facial features across experiments for the general

discussion.

Study 3

Together, the data from the first two experiments revealed converging evidence that

participants attended more to the eyes of members of their own than other groups. To the extent

that the eyes provide a rich source of social information to better understand (Itier & Batty, 2009;

Kleinke, 1986) and identify (Henderson et al., 2005; McKelvie, 1976) others, this focus may

indicate that participants were more motivated to know ingroup members. To directly investigate a possible relationship between eye gaze and perceiver motivation, Study 3 explored the impact of instructions to individuate on visual attention. Specifically, in this experiment we employed an eye tracking procedure similar to Study 1 where White perceivers were presented with White and Black faces. However, before completing this task, participants were randomly assigned to a condition in which they were instructed to individuate Whites, to individuate Blacks, or were given no additional instructions.

If people by default are motivated to individuate their ingroup, we expect that participants in the no instruction control condition and participants who were instructed to individuate Whites will attend more to the eyes of White in comparison to Black faces. Alternatively, participants who were instructed to individuate Blacks are expected to show an increase in their attention to the eyes of Black relative to White faces, attenuating the typical ingroup eye preference.

A further goal of this experiment was to investigate the relationship between eye gaze to ingroups and outgroups and one well-replicated intergroup phenomena in face perception – the Own Race Bias. In general, research has demonstrated that the eyes contain information that allows us to better identify and recognize specific individuals (McKelvie, 1976). When eye regions are masked, subsequent recognition drops significantly. Masking the nose or mouth, however, has little effect on later recognition performance. Based on these findings, we further predicted that greater attention to the eyes of White relative to Black targets would be associated with better recognition of White relative to Black faces. Indeed, if differential eye gaze plays a key role in the Own Race Bias, preferential attention to the eyes of ingroup over outgroup members should mediate biases in identifying ingroup relative to outgroup faces.

Although several studies have investigated the Own Race Bias and eye gaze, the results have failed to provide convincing evidence for a relationship between preferential attention to the eyes and an ingroup recognition bias. For example, whereas Goldinger et al. (2009) found that the extent of overall eye movements and pupil dilation differed as a function of the Own Race Bias, they did not report similar analyses for attention to specific facial features such as the eyes. Furthermore, whereas Wu et al. (2012) reported analyses on dwell times related to the eyes as a function of facial recognition, their results failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between target race (Asian vs. White), area of interest (including the eyes, nose, and mouth), and the Own Race Bias. Although the primary goal of the latter experiments was to better understand cognitive effort during encoding rather than attention to specific facial features, neither of these studies provide direct evidence related to the size or direction of a relationship between preferential attention to ingroup eyes and the Own Race Bias.

A further aim of the present research, therefore, was to specifically investigate the mediating role of attentional differences to the eyes in the subsequent biased identification of White compared to Black faces by experimentally manipulating eye gaze with individuation instructions. We expect that one reason why instructions to individuate Blacks can attenuate a common bias related to better recognition of ingroup relative to outgroup faces is because it decreases preferential attention to ingroup relative to outgroup eyes.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Upon entering the laboratory, 63 (49 female) White undergraduates who participated in the study for course credit were told that they would be presented with a series of faces while their eye movements were tracked and that they would subsequently complete a recognition task.

Before beginning the first task, however, participants were randomly assigned to one of three individuation conditions.

Individuation Instructions. To examine the impact of motivations to individuate on eye gaze, one third of the participants were instructed to individuate Blacks, one third were instructed to individuate Whites, and one third were given no specific instructions regarding race. Specifically, participants in the individuate Blacks condition were told that following the eye tracking task, they would be presented with a recognition memory task. They were also provided with the following text:

> You will have the opportunity to earn up to $8.00 based on your performance in the
>
> recognition task. For every Black face that you correctly recognize in the memory test
>
> you will be given 25¢. Therefore it is important that you try to remember the Black faces
>
> that you are presented with as individuals, paying attention to what makes them unique.
>
> Do your best to try to pay close attention to what differentiates one particular Black face
>
> from others.

Participants in the individuate Whites condition were presented with similar instructions, however, these participants were told that they would be compensated for the correct recognition of White rather than Black faces.

Eye Tracking Task. Participants were presented with an eye tracking task related to Black and White faces that was similar to Study 1 with several modifications. First, participants were presented with a total of 64 photographs of undergraduate faces which included 16 Black females, 16 White females, 16 Black males, and 16 White males. Specifically, 32 critical same sex pairs (16 females and 16 males) of Black-White faces used in Study 1 were presented in this task. Each pair of faces was presented for 7000 ms while participants' eye movements were

recorded. A drift correction requiring participants to focus on a calibration circle at the center of the screen preceded each trial. Once the calibration was manually accepted by the experimenter, participants were required to fixate on a cross for 1500 ms. The intertrial intervals ranged from 1500 to 2000 ms. In total, participants were presented with four blocks of eight trials.

Recognition Phase. After completing the eye tracking phase, participants were moved to a different cubicle and presented with a recognition task. Specifically, participants were presented with 64 faces that included 32 faces previously shown in the eye tracking task (8 Black females, 8 White females, 8 Black males, and 8 White males) and 32 new faces. These latter images were grey-scaled and matched with the previously shown faces on gender, race, mean luminance, and contrast. Faces were presented individually and in a random order. Images were displayed in the center of the computer screen and participants were asked to identify the image as either old (previously seen) or new (not previously seen) using one of two computer keys. To ensure that participants attended to each face, each image was presented for 400 ms before the response options appeared on screen. The image and response options remained on screen until the participant responded, after which the next image was immediately presented.

Results and Discussion

Gaze Pattern

Before analyzing the data related to the eye tracking task, the mean gaze latencies for the eyes, nose, and mouth were calculated for Black and White faces separately and divided by the total presentation time for each target set (7000 ms). To investigate the impact of motivation to individuate on attention to facial features, a Target Race (Black vs. White) × Area of Interest (eyes vs. nose vs. mouth) × Motivation to Individuate (Blacks vs. Whites vs. control) analysis of variance with the first two factors within-subjects was performed on these latency proportions.

Replicating the results in Study 1, the main effect for Target Race was not significant, $F(1, 60) = .51$, $p = .48$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, but the main effect for Area of Interest was significant, $F(2, 59) = 194.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .87$. Participants attended more to the eyes ($M = .252$, $SD = .059$) than the nose ($M = .068$, $SD = .035$), $t(62) = 16.87$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.79$, and the mouth ($M = .048$, $SD = .030$), $t(62) = 20.19$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.36$. Furthermore, participants attended more to the nose than the mouth, $t(62) = 3.91$, $p < .001$, $d = .61$.

Although the Target Race × Area of Interest, $F(2, 59) = 3.02$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$, and the Target Race × Motivation to Individuate, $F(2, 60) = 36.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .55$, two-way interactions were marginal and significant, respectively, these effects were qualified by the predicted Target Race × Area of Interest × Motivation to Individuate three-way interaction, $F(4, 118) = 10.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .27$, see Figure 2.

To examine whether eye gaze can be influenced by current motivation, we investigated the Target Race × Area of Interest interaction separately for each individuation instruction condition. Replicating the effects in Study 1, this interaction was significant in the no instruction control condition, $F(2, 18) = 8.69$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .49$. Specifically, when not provided with additional instructions, White participants attended more to the eyes of White ($M = .259$, $SD = .065$) in comparison to Black ($M = .233$, $SD = .059$) faces, $t(19) = 3.31$, $p = .004$, $d = .42$. Furthermore, participants attended more to the nose of Black ($M = .080$, $SD = .046$) in comparison to White ($M = .073$, $SD = .041$) faces, $t(19) = 2.58$, $p = .02$, $d = .16$, and marginally more to the mouth of Black ($M = .044$, $SD = .023$) in comparison to White ($M = .038$, $SD = .022$) faces, $t(19) = 1.91$, $p = .07$, $d = .27$.

