

System-perpetuating asymmetries between explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes among indigenous and non-indigenous Chileans

Andrés Haye,¹ Roberto González,¹ Gabriela Ordóñez,¹ Gerd Bohner,² Frank Siebler,³ David Sirlopú,¹ Andrés Millar,¹ Pablo de Tezanos-Pinto¹ and David Torres¹

¹*School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile,*

²*Department of Social Psychology, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany, and* ³*Institute for Psychology, University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway*

The present research demonstrates a dissociation between explicit and implicit intergroup evaluation in the reciprocal attitudes between indigenous (Mapuche) and non-indigenous Chileans. In both social groups, the explicit measures of attitudes towards the respective in-group and out-group were compared with the Implicit Association Test scores. The results indicate that the members of the low-status minority might explicitly express a moderate evaluative preference for their in-group but might implicitly devalue it. Conversely, the members of the high-status majority might implicitly devalue their out-group but might explicitly express no bias. These results are theoretically framed in terms of system justification, conventional stereotypes and motivated correction processes.

Key words: explicit and implicit measures, Implicit Association Test, intergroup attitudes, Mapuche school students, outgroup favouritism, stereotype activation.

Introduction

Minority group members might overtly express an evaluative preference for their in-group but, at the same time, might devalue it in a covert manner. It has long been stated that minority groups sometimes internalize a sense of inferiority (Allport, 1954; Lewin, 1941), particularly under low-status conditions (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992; Rudman, Feinberg, & Fairchild, 2002). This covert reproduction of orientations that are contrary to personal and group interests – despite conscious resistance against the dominant beliefs and stereotypes – has been called ‘false consciousness’ (Marcuse, 1964; Marx & Engels, 1846; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). The conscious/unconscious distinction has been used in several recent theories in the social psychology of intergroup attitudes. As it is a problematic distinction (Gawronski, Hofmann, & Wilbur, 2006), it is important to state from the outset that we are focusing on the operational level of attitude measurement, thus using the conventional explicit/implicit distinction. Jost (2001) and Jost and Banaji argued that the most straightforward form of false consciousness is the tendency of group members to covertly prefer the out-group over the in-group (in what follows, ‘out-group favouritism’), which is the opposite of the traditional in-group

bias that is predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Research on social cognition, moreover, suggests that automatic tendencies can substantially influence behaviour without conscious awareness (Bargh, 1997; Perugini, 2005). Thus, covert out-group favouritism in disadvantaged groups might constrain their emancipation efforts.

This hidden out-group favouritism even might be shown by minorities that are active in their struggle for equal rights. Examples are some indigenous peoples in Chile, particularly the Mapuche (see Bengoa, 2000). With ~1 million people, the Mapuche are Chile’s largest indigenous group. They are often said to be one of South America’s bravest people. Having fought foreign invasions for >300 years, in the 18th century the Mapuche forced the Spanish Crown to recognize their autonomy. However, conflict never stopped and, in the 1880s, the Mapuche were defeated by the Chilean Republic. Since then, Mapuche society has been subject to brutal oppression. According to the 2000 Census, the Mapuche are Chile’s most deprived social group. During the last 10 years, they have intensified their battle to improve their living conditions and to make Chilean society recognise their rights. In this battle, the Mapuche face negative beliefs about themselves that pervade Chilean society. Non-indigenous Chileans’ stereotypes depict them as violent, rude, lazy and unintelligent (Saiz, 1986, 2002).

Social identity theory posited that group members would tend to favour the in-group over the out-group in line with self-esteem and group-promotion motives. But, research

Correspondence: Andrés Haye, Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago 7820436, Chile. Email address: ahaye@uc.cl
Received 5 August 2008; accepted 29 June 2009.

has shown that low-status minorities in many cases display a different pattern (Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Mullen *et al.*, 1992). Disadvantaged group members frequently assert negative stereotypes about their own group (i.e. negative self-stereotyping), thus showing out-group favouritism. Despite the Mapuche's bravery, their social position as a low-status and powerless minority suggests that they might show this out-group favouritism pattern. Overt self-denigration, however, is unlikely because it would go against other prevailing tendencies, such as group esteem. Recent theoretical approaches to negative self-stereotyping indicate that out-group favouritism is more likely to be observed by means of indirect attitudinal measures that are assumed to tap automatic and unconscious processes (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). Therefore, low-status minorities might show in-group favouritism at the explicit level, but out-group favouritism at the implicit level (Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002; Rudman *et al.*, 2002).

