**Unfamiliar Face Perception**

- Unfamiliar face recognition is affected by many factors that do not affect familiar faces (5).
- Unfamiliar face matching is also surprisingly error prone (2, 6, 8).
- In applied contexts, unfamiliar face matching involves individuals from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

**Social Categorization**

- Classifying faces as social “in-group” benefits face perception (1).
- In-group faces are recognized more accurately than out-group faces.
- …even for made up social categories.

**Experiment 1: Recognition**

**Does social categorization occur automatically?**

**Encoding Phase**

- In-group benefits were observed even when participants did not explicitly categorize faces.
- Hits were defined as successful mismatches, and correct rejections as successful matches.

**Old/New Recognition**

- In-group decisions were associated with a liberal bias (tendency toward match).

**Experiment 2: Matching**

**Does in-group categorization improve face matching?**

- In-group decisions were associated with a liberal bias (tendency toward match).
- Social categorization did not affect face recognition, but did affect face matching.
- The effects of social categorization occurred regardless of explicit categorization.
- Empirical support for social cognitive models of face perception (e.g., 4, 7).
  - Categorization occurs quickly, effortlessly, and automatically.

**Unfamiliar Face Perception**

**Results**

- Recognition hits were not higher for in-group faces, which failed to replicate previous work (1).
- Accuracy (across both match and mismatch face pairs) was higher for in-group faces.

**Stimuli**

- 96 paired photos of volunteers (11).
- One student/government-issue ID; one recent, taken an average of 1.5 years after the ID photo.

**“In-group”:**

- U.S.A., Canada, Australia

**“Out-group”:**

- Iran, Iraq, Russia
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