For participants instructed to individuate Whites, a Target Race × Area of Interest interaction also emerged, $F(2, 21) = 13.26$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .56$. In accordance with the no

instruction control condition, these participants attended more to the eyes of White (M = .353, SD = .115) in comparison to Black (M = .157, SD = .087) faces, $t(22)$ = 5.05, $p < .001$, d = 1.92. In contrast to the control condition, however, these participants also attended more to the nose of White (M = .087, SD = .041) in comparison to Black (M = .049, SD = .038) faces, $t(22)$ = 3.66, p = .001, d = .96, and to the mouth of White (M = .067, SD = .047) in comparison to Black (M = .030, SD = .024) faces, $t(22)$ = 3.89, p = .001, d = .99.

Because participants attended more to all features of White compared to Black faces when instructed to individuate Whites, we further examined this two-way interaction to determine whether individuation instructions influenced attention to the eyes to a greater degree than the other facial features. In particular, we analyzed difference scores related to the gaze latencies to Black and White faces separately for each area of interest with higher scores indicating greater attention to White than Black features. These analyses indicated that when instructed to individuate Whites, the size of the ingroup preference related to the eyes (M = .196, SD = .186) was larger than the ingroup preference related to the nose (M = .038, SD = .049), $t(22)$ = 5.10, $p < .001$, d = 1.62, and the mouth (M = .038, SD = .046), $t(22)$ = 4.55, $p < .001$, d = 1.66. The size of the ingroup preference for the nose compared to the mouth did not differ, $t(22)$ = .003, p = 1.00, d = .00.

Although the Target Race × Area of Interest two-way interaction was also significant for participants instructed to individuate Blacks, $F(2, 18)$ = 5.38, p = .02, η_p^2 = .37, the gaze pattern was notably different. In contrast to the results in the no instruction control condition, simple effects analyses demonstrated that these participants attended *more* to the eyes of Black (M = .325, SD = .115) relative to White (M = .187, SD = .094) faces, $t(19)$ = 4.19, $p < .001$, d = 1.31. However, in accordance with the control condition, these participants also attended more to the

nose of Black ($M = .084$, $SD = .052$) in comparison to White ($M = .036$, $SD = .023$) faces, $t(19) = 4.20$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.19$, and to the mouth of Black ($M = .076$, $SD = .052$) in comparison to White ($M = .030$, $SD = .027$) faces, $t(19) = 5.78$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.10$.

Because participants attended more to all features of Black compared to White faces when instructed to individuate Blacks, we further examined this two-way interaction to determine whether individuation instructions influenced attention to the eyes to a greater degree than the other facial features. In particular, we analyzed difference scores related to the gaze latencies to Black and White faces separately for each area of interest. These analyses indicated that when instructed to individuate Blacks, the size of the outgroup preference related to the eyes ($M = -.138$, $SD = .147$) was larger than the outgroup preference related to the nose ($M = -.048$, $SD = .051$), $t(19) = -3.30$, $p = .004$, $d = .82$, and the mouth ($M = -.046$, $SD = .036$), $t(19) = -2.98$, $p = .008$, $d = .86$. The size of the outgroup preference for the nose and mouth, however, did not differ, $t(19) = -.17$, $p = .86$, $d = .05$.

Face Recognition

The next analyses investigated the Own Race Bias and the impact of individuation instructions on this phenomenon. As a measure of overall recognition, a signal detection measure of discriminability (d') was used to assess participants' ability to distinguish between previously seen and new faces. Specifically, z scores related to the proportion of hits (correct identification of old faces) and false alarms (incorrect identification of new faces) for each racial target group were calculated and subtracted such that higher d' scores indicated better recognition. To investigate the impact of motivation to individuate on face recognition, a Target Race (Black vs. White) × Type of Motivation (Individuate Blacks vs. Individuate Whites vs. control) analysis of variance with the first factor within-subjects and the second factor between-subjects was

performed on these d' scores. A significant main effect for Target Race was found, $F(1, 60) =$ 6.96, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. Replicating previous findings related to the Own Race Bias, our results showed that participants were better at recognizing White ($M = 1.472$, $SD = .801$) in comparison to Black ($M = 1.176$, $SD = .812$) faces.

This main effect, however, was qualified by the predicted Target Race × Motivation to Individuate interaction, $F(2, 60) = 7.11$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$, see Figure 3. Simple effects analyses examined the impact of Target Race for each type of motivation separately. For participants in the control condition, who did not receive any additional instructions, the results provide further evidence for the Own Race Bias. Specifically, White participants showed better recognition for White ($M = 1.603$, $SD = .685$) than Black ($M = 1.217$, $SD = .843$) faces, $t(19) =$ 2.14, $p = .046$, $d = .50$. Although participants who were instructed to individuate Whites also demonstrated better recognition for White ($M = 1.603$, $SD = .651$) than Black ($M = .912$, $SD =$ .730) faces, $t(22) = 3.35$, $p = .003$, $d = 1.00$, this difference was larger than in the control condition. More importantly in the present context, participants who were instructed to individuate Blacks showed an attenuation of the Own Race Bias. In fact, these participants were marginally *better, not worse*, at recognizing Black ($M = 1.439$, $SD = .817$) than White ($M =$ 1.188, $SD = 1.006$) faces, $t(19) = -1.83$, $p = .08$, $d = .27$.

Relationship between Eye Gaze and Own Race Bias

To explore the relationship between eye gaze and biased recognition of White over Black faces, we utilized regression analyses to investigate mediational processes. Based on current recommendations for mediation analyses (Hayes, 2009; MacKinnon, Lockwood, West, & Sheets, 2002; Rucker, Preacher, Tormala, & Petty, 2011; Zhao, Lynch, & Chen, 2010), we examined the magnitude and significance of the indirect effects. Specifically, our initial set of

analyses focused on the impact of the individuate Blacks condition compared to the control no motivation condition. We first computed our mediator, preference for ingroup eyes, by subtracting the proportion of gaze time to the eyes of Black from White targets with higher scores indicating greater attention to the eyes of Whites faces. We then regressed eye gaze on motivations to individuate Blacks compared to the control condition (the independent variable). As expected, instructions to individuate Blacks significantly decreased preference for the eyes of White compared to Black faces, $b = -.16$, $p < .001$. Next, we calculated an index of own race bias by subtracting recognition d' scores for Black from White targets with higher scores indicating better recognition of White faces. These scores were regressed simultaneously on individuation motivations and preference for ingroup eyes. As expected, preferential attention to ingroup eyes predicted the Own Race Bias, $b = 2.07$, $p = .05$. Confidence intervals for this effect created with 5000 bootstrap samples (CI 95% -.64 and -.06) did not include zero suggesting that decreased attention to the eyes of White relative to Black faces is a possible mediator of the relationship between instructions to individuate Blacks and a decrease in biased recognition of White relative to Black faces.

We ran an additional set of mediation analyses related to responses in the individuate Whites condition compared to the control no motivation condition. Specifically, difference scores related to attention to the eyes of Black compared to White faces (the mediator) were regressed on motivations to individuate Whites compared to the control condition (the independent variable). Instructions to individuate Whites significantly increased preference for the eyes of White compared to Black faces, $b = .17$, $p < .001$. When difference scores related to the Own Race Bias (the dependent variable) were regressed simultaneously on individuation motivations and preference for ingroup eyes, attention to ingroup eyes predicted the Own Race

Bias, $b = 2.69$, $p = .007$. Confidence intervals for this effect created with 5000 bootstrap samples (CI 95% -.79 and -.25) did not include zero. These findings suggest that increased attention to the eyes of White relative to Black faces is a possible mediator of the relationship between instructions to individuate Whites and an increase in biased recognition of White relative to Black faces.

In summary, the findings related to the eye tracking task in the no instruction control condition replicate the pattern of results related to the preferential attention to ingroup eyes in Studies 1 and 2. As expected, a similar though stronger effect was found in the individuate Whites condition. This preference, however, was reversed among participants in the individuate Blacks condition. Specifically, when perceivers were sufficiently motivated, they attended closely to the informationally rich eye regions of outgroup faces. Furthermore, although the individuation instructions motivated participants to attend more in general to all facial features of members of this group, as indicated by the significant three-way interaction and the pattern of results, the instructions were particularly effective in driving attention to the eyes of target group members.