Relative to the Mapuche, the non-indigenous Chileans are in the privileged position of a high-status majority. As powerless minorities are not in the position to impose beliefs and stereotypes on society, non-indigenous Chileans are expected to display in-group favouritism without obstruction. Again, such would be the prediction of social identity theory. In fact, a meta-analysis showed a positive correlation between group status and in-group bias (Mullen *et al.*, 1992). It is assumed that the extent to which group members seek a favourable in-group–out-group evaluative comparison is greater for high-status than for low-status group members. This pattern is easy to match with hostile prejudice, either contemptuous or envious (Glick & Fiske, 2001), but not with more subtle, ambivalent or even benevolent forms of prejudice that have arisen along with societal changes in the second half of the 20th century (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Devine, 1989; Glick & Fiske; Jost & Burgess, 2000). As majority members might think that it is socially inappropriate to be overtly prejudiced (van Knippenberg, 1978), their tendency to favour the in-group over the out-group might have become covert or even inaccessible by introspection. In accordance with this idea, Jost *et al.* (2002) argued that strong in-group favouritism in high-status majorities might be observed more likely through indirect, unobtrusive attitude measures. Moreover, even if the majority members show implicit in-group favouritism, the explicit subscription to values, such as tolerance and equity, might make them express positive attitudes towards low-status minorities (in what follows, 'benevolent prejudice'), often with paternalistic and pitying content (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Katz & Hass, 1988). Consequently, a high-status majority might express an evaluation of the minority as favourably as their in-group evaluation at the explicit level (Glick and Fiske), but express a clear

preference for their in-group at the implicit level (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes

Research on attitudes, self-esteem and stereotypes has often focused on 'explicit cognition'; that is, controlled thought processes that are accessible to research participants by conscious introspection. For instance, participants' opinions about the Mapuche, expressed as a response to either blatant or subtle questions or tasks, are an explicit form of intergroup attitude. This approach largely has been criticized as subject to the influence of ego and group justification motives, such as those involved in self-presentation strategies. This explains the current tendency in attitude research to focus increasingly on 'implicit cognition' (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Recent methodological innovations allow researchers to assess attitudes as automatic associations (Bargh, 1997; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Nosek & Banaji, 2001) that are expected to be relatively unaffected by controlled processing. The most widely used of these new methods for assessing the implicit aspects of attitudes is the Implicit Association Test (IAT), as developed by Greenwald *et al.*.

The development of the IAT has spurred interest in the distinction and possible relationships between implicit and explicit cognition. Research on prejudice that used both indirect measures (i.e. the IAT) and direct measures (i.e. self-reports) revealed only moderate-to-low correlations between implicit and explicit prejudice (Chen & Bargh, 1997; Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Nosek, 2001; Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; but see Hofmann, Gawronski, Gschwendner, Le, & Schmitt, 2005, whose meta-analysis suggested strong correlations under certain conditions), thus providing evidence for a dissociation of implicit and explicit cognition. However, other work points to different forms of interaction between implicit and explicit attitudes, suggesting a dynamic relation in determining social behaviour, rather than mere independence (Nier, 2005; Perugini, 2005; Strack & Deutsch, 2004). Yet another group of studies suggests that the pattern of relations between the implicit and explicit attitudes of nationhood among ethnic groups depends on the sociocultural context, as well as on the particular ethnic group considered within a given national context (see Bohner, Siebler, González, Haye, & Schmidt, 2008; Devos & Banaji, 2005; Sibley & Liu, 2007). In particular, the phenomena of out-group favouritism in powerless minorities and of benevolent prejudice in dominant majorities offer an interesting field in which to study the interplay between implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. Our research aims at further exploring this, building upon

other theoretical developments (Devine; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Burgess, 2000).

