Table S1:  Pre and Post workshop IAT scores, and their differences, by Group Identity and Gender—Study 1

| | | Group Identity | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Majority** | | **Non-Target** | | **Target** | | **Across Identity** | |
| | | **(n = 54)** | | **(n = 31)** | | **(n = 11)** | | | |
| **Pre Workshops[1]** | | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** |
| | **Male (n = 45)** | 0.31*** | 0.25 | 0.26* | 0.36 | -0.11 | 0.64 | 0.16* | 0.35 |
| | **Female (n = 51)** | 0.10 | 0.46 | 0.27** | 0.25 | -0.11 | 0.51 | 0.08 | 0.41 |
| | **Across Gender** | 0.20*** | 0.37 | 0.27*** | 0.29 | -0.11 | 0.54 | 0.12 | 0.38 |
| **Post Workshops** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Male (n = 45)** | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.18 | 0.35 |
| | **Female (n = 51)** | -0.04 | 0.48 | 0.19* | 0.34 | -0.20 | 0.23 | -0.02 | 0.42 |
| | **Across Gender** | 0.11* | 0.45 | 0.18** | 0.32 | -0.04 | 0.35 | 0.08 | 0.40 |
| **Difference[2]** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Male (n = 45)** | -0.05 | 0.39 | -0.08 | 0.43 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.03 | 0.43 |
| | **Female (n = 51)** | -0.14 | 0.44 | -0.08 | 0.38 | -0.09 | 0.59 | -0.10 | 0.43 |
| | **Across Gender** | -0.09 | 0.41 | -0.08 | 0.39 | 0.07 | 0.62 | -0.04 | 0.43 |

*Note 1*. All means were adjusted means derived from a model including participant group identity, and participant gender. The values

in the bottom right corner are the average pre-workshop IAT d-score adjusting for participant group identity, and participant gender.

Significance markers refer to the test of the adjusted mean from 0. [+] p <.10;* p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.


*Note 2*. Difference scores were calculated post-workshop minus pre-workshop so that negative scores indicate a reduction in implicit

bias after the workshop. Significance markers refer to the test of the adjusted mean (or mean difference score) from zero. [+] p <.10;* p

< .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table S2:  Pre and Post workshop IAT scores, and their differences, by Group Identity and Gender—Study 2

| | | **Majority** (n = 23) | | **Non-Target** (n = 11) | | **Target** (n = 5) | | **Across Identity** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Pre Workshops**[1] | | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** | **M** | **SD** |
| | **Male (n = 21)** | 0.56*** | 0.32 | 0.19 | 0.44 | -0.28 | 0.45 | 0.16 | 0.47 |
| | **Female (n = 18)** | 0.20 | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.22* | 0.37 |
| | **Across Gender** | 0.38*** | 0.43 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.05 | 0.48 | 0.19* | 0.42 |
| **Post Workshops** | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Male (n = 21)** | 0.25* | 0.32 | 0.45* | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.25* | 0.30 |
| | **Female (n = 18)** | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.34 |
| | **Across Gender** | 0.15* | 0.38 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.20** | 0.33 |
| **Difference**[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Male (n = 21)** | -0.31* | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.09 | 0.49 |
| | **Female (n = 18)** | -0.14 | 0.52 | 0.02 | 0.34 | -0.11 | 0.05 | -0.08 | 0.43 |
| | **Across Gender** | -0.23* | 0.48 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.01 | 0.45 |

*Note 1*. All means were adjusted means derived from a model including participant group identity, and participant gender.. The values

in the bottom right corner are the average pre-workshop IAT d-score adjusting for participant group identity, and participant gender.

Significance markers refer to the test of the adjusted mean from 0. [+] p <.10;* p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

*Note 2*. Difference scores were calculated post-workshop minus pre-workshop so that negative scores indicate a reduction in implicit

bias after the workshop. Significance markers refer to the test of the adjusted mean (or mean difference score) from zero. [+] p <.10;* p

< .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table S3. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- White Females