Replicating previous findings on the Own Race Bias (Meissner & Brigham, 2001), the results from the recognition task demonstrated that participants had better memory for own as compared to other race faces in both the control and the individuate Whites conditions. Consistent with recent theorizing (Hugenberg et al., 2007, 2010; Levin, 1996, 2000), these findings suggest that individuating Whites may be the default mode in own race perceptions. Notably, when participants were instructed to individuate Blacks, the pattern was strikingly different. Specifically, these latter instructions attenuated the Own Race Bias and participants in this condition showed somewhat better recall for Black in comparison to White faces.

Finally, the current experiment also provided new information on the relationship between group-based preferences in eye gaze and biased face recognition. Whereas previous research has failed to directly test the impact of attention to ingroup eyes on the Own Race Bias, the present research manipulated eye gaze with individuation instructions and examined the impact of changes in attention to outgroup eyes on recognition of outgroup faces. Our results indicated that one key mechanism for the misidentification of outgroup faces is a deficit in attention to the eyes of outgroup members and that by decreasing attention to ingroup relative to outgroup eyes, motivations to individuate Blacks can effectively reduce the Own Race Bias.

Study 4

Study 3 highlighted the role of perceiver motivation on visual processing of intergroup faces and provided novel evidence that preferential attention to ingroup relative to outgroup eyes can predict the misidentification of outgroup faces. In Study 4 we sought to extend these findings by investigating another form of intergroup bias, a willingness to interact with outgroup members. Specifically, we investigated the relationship between individuation motivations, attention to Black eyes, and the selection of Black partners.

Notably, recent research has underlined the importance of approach behaviors and a willingness to interact with outgroup members for racial attitudes and intergroup relations. For example, several experiments have demonstrated that an approach orientation toward outgroup members can reduce implicit prejudice, increase positive behaviors in interracial interactions, and increase identification with target categories (Kawakami et al., 2007; Kawakami, Steele, Cifa, Phills, & Dovidio, 2008; Phills, Kawakami, Tabi, Nadolny, & Inzlicht, 2011). Because such intentions to interact can impact a broad array of intergroup behaviors, understanding their antecedents has widespread implications.

Whereas more generally theorists have suggested that eye gaze signals approach motivations (Mason et al., 2005; Richeson et al., 2008), we propose more specifically that a preference for ingroup eyes will be closely related to a decreased willingness to interact with and approach outgroup members. To specifically investigate the mediating role of attention to the eyes in intentions to interact with outgroup members, we once again experimentally manipulated ingroup eye gaze with individuation instructions. We expected that one reason why instructions to individuate Blacks can attenuate the likelihood of choosing a previously presented White relative to Black target as a partner is because it decreases preferential attention to ingroup relative to outgroup eyes.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Upon entering the laboratory, 63 (46 female) White undergraduates who participated in the study for course credit were required to complete an eye tracking task in which they were presented with a series of faces while their eye movements were monitored. To investigate the impact of individuation motivations on eye gaze, before beginning this task participants were randomly assigned to either an individuate Blacks or individuate Whites condition. Because the pattern of results related to the control condition were in the same direction as the individuate Whites condition in Study 3, in the current experiment we focused on the two conditions related to motivation instructions.

Although all participants after receiving individuation instructions, completed the eye tracking task followed by a partner choice task to measure their willingness to interact with an outgroup member, the data from one participant related to experimenter error and nine participants related to programming error were not included in the analyses of the eye tracking

responses. The data from two participants related to experimenter error were not included in the

analyses of partner choice.

Eye Tracking Task. After receiving individuation instructions, participants were

presented with the same eye tracking task used in Study 3 which included 64 undergraduate

faces (16 Black females, 16 White females, 16 Black males, and 16 White males) presented in 32

critical same sex pairs of Black-White faces.

Partner Choice. After the eye tracking phase, participants were moved to a different

cubicle and asked to complete a task in which they were instructed to choose potential

interaction partners. They were told that this pilot study would inform future research. In total,

64 faces were included in the task; 32 of these faces had been previously presented in the eye

tracking task (8 Black females, 8 White females, 8 Black males, and 8 White males) and 32 were

new faces that had not previously been presented. These latter images were grey-scaled and

matched with the previously seen faces on gender, race, mean luminance, and contrast.

On each trial participants were presented with an array of four same sex faces that

consisted of two previously seen faces, one Black and one White, and two new faces, one Black

and one White. These faces were displayed in a quadrant and were labeled "Person 1," "Person

2," Person 3," and "Person 4." The position of the types of targets was randomized across trials.

Participants were asked to select from the four potential partners, the person they would most

like to work with. The faces remained on screen until participants chose their preferred partner

using one of four computer keys after which the next trial was immediately presented. In total,

participants completed 16 trials.

Based on current theorizing on interpersonal attraction and the mere exposure effect, we

expected that, in general, participants would be more attracted to familiar over unfamiliar targets

(Moreland & Topolinski, 2010; Zajonc, 1968). In particular, we predicted that participants would prefer to interact more with previously seen than new targets. However, we also expected that both motivation instructions and target race would impact this effect. Specifically, we predicted that although participants who were instructed to individuate Whites would prefer the previously seen White over Black faces, instructions to individuate Blacks would attenuate this preference. Furthermore, we predicted that instructions to individuate Blacks would increase attention to Black relative to White eyes and that this effect would be related to a greater willingness to interact with familiar outgroup over ingroup targets.

Results and Discussion

Gaze Pattern

Before analyzing the eye tracking data, the mean gaze latencies for the eyes, nose, and mouth were calculated for Black and White faces separately and divided by the total presentation time for each target set (7000 ms). To investigate the impact of motivation to individuate on attention to facial features, a Target Race (Black vs. White) × Area of Interest (eyes vs. nose vs. mouth) × Motivation to Individuate (Blacks vs. Whites) analysis of variance with the first two factors within-subjects was performed on these latency proportions.

Consistent with the results in Studies 1 and 3, the main effect for Target Race was not significant, $F(1, 51) = .01$, $p = .93$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, but the main effect for Area of Interest was significant, $F(2, 50) = 168.74$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .87$. Participants attended more to the eyes ($M = .265$, $SD = .074$) than the nose ($M = .069$, $SD = .033$), $t(52) = 14.80$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.42$, and the mouth ($M = .049$, $SD = .029$), $t(52) = 17.70$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.84$. Furthermore, participants attended more to the nose than the mouth, $t(52) = 4.66$, $p < .001$, $d = .64$.

Although the Target Race × Motivation to Individuate two-way interaction was significant, $F(1, 51) = 20.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .29$, this effect was qualified by the predicted Target Race × Area of Interest × Motivation to Individuate three-way interaction, $F(2, 50) = 10.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$, see Figure 4.

To examine whether attention to outgroup eyes can be influenced by perceiver motivation, we investigated the Target Race × Area of Interest interaction separately for each motivation condition. In accordance with the results in Study 3, this interaction was significant in the individuate Whites condition, $F(2, 25) = 7.39$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .37$. Simple effects analyses demonstrated that when instructed to individuate White faces, participants attended more to the eyes of White ($M = .310$, $SD = .091$) in comparison to Black ($M = .230$, $SD = .093$) faces, $t(26) = 3.41$, $p = .002$, $d = .87$. However, these participants did not differ in the extent to which they attended to the nose of White ($M = .070$, $SD = .038$) in comparison to Black ($M = .061$, $SD = .036$) faces, $t(26) = 1.08$, $p = .29$, $d = .24$, or the mouth of White ($M = .047$, $SD = .041$) in comparison to Black ($M = .038$, $SD = .027$) faces, $t(26) = 1.01$, $p = .32$, $d = .26$. Thus, when instructed to individuate Whites, participants attended more to the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup targets but did not increase attention to the nose or mouth of these members.

Although the Target Race × Area of Interest two-way interaction was also significant in the individuate Blacks condition, $F(2, 24) = 3.51$, $p = .046$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$, the gaze pattern was notably different. Simple effects analyses demonstrated that participants who were instructed to individuate Black faces attended *more* to the eyes of Black ($M = .290$, $SD = .105$) in comparison to White ($M = .230$, $SD = .073$) faces, $t(25) = 3.53$, $p = .002$, $d = .66$. These participants also attended more to the nose of Black ($M = .083$, $SD = .040$) in comparison to White ($M = .064$, SD

= .036) faces, $t(25) = 4.74$, $p < .001$, $d = .50$, and the mouth of Black ($M = .066$, $SD = .037$) in

comparison to White ($M = .043$, $SD = .029$) faces, $t(25) = 5.05$, $p < .001$, $d = .69$.