Out-group favouritism and benevolent prejudice

There are different ways of understanding the interplay between implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes that seem relevant to explaining the complementary phenomena of out-group favouritism and benevolent prejudice. A first approach is based on Devine's (1989) notion that indirect attitude measures assess widespread cultural stereotypes that are automatically accessed on the basis of situational stimuli. This automatically accessible knowledge might influence the construction of explicit evaluative judgments and of social action, normally in interaction with more controlled processes, such as impression management, self-esteem concerns and elaborated thought. Devine developed these ideas to account for the difference between the automatic activation of the stored knowledge about a given social group and the endorsement of an attitude towards it. In fact, people might hold beliefs about a given social group that are quite different from the dominant stereotype because their knowledge of the stereotype does not imply its acceptance. Research that is inspired by this perspective suggests that controlled processes are involved, mainly in the inhibition of the automatic orientations that work as the starting point of attitude construction.

Thus, these ideas are particularly relevant to the phenomenon of benevolent prejudice. Nevertheless, we think Devine's (1989) approach can be extended to the analysis of out-group favouritism. According to these assumptions, the out-group favouritism that is shown by minorities may be explained as reflecting the most accessible knowledge about the social groups within society, which certainly would include the dominant perspective to which even minority members are most frequently exposed. This is likely to be the case of the Mapuche because, for decades, even centuries, they have been learning a negative common-sense representation of themselves (Saiz, 1986). However, explicit attitudes do not need to express this automatically activated knowledge. For instance, it is expected that a Mapuche will generate an explicit attitude by inhibiting automatically accessed knowledge if it can be recognized as pertaining to the dominant group's perspective. Similarly, benevolent prejudice would be the result of constructing an explicit attitude by inhibiting automatically accessed knowledge if it is felt as an unwanted, prejudice-like orientation. Thus, motivated correction processes are assumed to be involved in the on-line construction of explicit attitudes (Strack, Schwarz, Bless, Kübler, & Wänke, 1993; Wegener & Petty, 1997).

Another complementary approach is founded on the system justification theory of Jost and Banaji (1994) and Jost *et al.* (2004), which assumes that indirect measures tap the internalized beliefs of the dominant groups within a given society, even if the perceiver belongs to a powerless minority, whereas direct measures reflect more ego- and group-justifying interests. This approach has been developed specifically to account for false consciousness, which involves out-group favouritism at its core. In this line, out-group favouritism is understood as an ambivalent attitude (Jost & Burgess, 2000) that reflects the dominant group's view, which has been learned and hidden out of conscious awareness but still serves to justify the status quo. Direct measures might reveal in-group favouritism because its expression is assumed to satisfy ego- and group-justifying motives. Benevolent prejudice again would reflect an ambivalent attitude (Glick & Fiske, 2001) that might result from group justification being realized through an implicit derogation of a minority, whereas ego justification is achieved via the explicit valuation of, or respect towards, this minority. Thus, benevolent prejudice can be conceived of as the form of false consciousness that is expected for dominant groups and that reinforces the status quo, as much as out-group favouritism does on the part of dominated groups (Jost & Kay, 2005; Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay, Jost, & Young, 2005).

Proponents of system justification theory state that indirect and direct measures of attitude refer to independent tendencies that can differ to varying degrees, thus provoking a dissonance that the perceiver ought to reduce in some way. A feasible way to reduce this dissonance is by moderating one's own in-group favouritism that, in extreme cases, is achieved by means of dissociating in-group evaluation. Such dissociation can be described as maintaining the consensual perspective at an implicit level in accordance with system justification needs and maintaining the personal perspective at the explicit level in line with ego- and group-justification needs. Note that this reasoning is valid for both out-group favouritism on the part of low-status group members and benevolent prejudice on the part of dominant-majority members (see Jost *et al.*, 2004). According to the theory, in both cases, the implicit level is not passively confined to unawareness but can influence both subjective experience and overt behaviour. For instance, in the case of low-status group members, implicit tendencies might produce frustration (Lerner, 1980) and might inhibit behaviour that challenges the social system (Rudman *et al.*, 2002). In the case of dominant-majority members, implicit tendencies might produce pity (Glick & Fiske, 2001) and reinforce subtle discriminatory behaviour.