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .50** | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.49** | .51** | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | -.14 | -.24 | -.10 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | .04 | .12 | .08 | -.18 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | .04 | -.02 | -.07 | .08 | -.07 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | .02 | -.08 | -.10 | .07 | .64*** | .22 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | .15 | -.12 | -.26 | .06 | -.41* | .33* | -.12 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | .18 | .15 | -.03 | .28 | -.28 | .23 | -.21 | .39* | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | .03 | .03 | .00 | -.04 | .47** | .24 | .52** | -.29 | -.01 | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | -.07 | .16 | .23 | -.20 | .55*** | .15 | .54** | -.46** | -.05 | .74*** | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | .00 | -.07 | -.07 | .12 | .28 | .32 | .29 | .00 | -.05 | .20 | .26 | - | |
| 13. Escape | .04 | .00 | -.04 | -.20 | .00 | .25 | -.13 | .10 | .05 | .13 | .11 | .29 | - |
| M | 0.13 | -0.01 | -0.14 | 24.73 | 29.24 | 19.49 | 38.95 | 13.43 | 13.03 | 10.95 | 10.95 | 7.22 | 10.11 |
| SD | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 3.51 | 6.42 | 6.16 | 6.12 | 6.40 | 5.57 | 2.53 | 2.75 | 2.62 | 4.89 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind

Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. * p < .05; **p <

.01; ***p < .001

Table S4. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- White Males

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .15 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.57*** | .73*** | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | .17 | .20 | .05 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | .10 | .16 | .06 | -.04 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | .23 | .09 | -.09 | -.35* | .17 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | -.14 | -.01 | .09 | -.24 | .49** | .09 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | -.03 | .20 | .19 | -.02 | -.22 | .06 | -.09 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | .26 | .12 | -.08 | .27 | -.22 | -.11 | -.04 | .24 | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | -.05 | .16 | .16 | .06 | .62*** | .01 | .48** | -.14 | -.37* | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | -.19 | .16 | .27 | -.07 | .55*** | .03 | .78*** | -.10 | .02 | .44** | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | .19 | .10 | -.05 | -.03 | -.03 | .47** | -.17 | .34* | .09 | -.28 | -.07 | - | |
| 13. Escape | .26 | .32* | .09 | .22 | -.21 | .12 | -.21 | .24 | .50** | -.42** | -.12 | .53*** | - |
| M | 0.38 | 0.25 | -0.12 | 25.40 | 29.75 | 16.40 | 38.95 | 12.90 | 12.90 | 11.47 | 11.65 | 6.80 | 8.00 |
| SD | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.42 | 4.73 | 4.94 | 6.63 | 7.86 | 5.52 | 4.80 | 2.45 | 2.21 | 2.69 | 4.35 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind

Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. * $p < .05$; **$p <$

.01; ***$p < .001$

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Table S5. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- Non-Target Minority Females    Active workshops for reducing implicit bias   37** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .16 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.54** | .74*** | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | -.10 | .06 | .12 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | -.08 | .03 | .08 | -.25 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | -.06 | .18 | .20 | -.01 | .02 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | .19 | .26 | .09 | .32 | .40* | -.35 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | .03 | .25 | .20 | -.35 | -.18 | .00 | -.31 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | -.21 | .14 | .26 | .14 | -.26 | -.11 | -.24 | .15 | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | -.25 | -.46* | -.23 | -.10 | .43* | -.10 | .18 | -.43* | -.05 | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | .03 | .04 | .01 | -.07 | .57** | -.11 | .39* | -.34 | -.09 | .66*** | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | -.33 | .03 | .25 | -.09 | .01 | .28 | -.21 | .02 | .25 | .10 | .07 | - | |
| 13. Escape | -.33 | .25 | .43* | -.18 | -.21 | .16 | -.44* | .35 | .15 | -.28 | -.24 | .16 | - |
| M | 0.22 | 0.17 | -0.05 | 24.11 | 30.63 | 18.19 | 39.67 | 12.04 | 13.52 | 10.93 | 11.41 | 7.67 | 9.00 |
| SD | 0.25 | 0.31 | 0.36 | 3.04 | 4.93 | 6.94 | 5.60 | 4.33 | 4.89 | 2.34 | 2.10 | 2.40 | 4.78 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind

Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. * $p < .05$; **$p <$

.01; ***$p < .001$

Table S6. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- Non-Target Minority Males