Because participants attended more to all features of Black compared to White faces

when instructed to individuate Blacks, we further examined this two-way interaction to

determine whether individuation instructions influenced attention to the eyes to a greater extent

than attention to the other facial features. In particular, we analyzed difference scores related to

the gaze latencies to Black and White faces separately for each area of interest. These analyses

indicated that when instructed to individuate Blacks, the size of the outgroup preference was

larger for the eyes ($M = -.06$, $SD = .087$) than the nose ($M = -.019$, $SD = .020$), $t(25) = 2.69$, $p =$

.013, $d = .65$, and the mouth ($M = -.023$, $SD = .023$), $t(25) = 2.53$, $p = .018$, $d = .58$. The size of

the outgroup preference for the nose and mouth, however, did not differ, $t(25) = 1.11$, $p = .28$, d

= .19.

Partner Choice

To create an index of willingness to interact with Blacks, we totaled the number of times

during the sixteen trials a previously seen Black face, a new Black face, a previously seen White

face, or a new White face was chosen as a potential partner. To investigate the impact of

motivation to individuate on partner choice, a Target Race (Black vs. White) × Familiarity

(Previously Seen vs. New Face) × Motivation to Individuate (Blacks vs. Whites) analysis of

variance with the first two factors within-subjects was performed on the choice totals.

Consistent with our predictions, a significant main effect for Familiarity was found, $F(1,$

$59) = 38.52$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .40$. As expected, participants selected faces that they had

previously seen ($M = 9.48$, $SD = 1.894$) more often than new faces ($M = 6.52$, $SD = 1.894$) as

potential partners. A significant main effect for Target Race was also found, $F(1, 59) = 35.62$, p

$< .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .38$. Participants overwhelming preferred White ($M = 10.79$, $SD = 3.139$) in comparison to Black ($M = 5.21$, $SD = 3.139$) partners.

These main effects, however, were qualified by the predicted Target Race × Familiarity × Motivation to Individuate three-way interaction, $F(1, 59) = 4.06$, $p = .049$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$, see Figure 5. Simple effects analyses examined the impact of Target Race and Motivation to Individuate for new and previously seen faces separately. Whereas the Target Race × Motivation to Individuate two-way interaction was not significant for new faces, $F(1, 59) = .29$, $p = .59$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, it was significant for previously seen faces, $F(1, 59) = 5.19$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$. Simple effects analyses related to this latter interaction demonstrated that when motivated to individuate Whites, participants strongly preferred familiar White ($M = 6.40$, $SD = 2.472$) over familiar Black ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 2.157$) partners, $t(29) = 4.83$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.48$. However, motivations to individuate Blacks attenuated this preference. In particular, when motivated to individuate Blacks, participants did not differ in their choice of familiar White ($M = 5.32$, $SD = 2.427$) and familiar Black ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 2.554$) partners, $t(30) = 1.00$, $p = .32$, $d = .35$.

Relationship between Eye Gaze and Partner Choice

To explore the indirect effects of eye gaze on a willingness to interact with Blacks, we utilized regression analyses to investigate mediational processes. Specifically, we first computed our mediator, preference for ingroup eyes, by subtracting the gaze latency proportions to the eyes of Black from White targets with higher scores indicating greater attention to the eyes of Whites faces. We then regressed eye gaze on motivations to individuate White versus Blacks (the independent variable). As expected, instructions to individuate Blacks significantly decreased preference for the eyes of White compared to Black faces $b = -.07$, $p < .001$. Next, we calculated an index of partner choice. To control for the tendency to select previously seen over new faces

more generally, we first subtracted the number of trials on which a new target was selected from the number of trials on which a previously seen target was selected for Black and White targets separately. The Black difference scores were then subtracted from the White difference scores with higher scores indicating a preference for familiar White over Black partners. These partner scores were regressed simultaneously on individuation motivations and preference for ingroup eyes. As expected, preferential attention to ingroup eyes predicted partner choice, $b = 12.64$, $p = .01$. Although 95% confidence intervals for this effect created with 5000 bootstrap samples included zero, 90% confidence intervals (-1.71 and -.13) did not. Furthermore, a Sobel test of the indirect effect (a x $b = -.86$) was significant, $z = -2.19$, $p = .03$. Together these results suggest that to some extent decreased attention to the eyes of Blacks relative to Whites mediates the relationship between individuation instructions and partner choice.

In summary, the current findings related to attention to the eyes replicate the pattern of results from Study 3. When motivated to individuate Whites, participants attended more to the eyes of White compared to Black faces. This attentional preference, however, was reversed among participants in the individuate Blacks condition. Although instructions to individuate Blacks motivated participants to attend more generally to all of the facial features of target group members, the significant three-way interaction and the pattern of results indicated that these instructions were particularly effective in focusing attention on the eyes. In contrast to Study 3, preferences for facial features when participants were instructed to individuate White targets were more specific to the eyes. The latter participants did not demonstrate preference for White over Black noses or mouths.

The results also demonstrated that individuation instructions can influence partner choice. Specifically, when instructed to individuate Whites during the eye tracking task, participants

were more likely to subsequently choose a familiar White over Black partner. However, when instructed to individuate Blacks, this bias was no longer evident and participants failed to show a preference for familiar White over Black partners. Furthermore, the current experiment indicates that a possible key mechanism for racial biases in partner choice may be a deficit in attention to the eyes of outgroup members. One reason why individuation processes increase the choice of familiar Black partners may be because they foster attention to the eyes of Black relative to White faces. Supporting theorizing that eye gaze can be closely related to approach orientations (Mason et al., 2005; Richeson et al., 2008), these results provide new evidence for a relationship between attention to the eyes of Black faces and a willingness to interpersonally interact with Blacks.

General Discussion

The primary goal of the present research was to investigate how visual attention is allocated to ingroup and outgroup faces. The results highlight the importance of the eyes when processing members of different social categories. Specifically, Study 1 demonstrated that White participants attended more to the eyes of White in comparison to Black faces and the nose and mouth of Black in comparison to White faces. This pattern was replicated in Study 3 in the control condition. Notably, the eye gaze results were also conceptually replicated in Study 2 with experimentally created artificial categories. In particular, participants attended more to the eyes of ingroup in comparison to outgroup members. However, these latter participants also attended more to the mouth of ingroup than outgroup members and did not differ in their attention to the nose. In short, the results related to visual attention to the eyes provide consistent evidence for a preference for ingroup members.

The present research also extended previous findings by uniquely studying the impact of motivation on eye gaze (Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Whereas previous studies have investigated the impact of more cognitive factors such as verbalization and effort on attention to intergroup facial features (Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al., 2012), two of the current experiments investigated the impact of individuation motivations. In particular, Studies 3 and 4 examined whether instructions to individuate category members can influence eye gaze. The results demonstrated that when instructed to individuate Blacks, participants attended more to the eyes of Black compared to White targets. Notably, this shift in focus occurred for outgroup faces whose eyes normally receive less attention than ingroup faces, reversing typical attentional patterns. These findings extend past empirical work by providing new evidence for a close link between individuation processes and eye gaze. Furthermore, these results support earlier theorizing that assumed default individuation processes for members of one's own social group (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Hugenberg et al., 2007; Hugenberg et al., 2010; Levin, 1996, 2000).

In interpreting these results, it is important to take the current procedure into account. In particular, the target stimuli in all of the experiments were presented in pairs which included an ingroup and outgroup face. Although this strategy was intentionally utilized to investigate visual attention in an intergroup context (Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Inzlicht & Good, 2006), and has previously been used to explore temporal preferences in attention to Black and White faces (Bean et al., 2012; Richeson et al., 2008; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008; Trawalter et al., 2008), it may have meaningfully impacted gaze patterns. Because all faces were presented for a set amount of time, focusing on the feature of one face reduced the amount of time available to focus on the other features or the other face. Though the results related to the individuation instructions in Studies 3 and 4 indicated that motivating participants to individuate both Black

and White faces increased attention to the eyes of faces from a particular target category, it also

decreased the amount of time participants attended to the eyes of faces from an alternative group

that was not the target category. Whereas future research may productively utilize an alternative

strategy to manipulate intergroup context and present single target faces in an attempt to tease

apart these hydraulic effects, the present results provide important information on how ingroups

and outgroups may be processed simultaneously, as may be the case in an increasingly multi-

cultural society.

