Hi Bruce and Laura,

I've had a little more time to think about the results of WIT3.

Remember that we had two conditions: The usual Black/White Gun/Tool IAT, and a novel Black/White Black/Gun condition. In the novel condition, people saw the same Black and White face primes, but the targets were Black faces and guns instead of the usual tools and guns. It was our hypothesis that people would pair the Black face primes with the Black face targets, leaving the White face primes to facilitate gun responses in this condition. By contrast, in the classic Black/White Gun/Tool IAT, White face primes would facilitate tool responses.

Here are my results.

**1. The results are ambiguous -- not a strong result either way.**

We have a significant three-way interaction of Condition × Prime × Target, *p* = .016. This indicates that the Prime × Target interaction varies in strength across the two conditions. We preregistered this test, which is cool. You can see the accuracies in Plot 1.

However, there are more specific tests we can do. One is to restrict our analyses to just the Gun trials and look at the Condition × Prime interaction. We'd expect such an interaction because, while Black primes (relative to White primes) increase Gun accuracy in the typical IAT, White primes (relative to Black primes) should increase Gun accuracy in our new Black/Gun task. We don't get that interaction (*p*= .196), although it is in the right direction, and the *p*-value does not seem particularly discouraging. You can see the accuracies in Plot 2.

**2. Not sure what to think of the new Black/Gun task.**It was our expectation that, in this task, Black-face primes would prepare Black-face responses moreso than would White-face primes. We do not find particularly strong evidence of this. The Prime × Target interaction within this condition is only *p*= .060. It is not small enough to conclude that the task works as we hoped, but it's also too large to conclude that all faces prepare face responses regardless of race. You can see the accuracies in Plot 3.

**3. The dataset may just be too noisy.**After exclusions for poor accuracy, inattention, or race, our sample sizes are 20 in the novel Black/Gun task and 28 in the classic Gun/Tool task. About half of participants performed the 30-trial-per-condition version and the other half performed the shorter 24-trial-per-condition version. This might not be enough subjects per condition, nor might it be enough trials per subject. Having to collect data in hallways, student centers, and grad student hangouts probably didn't help either.

Supporting this concern, we did not replicate the usual WIT effect in the classic Gun/Tool version of the task, *p*= .122. The means are in the right directions, but the data are probably too noisy. You can see the accuracies in Plot 4.

**So, what's next?**

The way I see it, it might not be a bad idea to run a proper lab study. With another 30 subjects per cell performing a healthier 60+ trials/condition or whatever, we might be able to make a stronger decision about this -- whether for or against. I don't have the resources here to run a psych undergrad study (they keep me working to the bone on telephone survey data), so it would be, ultimately, your resources and your decision.

Alternatively, we could try to prepare a different task to better measure and manipulate this. We'd still be stuck needing to collect a fresh dataset either way if we still hope to resubmit to PSPB.

I recognize this is a lengthy report and long overdue. Please let me know what you think -- I'm sure we'd all like to wrap this project up.

-Joe