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .20 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.74** | .52* | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | .15 | .07 | -.08 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | .35 | .15 | -.20 | .41 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | -.27 | -.06 | .19 | -.40 | .24 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | -.04 | .46 | .35 | -.03 | -.08 | -.02 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | -.40 | .02 | .37 | -.43 | -.16 | .54* | -.15 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | .09 | .10 | -.01 | -.68** | -.59* | .14 | .05 | .15 | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | -.19 | .29 | .36 | .00 | -.22 | .42 | .46 | .11 | .19 | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | .06 | .34 | .18 | .12 | -.08 | -.09 | .74** | -.13 | -.01 | .49 | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | -.05 | .32 | .26 | .09 | .30 | .05 | .16 | -.34 | -.07 | .17 | -.09 | - | |
| 13. Escape | .28 | .03 | -.22 | .18 | .35 | -.10 | -.40 | -.32 | -.06 | -.23 | -.30 | .21 | - |
| M | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 23.80 | 30.87 | 18.33 | 39.33 | 16.13 | 15.40 | 11.33 | 11.80 | 8.13 | 9.87 |
| SD | 0.37 | 0.29 | 0.42 | 1.97 | 3.74 | 8.63 | 6.49 | 7.07 | 4.39 | 2.09 | 1.61 | 2.61 | 4.56 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. $* p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p < .001$

Table S7. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- Target Minority Females

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .24 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.82* | .35 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | -.38 | .24 | .51 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | .75 | .17 | -.63 | .23 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | -.67 | -.05 | .62 | .44 | -.40 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | .76* | .74* | -.31 | -.24 | .47 | -.38 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | -.62 | -.48 | .32 | .06 | -.44 | .58 | -.57 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | -.03 | -.35 | -.18 | -.10 | -.12 | .44 | -.24 | .30 | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | .64 | .23 | -.48 | .04 | .71* | -.39 | .41 | -.79* | -.18 | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | .77* | .50 | -.45 | -.08 | .58 | -.70 | .74* | -.87** | -.36 | .59 | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | -.09 | -.52 | -.22 | -.21 | -.23 | -.21 | -.41 | -.31 | .04 | .15 | .14 | - | |
| 13. Escape | -.29 | -.50 | -.01 | -.43 | -.47 | -.23 | -.34 | .39 | -.37 | -.55 | -.22 | .35 | - |
| M | 0.01 | -0.09 | -0.10 | 23.62 | 30.88 | 16.38 | 37.38 | 12.00 | 14.38 | 11.12 | 11.00 | 6.75 | 9.88 |
| SD | 0.48 | 0.29 | 0.50 | 1.85 | 4.22 | 7.54 | 7.42 | 7.21 | 4.78 | 2.85 | 2.88 | 1.39 | 4.61 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. * p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table S8. Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics- Target Minority Males

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pre IAT | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Post IAT | .28 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IAT Change | -.83* | .30 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | .27 | .39 | -.05 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. IMCP | .58 | .18 | -.47 | .46 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 6. EMCP | .51 | .71* | -.10 | .68 | .21 | - | | | | | | | |
| 7. PT | .54 | .38 | -.31 | .08 | .07 | .18 | - | | | | | | |
| 8. Lay Theory | -.37 | .49 | .65 | .26 | -.47 | .42 | .13 | - | | | | | |
| 9. CB Ideology | .19 | .29 | -.01 | .77 | .41 | .64 | -.21 | .19 | - | | | | |
| 10. Direct | .03 | -.54 | -.35 | -.30 | -.10 | -.33 | .13 | .04 | -.33 | - | | | |
| 11. Indirect | -.39 | -.83* | -.09 | -.53 | -.29 | -.86** | -.15 | -.37 | -.71* | .51 | - | | |
| 12. Overcomp. | .11 | .65 | .27 | .48 | .55 | .41 | .14 | .33 | .61 | -.27 | -.71* | - | |
| 13. Escape | -.35 | .54 | .66 | .16 | .06 | -.01 | .26 | .48 | .16 | -.33 | -.34 | .75* | - |
| M | -0.17 | 0.09 | 0.26 | 28.00 | 30.62 | 12.38 | 39.62 | 12.50 | 14.50 | 11.00 | 11.88 | 8.00 | 9.00 |
| SD | 0.55 | 0.32 | 0.55 | 4.50 | 6.30 | 7.56 | 6.89 | 4.99 | 5.18 | 3.02 | 2.03 | 2.78 | 6.00 |

*Note.* IMCP- Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice, EMCP- External Motivation to Control prejudice, PT- Perspective Taking, CB- Colorblind

Ideology. Direct, Indirect, Overcompensation and Escape are all strategies for handling an uncomfortable interracial interaction. * $p < .05$; **$p <$

.01; ***$p < .001$