Together the present findings provide strong evidence for the impact of social category

membership on attention to the eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup faces. Regardless of whether

we varied a number of important theoretical variables such as racial versus novel target

categories or more mundane procedural dimensions such as the number of trials and facial

stimuli, target presentation latencies, sampling rate, and length of the intertrial intervals, the

current experiments consistently demonstrated a preference for ingroup eyes. Notably, whereas

previous studies have demonstrated an inconsistent pattern of results related to attention to

intergroup facial features (e.g., Blais et al., 2008; Goldinger et al., 2009; Nakabayashi et al.,

2012; Wu et al., 2012), the present findings suggest that these differences may not be solely due

to divergences in these types of methodological factors.

Although the present research focused on individuation processes and attention to the

eyes of ingroup relative to outgroup members, the findings related to other facial features are

notable. In both Study 1 and the control condition in Study 3, participants attended at least

somewhat more to the nose and mouth of Black in comparison to White faces. However, when

presented with experimentally created ingroups and outgroups in Study 2, participants attended

more to the mouth but not the nose of ingroup than outgroup members. Because of greater

attention to the nose and mouth of Black targets in Study 1, an overall preference for White faces was not found. When social categories were based on more novel ingroup-outgroup distinctions, however, participants demonstrated a main effect for type of social category that was qualified by a category by feature interaction.

One possible explanation for these distinct gaze patterns for noneye regions in the current experiments may be associated with differences in prototypical features related to the particular ingroups and outgroups. Whereas specific features are not readily associated with the experimentally created categories used in Study 2, this is not the case for Blacks. Specifically, recent research has indicated that skin tone, hair quality, noses, and mouths are considered to be the primary prototypical features of Afrocentricity (Blair, Judd, & Chapleau, 2004; Blair, Judd, & Fallman, 2004; Blair, Judd, Sadler, & Jenkins, 2002; Livingston & Brewer, 2002; Maddox, 2004). Because in the present context differences in skin tone were held constant and hair was cropped from each image, attention to the nose and mouth of Black relative to White targets may indicate attention to category-diagnostic characteristics of outgroup members (Hugenberg et al., 2010; Levin, 1996, 2000).

It is important to note, however, that past research has demonstrated similar patterns of attention to noneye features for both Asian and White faces. In particular, Goldinger et al. (2009) have shown that White *and* Asian participants attend more to the nose and mouth of outgroups (Asian and White targets, respectively) than ingroups. Although it is possible that the nose and mouth may be stereotypically associated with features of Whites by Asians and of Asians by Whites, it is also possible that participants are focusing on alternative facial features of outgroup members to avoid attending to their eyes (Richeson & Trawalter, 2008). If the latter theorizing were true, one might expect a similar pattern to the features of novel outgroup faces. However,

this pattern was not evident in Study 2. Nonetheless, future research should investigate whether such attentional avoidance is reserved for social categories stereotypically associated with danger and threat (Richeson et al., 2008; Trawalter et al., 2008) by continuing to study a variety of social groups with different sets of prototypical facial features.

Because past research has demonstrated that the degree of racial prototypicality of specific facial features can influence a wide range of evaluations and judgments -- from stereotype attributions to criminal justice decisions (Blair & Judd, 2010; Eberhardt, Davies, Purdie-Vaughns, & Johnson, 2006; Maddox, 2004), a potentially productive strategy for future research is to investigate the joint effects of social categorization and racial prototypicality on attention to facial features. Whereas the present results provide strong evidence that in general people visually process members of racial and other outgroups in distinct ways, further research related to attention to categorical features is recommended.

Although past research related to more general processing of ingroup and outgroup faces has demonstrated an attentional preference for Black over White faces in the early stages (Amodio et al., 2003; Bean et al., 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008; Trawalter et al., 2008), the present research concentrated on the extent to which participants focused on specific features when faces were presented for a more extended period of time. Even though this emphasis does not permit investigators to determine the specific psychological processes over time or to detect initial vigilance responses to threatening outgroup faces, it does allow them to better understand the importance of attentional patterns toward the face regions of ingroup and outgroup targets during person perception. Specifically, the present research suggests that for longer periods of time (e.g., more than five seconds) participants tend to prefer to focus on the eyes of ingroups. This facial feature is assumed to provide critical interpersonal information about the target

(Looser & Wheatley, 2010; Macrae et al., 2002; Niedenthal et al., 2010). Furthermore, our results demonstrate that this preference for ingroup over outgroup eyes predicts important intergroup biases such as better recognition of and a greater willingness to work with one's own group. Though there is no denying the value in investigating initial vigilance and avoidance-based processes to our further understanding of outgroup face processing, it is as yet unclear how these early attentional patterns are related to downstream behavioral consequences.

It is also unknown whether processes related to attention to the eyes of ingroups and outgroups follows the same trajectory as whole face processes. To some extent the time course of attention to the eyes may be related to the meaning of the eyes in an intergroup context. On the one hand, it is possible that a focus on the eyes may be related to trust and a willingness to form social bonds, on the other hand, eye gaze may be related to dominance and status. Although greater attention to the eyes of ingroup members in the current studies suggest the former, it is not clear if this pattern would also be evident in earlier stages of face processing. Because people may be less willing to make interpersonal connections with outgroup than ingroup members, in contrast to general face processing findings, they may show an avoidance of outgroup eyes even in the first 100 ms. Although future research is needed to investigate how patterns of attention to the eyes vary over time and how early attentional processes predict intergroup relations and discrimination, our starting point was to explore an attentional focus on the eyes during a more extended presentation time. This decision, however, limits our ability to examine more fine-grained initial processes of attention and how they might be related to such initial social cognitive responses such as trust, dominance, and threat.

Importantly, we find that overall attention to the eyes may be intimately related to individuation processes. These results raise the possibility that eye gaze may be usefully

employed as a measure of person perception. Whereas previous research has often inferred categorical and individuation processes based on downstream consequences such as the activation of stereotypes, affective responses, negative evaluations, and discrimination (Bargh, 1999; Blair, 2002; Devine, 1989; Kawakami, Dovidio, & Dijksterhuis, 2003; Kawakami et al., 2000; Word et al., 1974), the present procedure has the potential to more directly access whether people are processed as individuals or category members. Although several paradigms have been used in the past to measure social categorization processes (Klauer & Wegener, 1998; Stangor, Lynch, Duan, & Glass, 1992; Stroessner, Haines, Sherman, & Kantrowitz, 2010; Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978), assessing visual attention in face perception may allow us to investigate the onset of visual preferences very early in this process (Bean et al., 2012) and over a relatively more extended period. For example, the present research examined visual attention in the first five to seven seconds of processing ingroup and outgroup members. Furthermore, future research could investigate how visual attention as a proxy for initial individuation processes is related to subsequent biases such as stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000; Stroessner et al., 2010) and how strategies to reduce or increase specific intergroup biases influence attention to the eyes of outgroup members (Kawakami et al., 2012; Kawakami et al., 2007; Mann & Kawakami, 2012; Phills et al., 2011).

As a starting point, the results from Studies 3 and 4 demonstrated that attention to the eyes of ingroup and outgroup members have important implications for intergroup phenomena. Specifically, in Study 3 we focused on the Own Race Bias and found that this type of bias can be influenced by current motivations (Hugenberg et al., 2007; Hugenberg et al., 2010) and eye gaze. Our results indicated that one reason why people are better at recognizing faces from their own compared to other racial groups (Meissner & Brigham, 2001; Sporer, 2001) may be because they

are more motivated to individuate the ingroup and therefore attend more to the eyes of ingroup members. However, our results also indicate that people were better at identifying outgroups when individuation instructions increased attention to the eyes of outgroup faces. Study 4, alternatively, demonstrated that motivations to individuate and eye gaze can also play an important role in a willingness to interact with outgroup members. In particular, we found that people were more likely to select a familiar outgroup member as a partner when individuation processes increased preference for the eyes of outgroup faces.

Although the present research suggests that one factor in identifying and being willing to interact with outgroup members may be attention to the eyes, this factor is certainly not the only one to play a role in our ability to correctly identify and infer cognitions and preferences for outgroups. Notably, recent research by Adams et al. (2010) showed that when ingroup and outgroup eyes were presented in isolation, and people were expected to look into the eyes of members from both categories, participants still demonstrated an ingroup bias in their ability to decode mental states. Although it is possible that even in this context, participants were avoiding outgroup eyes or scanning images of outgroup members in distinct ways, it may also be the case that when attending equally to both ingroup *and* outgroup eyes, people are still better at reading the intentions of ingroup members. Though research which further examines our ability to infer social cognitions from the eyes of outgroup members is clearly necessary, it is recommended that this work includes other target categories, other intergroup biases, and other social motivations.

In conclusion, it is not surprising that when trying to understand people, we look to their face. The face provides us with a rich and valuable source of information about others and how best to interact with them. The eyes, in particular, are critical to person perception. Lay people and researchers alike believe that the eyes can tell us about a person's intentions and who they

are as individuals. However, when we look into the eyes of others, they can reciprocate and look into our eyes, thereby leaving our "windows to the soul" open to others. Importantly, eye gaze can imply trust and a willingness to connect and form bonds. The present research suggests that this may be less likely when the other person is not one of our own.

References

Adams, R. B., Franklin, R. G., Nelson, A. J., & Stevenson, M. T. (2010). Compound social cues in face processing. In R. B. Adams, N. Ambady, K. Nakayama, & S. Shimojo (Eds.), *The science of social vision* (pp. 90-107). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Adams, R. B., & Kleck, R. E. (2003). Perceived gaze direction and the processing of facial displays of emotion. *Psychological Science, 14*, 644-647. doi: 10.1046/j.0956-7976.2003.psci_1479.x

Adams, R. B., & Kleck, R. E. (2005). Effects of direct and averted gaze on the perception of facially communicated emotion. *Emotion, 5*, 3-11. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.3

Adobe Systems Inc. (2007). *Photoshop* [computer software]. San Jose, CA.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York, NY: Perseus Books.

Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Devine, P. G. (2003). Individual differences in the activation of affective race bias as assessed by startle eyeblink response and self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 738-753. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.738

Bargh, J. A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against controllability of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp. 361-382). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., & Plumb, I. (2001). The "reading the mind in the eyes" test revised version: A study with normal adults, and adults with Asperger Syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 42*, 241-251. doi: 10.1111/1469-7610.00715

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., & Jolliffe, T. (1997). Is there a "language of the eyes"? Evidence from normal adults, and adults with autism or Asperger syndrome. *Visual Cognition, 4*, 311-331. doi: 10.1080/713756761

Bean, M., Slaten, D., Horton, W., Murphy, M., Todd, A., & Richeson, J. (2012). Prejudice Concerns and Race-Based Attentional Bias: New Evidence from Eyetracking. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 722-729. doi: 10.1177/1948550612436983

Bernstein, M. J., Young, S. G., & Hugenberg, K. (2007).The cross-category effect: Mere social categorization is sufficient to elicit an own-group bias in face recognition. *Psychological Science, 18*, 706-712. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01964.x

Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 242-261. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0603_8

Blair, I. V., & Judd, C. M. (2010). Afrocentric facial features and stereotyping. In R. B. Adams, N. Ambady, K. Nakayama, & S. Shimojo (Eds.), *The science of social vision* (pp. 306-320). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Chapleau, K. M. (2004). The influence of Afrocentric facial features in criminal sentencing. *Psychological Science, 15,* 674-679. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00739.x

Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Fallman, J. L. (2004).The automaticity of Race and Afrocentric facial features in social judgments. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7,* 98-118. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.763

Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., Sadler, M. S., & Jenkins, C. (2002). The role of Afrocentric features in person perception: Judging by features and categories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 5-25. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.1.5

Blais, C., Jack, R. E., Scheepers, C., Fiset, D., & Caldara. R. (2008). Culture shapes how we look at faces. *PLoS ONE, 3*, e3022. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0003022

Bogardus, E. S., (1947). Measurement of personal-group relations. *Sociometry, 10*, 306-311. doi: 10.2307/2785570

Brewer, M. B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Advances in social cognition* (pp. 1–36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Caldara, R., & Miellet, S. (2011). iMap: A novel method for statistical fixation mapping of eye movement data. *Behavior Research Methods, 43*, 864-878. doi: 10.3758/s13428-011-0092-x

Chiao, J. Y., Iidaka, T., Gordon, H. L., Nogawa, J., Bar, M., Aminoff, E., Sadato, N., & Ambady, N. (2008). Cultural specificity in amygdala response to fear faces. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 20*, 2167-2174. doi: 10.1162/jocn.2008.20151

Cloutier, J., & Macrae, C. N. (2007). Who or what are you? Facial orientation and person construal. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 1298-1309. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.433

Cloutier, J., Mason, M. F., & Macrae, C. N. (2005). The perceptual determinants of person construal: Reopening the social-cognitive toolbox. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 885-894. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.885

Cross, J. F., Cross, J., & Daly, J. (1971). Sex, race, age, and beauty as factors in recognition of faces. *Perception and Psychophysics, 10*, 393-396. doi: 10.3758/BF03210319

Demoulin, S., Leyens, J., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Intergroup misunderstandings: Interactions and divergences in realities, goals, and strategies. In S. Demoulin, J. Leyens, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Interactions and divergences in realities, goals, and strategies* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

DeSteno, D., Dasgupta, N., Bartlett, M. Y., & Cajdric, A. (2004). Prejudice from thin air: The

effect of emotion on automatic intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science, 15*, 319-324.

doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00676.x

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 5-18. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5

Donders, N. C., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2008). Danger stereotypes predict racially biased

attentional allocation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1328-1333. doi:

10.1016/j.jesp.2008.04.002

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past and the

future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 5-21. doi:

10.1177/1368430203006001009

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002).Implicit and explicit prejudice and

interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 62-28. doi:

10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.62

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of

prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social

Psychology: Special Issue on Unconscious Processes in Stereotyping and Prejudice, 33*,

510-540. doi:10.1006/jesp.1997.1331

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, J. L., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. (2006). Looking

deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing

outcomes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 383-386. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01716.x

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation: From

category-based to individuating processes as a function of information, motivation, and

attention. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-74).

New York, NY: Academic Press.

Frischen, A., Bayliss, A. P., & Tipper, S. P. (2007). Gaze cuing of attention: Visual attention,

social cognition, and individual differences. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*, 694-724. doi:

10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.694

Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The

benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 239-249.

doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.239

Goldinger, S. D., He, Y., & Papesh, M. H. (2009). Deficits in cross-race face learning: Insights

from eye movements and pupillometry. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*

Memory, and Cognition, 35, 1105–1122. doi: 10.1037/a0016548

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual

differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality*

and Social Psychology, 74, 1464-1480. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464

Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new

millennium. *Communication Monographs, 76*, 408-420. doi: 10.1080/03637750903310360

Hehman, E., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2010). Where the division lies: Common ingroup

identity moderates the cross-race facial-recognition effect. *Journal of Experimental Social*

Psychology, 46, 445-448. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.11.008

Henderson, J. M., Falk, R. J., Minut, S., Dyer, R. C., & Mahadevan, S. (2001). Gaze control for

face learning and recognition by humans and machines. In T. F. Shipley & P. J. Kellman

(Eds.), *From fragments to objects: Segmentation and grouping in vision. Advances in*

Psychology (pp. 463-481). New York, NY: Elsevier Science.

Henderson, J. M., Williams, C. C., & Falk, R. J. (2005). Eye movements are functional during

face learning. *Memory & Cognition, 33*, 98-106. doi: 10.3758/BF03195300

Hietanen, J. K., Leppänen, J. M., Peltola, M. J., Linna-Aho, K., & Ruuhiala, H. J. (2008).Seeing

direct and averted gaze activates the approach-avoidance motivational brain systems.

Neuropsychologia, 46, 2423-2430. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.02.029

Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2003). Facing prejudice: Implicit prejudice and the

perception of facial threat. *Psychological Science, 14*, 640-643. doi: 10.1046/j.0956-

7976.2003.psci_1478.x

Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2004). Ambiguity in social categorization: The role of

prejudice and facial affect in race categorization. *Psychological Science, 15*, 342-345.

doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00680.x

Hugenberg, K. & Corneille, O. (2009). Holistic Processing is tuned for In-Group faces.

Cognitive Science, 33, 1173-1181. doi: 10.111/j.1551-6709.2009.01048.x

Hugenberg, K., Miller, J., & Claypool, H. M. (2007). Categorization and individuation in the

cross-race recognition deficit: Toward a solution to an insidious problem. *Journal of

Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 334-340. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2006.02.010

Hugenberg, K., & Sacco, D. F. (2008).Social categorization and stereotyping: How social

categorization biases person perception and face memory. *Social and Personality

Psychology Compass, 2,* 1052-1072. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00090.x

Hugenberg, K., Wilson, J. P., See, P. E., & Young, S. G. (in press). Toward a synthetic model of

Own Group Biases in face memory. *Visual Cognition*.

Hugenberg, K., Young, S. G., Bernstein, M. J., & Sacco, D. F. (2010). The categorization-individuation model: An integrative account of the other-race recognition deficit. *Psychological Review, 117,* 1-20. doi: 10.1037/s0020463

Inzlicht, M., & Ben-Zeev, T. (2000). A threatening intellectual environment: Why females are susceptible to experiencing problem-solving deficits in the presence of males. *Psychological Science, 11*, 365-371. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00272

Inzlicht, M., & Good, C. (2006). How environments threaten academic performance, self-knowledge, and sense of belonging. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Approaches* (pp. 129-150). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Itier, R. J., & Batty, M. (2009). Neural bases of eye and gaze processing: The core of social cognition. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 33,* 843-863. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.02.004

Ito, T. A., & Urland, G. R. (2005). The influence of processing objectives on the perceptions of faces: An ERP study of race and gender perception. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience, 5*, 21-36. doi: 10.3758/CANB.5.1.21

Janik, S. W., Wellens, A. R., Goldberg, M. L., & Dell'Osso, L. F. (1978). Eyes as the center of focus in the visual examination of human faces. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 47*, 857-858. doi: 10.2466/pms.1978.47.3.857

Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2003). Effect of social category priming on personal attitudes. *Psychological Science*, *14*, 315-319. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.14451

Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotypic associations on stereotype

activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 871-888. doi:

10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.871

Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Response to confronting racism.

Science, 324, 591-592. doi: 10.1126/science.1164951

Kawakami, K., Phills, C. E., Greenwald, A. G., Simard, D., Pontiero, J., Brnjas, A., … Dovidio,

J. F. (2012). Synchronizing the self to activated social categories. *Journal of Personality*

and Social Psychology, 102, 562-575. doi: 10.1037/a0025970

Kawakami, K., Phills, C. E., Steele, J. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2007). (Close) Distance makes the

heart grow fonder: Improving implicit racial attitudes and interracial interactions through

approach behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 957-971. doi:

10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.957

Kawakami, K., Steele, J. R., Cifa, C., Phills, C. E., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Approaching math

increases math = me, math = pleasant. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,*

818-825. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2007.07.009

Klauer, K. C., & Wegener, I. (1998).Unraveling social categorization in the "who said what?"

paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1155-1178. doi:

10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1155

Kleinke, C. L. (1986). Gaze and eye contact: A research review. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 78-

100. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.100.1.78

Levin, D. T. (1996). Classifying faces by race: The structure of face categories. *Journal of*

Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 22, 1364.1382. doi:

10.1037/0278-7393.22.6.1364

Levin, D. T. (2000). Race as a visual feature: Using visual search and perceptual discrimination

tasks to understand face categories and the cross-race recognition deficit. *Journal of

Experimental Psychology: General, 129,* 559-574. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.129.4.559

Livingston, R. W., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). What are we really priming? Cue-based versus

category-based processing of facial stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 82,* 5-18. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.5

Looser, C. E., & Wheatley, T. (2010). The tipping point of animacy: How, when, and where we

perceive life in a face. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1854-1862. doi:

10.1177/0956797610388044

MacKinnon, D. P, Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., & Sheets, V. (2002). A

comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects.

Psychological Methods, 7, 83-104. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.83

MacLin, O. H, & Malpass, R. S. (2001). Racial categorization of faces: The ambiguous race face

effect. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7,* 98-118. doi: 10.1037//1076-8971.7.1.98

Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about

others. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 93-120. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.93

Macrae, C. N., Hood, B. M., Milne, A. B., Rowe, A. C., & Mason, M. F. (2002). Are you

looking at me? Eye gaze and person perception. *Psychological Science, 13*, 460-464. doi:

10.1111/1467-9280.00481

Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspective on racial phenotypicality bias. *Personality and Social

Psychology Review, 8,* 383-401. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0804_4

Mann, N. H., & Kawakami, K. (2012). The long steep path to equality: Progressing on

egalitarian goals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*, 187-197. doi:

10.1037/a0025602

Martin, D., & Macrae, C. N (2010). Processing style and person recognition: Exploring the face

inversion effect. *Visual Cognition, 18*, 161-170. doi: 10.1080/13506280902868793

Mason, M. F., Hood, B. M., & Macrae, C. N. (2004). Look into my eyes: Gaze direction and

person memory. *Memory, 12*, 637-643. doi: 10.1080/09658210344000152.

Mason, M. F., Tatkow, E. P., & Macrae, C. N. (2005). The look of love: Gaze shifts and person

perception. *Psychological Science, 16*, 236-239. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00809.x.

McKelvie, S. J. (1976). The role of eyes and mouth in the memory of a face. *The American

Journal of Psychology, 89*, 311-323. doi: 10.2307/1421414.

Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001).Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in

memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7,* 3-35.

doi: 10.1037//1076-8971.7.1.3

Moreland, R. L., & Topolinski, S. (2010). The mere exposure phenomenon: A lingering melody

by Robert Zajonc. *Emotion Review, 2*, 329-339. doi: 10.1177/1754073910375479

Nakabayashi, K., Lloyd-Jones, T. J., Butcher, N. & Liu, C. H. (2012). Independent influences of

verbalization and race on the configural and featural processing of faces: A behavioral

and eye movements study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and

Cognition, 38*, 61-77. doi: 10.1037/a0024853

Niedenthal, P. M., Mermillod, M., Maringer, M., & Hess, U. (2010). The simulation of smiles

(SIMS) model: Embodied simulation and the meaning of facial expression. *Behavioral

and Brain Sciences, 33*, 417-433. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X10000865.

Nummenmaa, L., Hyönä, J., & Heitanen, J. K. (2009). I'll walk this way: Eyes reveal the

direction of locomotion and make passersby look and go the other way. *Psychological

Science, 20*, 1454-1458. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02464.x

Ofan, R. H., Rubin, N., & Amodio, D. M. (2011). Seeing race: N170 responses to race and their

relations to automatic racial attitudes and controlled processing. *Journal of Cognitive

Neuroscience, 23*, 3153-3161. doi: 10.1162/jocn_a_00014

Pauker, K., Weisbuch, M., Ambady, N., Sommers, S. R., Adams, R. B., & Ivcevic, Z. (2009).

Not so black and white: Memory for ambiguous group members. *Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 96*, 795-810. doi: 10.1037/a0013265

Phills, C. E., Kawakami, K., Tabi, E., Nadolny, D. & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Mind the gap:

Increasing associations between the self and Blacks with approach behaviors. *Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 100,* 197-210. doi: 10.1037/a0022159

Ratner, K. G., & Amodio, D. M. (2013). Seeing "us vs. them": Minimal group effects on the

neural encoding of faces. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*, 298-301. doi:

10.1016/j.jesp.2012.10.017

Rhodes, G., Locke, V., Ewing, L., & Evangelista, E. (2009). Race coding and the other-race

effect in face recognition. *Perception, 38*, 232-241. doi: 10.1068/p6110

Richeson, J. A., Todd, A. R., Trawalter, S., & Baird, A. A. (2008). Eye-gaze direction modulates

race-related amygdala activity. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 11*, 233-246.

doi: 10.1177/1368430207088040.

Richeson J. A., & Trawalter, S. (2008). The threat of appearing prejudiced and race-based

attentional biases. *Psychological Science, 19*, 98-102. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-

9280.2008.02052.x

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Hickson, M. L., III (2007). Eye behavior. In *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations* (6th ed., pp. 92-104). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Rodin, M. J. (1987). Who is memorable to whom: A study of cognitive disregard. *Social Cognition, 5*, 144-165.

Rule, N. O., Ambady, N., Adams, R. B., & Macrae, C. N. (2007). Us and them: Memory advantages in perceptually ambiguous groups. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 14*, 687-692.

Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analyses in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*, 359-371. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00355.x

Sporer, S. L. (2001). Recognizing faces of other ethnic groups: An integration of theories. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7,* 36-97. doi: 10.1037//1076-8971.7.1.36

SR Research (2008). *Eyelink II* [Apparatus and software]. Mississauga, ON, Canada.

Stangor, C., & Lange, J. E. (1994).Mental representations of social groups: Advances in conceptualizing stereotypes and stereotyping. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Mental representations of social groups: Advances in understanding stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 367-416). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 207-218. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.207

Stroessner, S. J., Haines, E. L., Sherman, J. W., & Kantrowitz, C. J. (2010). Stereotype relevance moderates category activation: Evidence from the indirect category accessibility task

(ICAT). *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1*, 335-343. doi: 10.1177/1948550610372144

Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 778-793. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.778

Trawalter, S., Todd, A. R., Baird, A. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2008). Attending to threat: Race-based patterns of selective attention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1322-1327. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.03.006

Van Bavel, J. J., & Cunningham, W. A. (2012). A social identity approach to person memory: Group membership, collective identification, and social role shape attention and memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38,* 1566-1578. doi: 10.1177/0146167212455829.

Van Bavel, J. J., Packer, D. J., & Cunningham, W. A. (2008). The neural substrates of in-group bias: A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation. *Psychological Science, 19,* 1131-1139. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02214.x

Van Bavel, J. J., Packer, D. J., & Cunningham, W. A. (2011). Modulation of the Fusiform Face Area following minimal exposure to motivationally relevant faces: Evidence of in-group enhancement (not out-group disregard). *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 23,* 3343-3354. doi: 10.1162/jocn_a_00016

Vizioli, L., Rousselet, G. A., & Caldara, R. (2010). Neural repetition suppression to identity is abolished by other-race faces. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*, 20081-20086. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1005751107

Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 917-937. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.917

Vorauer, J. D., & Sakamoto, Y. (2006). I thought we could be friends, but .... systematic miscommunication and defensive distancing as obstacles to cross-group friendship formation. *Psychological Science, 17*, 326-331. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01706.x

Wirth, J. H., Sacco, D. F., Hugenberg, K., & Williams, K. D. (2010). Eye gaze as relational evaluation: Averted eye gaze leads to feelings of ostracism and relational devaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 869-882. doi: 10.1177/0146167210370032

Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 109-120. doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(74)90059-6

Wu, E. X. W., Laeng, B., & Magnussen, S. (2012). Through the eyes of the own-race bias: Eye-tracking and pupilometry during face recognition. *Social Neuroscience, 7*, 202-216. doi: 10.1080/17470919.2011.596946

Yardley, L., McDermott, L., Pisarski, S., Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2008). Psychosocial consequences of developmental prosopagnosia: A problem of recognition. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 65*, 445-451. doi: 10.1016/j.psychores.2008.03.013

Young, S. G., Bernstein, M. J., & Hugenberg, K. (2010). When do own-group biases in face recognition occur? Encoding versus post-encoding. *Social Cognition, 28*, 240-250. doi: 10.1521/soco.2010.28.2.240

Young, S. G., & Hugenberg, K. (2010). Mere social categorization modulates identification of facial expressions of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 964-977. doi: 10.1097/a0020400

Young, S. G., & Hugenberg, K. (2012). Individuation motivation and face experience can operate jointly to produce the own-race bias. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 80-87. doi: 10.1177/1948550611409759

Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9*, 1-27. doi: 10.1037/h0025848

Zebrowitz, L. A., Bronstad, P. M., & Lee, H. K. (2007). The contribution of face familiarity to ingroup favoritism and stereotyping. *Social Cognition, 25*, 306-338. doi: 10.1521/soco.2007.25.2.306

Zhao, X., Lynch Jr., J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*, 197-206. doi: 10.1086/651257

Footnotes

[1] Initial analyses of all studies included sex of participant as a variable. In Study 1, the results related to gaze proportions showed no significant interactions related to this variable, all Fs < 1.3, ps > .27, η_p^2s < .01. In Study 2, the results related to gaze proportions also showed no sex of participant interactions, Fs < .09, ps > .92, η_p^2s < .01, except for a marginal Area of Interest × Sex of Participant interaction that was not directly relevant to the present theorizing, $F(2, 56) = 2.79$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. In Study 3, the results related to gaze proportions, Fs < 2.26, ps > .14, η_p^2s < .08, and the Own Race Bias, Fs < .31, ps > .74, η_p^2s < .02, showed no significant interactions related to sex of participant. In Study 4, the results related to gaze proportions, Fs > 2.29, ps > .11, η_p^2s < .09, and partner choice, Fs > 2.61, p > .11, η_p^2s < .05, also showed no significant interactions related to this variable.

[2] To explore whether a preference for the eyes of White faces reflected a more general process related to the attentional avoidance of Black faces in an intergroup context (Bean et al., 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2008), a secondary set of analyses examined gaze patterns in an intragroup context. If participants in the present experiment were attending more to White eyes because they were trying to avoid attending to Black eyes, we would expect, in contrast to the findings presented in the main text, that attention to the eyes of Black and White faces in same race trials would not differ. To test this assumption, mean gaze latencies for the eyes, nose, and mouth were separately calculated for White faces presented in same race trials and for Black faces presented in same race trials. These mean latencies were then divided by the total presentation time of each target set (5000 ms). To investigate gaze patterns related to same and other race faces presented in an intragroup context, a Race of Target Pair (Black vs. White) × Area of Interest (eyes vs. nose vs. mouth) repeated measures analysis of variance was performed

on the gaze latency proportions for faces presented in same race pairs. A significant Race of

Target Pair $\times$ Area of Interest interaction emerged, $F(2, 27) = 14.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .53$. Even in

an intragroup context, participants attended more to the eyes when presented with two White

faces ($M = .235$, $SD = .052$) compared to two Black faces ($M = .218$, $SD = .048$), $t(28) = 4.74$, p

$< .001$, $d = .88$. Further, participants attended more to the nose when presented with two Black

faces ($M = .067$, $SD = .031$) compared to White faces ($M = .061$, $SD = .036$), $t(28) = -2.42$, $p =$

$.02$, $d = .45$, and more to the mouth when presented with two Black faces ($M = .040$, $SD = .022$)

compared to two White faces ($M = .032$, $SD = .021$), $t(28) = -4.27$, $p < .001$, $d = .79$. These

analyses suggest that increased attention to the eyes of White faces reflects a preference for the

eyes of ingroup members rather than avoidance of the eyes of outgroup members.

Figure 1: Example of eye tracking stimuli with areas of interest defined for the eyes, nose, and mouth of Black and White faces.

Figure 2: Dwell proportions in Study 3 for the eyes, nose, and mouth of Black and White faces

in the Individuate Blacks, Individuate Whites, and Control conditions.

Figure 3: Recognition scores in Study 3 for Black and White targets in the Individuate Blacks, Individuate Whites, and Control conditions.

Figure 4: Dwell proportions in Study 4 for the eyes, nose, and mouth of Black and White faces

in the Individuate Blacks and Individuate Whites conditions.

Figure 5: Partner choice scores in Study 4 for Black and White new targets and Black and

White familiar targets in the Individuate Blacks and Individuate Whites conditions.