Based on the historical situation of the Mapuche intergroup relations and on the theoretical and empirical background presented, our hypotheses were that:

- 1 The Mapuche would show evidence of in-group favouritism at the explicit level
- 2 The Mapuche would show evidence of out-group favouritism at the implicit level
- 3 Non-indigenous Chileans would express an evaluation of the Mapuche as favourably as their in-group evaluation at the explicit level
- 4 Non-indigenous Chileans would express a clear preference for their in-group at the implicit level.

To the present, research that has been inspired by system justification theory has focused on implicit intergroup attitudes (e.g. Jost, 2001; Jost *et al.*, 2002), including the perspectives of both high-status and low-status groups but frequently lacking comparisons at the explicit level. Other studies have addressed the perspective of minorities only (e.g. Rudman *et al.*, 2002), comprising indirect and direct attitude measures but lacking comparisons with the perspective of high-status majorities. In sum, many studies have tackled false consciousness with an incomplete framework of intergroup attitudes. A complete framework, as found, for example, in O'Brien and Major (2005) and in Nosek, Banaji, and Greenwald (2002), involves a systematic analysis of reciprocal attitudes between the high-status and low-status groups at both the explicit and the implicit levels (see Jost *et al.*, 2004 for a review within system justification theory). Thus, a central aim of the present study was to conceptually replicate previous research on false consciousness with a complete framework of intergroup attitudes in a sample of school-aged Chileans, involving a real intergroup context of indigenous and non-indigenous groups.

Method

Participants

Fifty-nine students from four schools in Temuco, Chile, participated in the study. The participants were selected from school grades corresponding to students aged ~12–14 years. All the participants were Chilean: 29 were Mapuche and 30 were non-indigenous. They were between 11 and 15 years old, with an average age of 13 years. There were 22 boys and 37 girls in the whole sample, evenly distributed between the Mapuche and non-indigenous.¹

Procedure and design

The computer laboratories at the schools were used for running the study and recording the responses. The students were contacted through their teachers and invited to participate in the experiment on a voluntary basis. Then, they were told to read carefully the instructions that would appear on the computer screen and to complete the task (see below for details). After the IAT task, the students completed a self-

report questionnaire that assessed explicit intergroup attitudes. Once the experimental session was finished, they were thanked for their participation and informed of the objective of the study. Basically, the study had a mixed 2 × 2 design with ethnicity of the participant (the Mapuche *vs* non-indigenous) as a between-subjects factor and the type of attitude measure (direct *vs* indirect) as a within-subjects factor.

Instructions to the participants. The introductory instructions stated that the study was concerned with young people's recognition of, and opinions towards, persons, objects and words. For the IAT task, the students learned that they were to respond to the materials presented on the computer screen by pressing one of two colour-coded keys on the computer keyboard. They were instructed that there was only one correct response for each stimulus, that they should respond as quickly as possible, that errors (indicated by the letter 'X') needed to be corrected and that they should not worry if they made a few errors. They were asked to keep their index fingers on the response keys so that they could respond more quickly. Then, the students practised the discrimination task by assigning the names of well-known Chilean athletes to the categories of 'soccer' or 'tennis'.

Materials and apparatus. The IAT stimuli were drawn at random from a pool of pleasant words, unpleasant words, non-indigenous category targets and indigenous category targets. The four stimulus classes comprised six-to-seven items each. The category targets were either typical surnames of the Mapuche and non-indigenous people for half of the participants or a controlled combination of surnames and digital photographs for the other half. The photographs were facial portraits of different members of the respective groups. All the photographs were of identical size, were comparable in contrast and brightness and covered the same restricted set of features (eyebrows, eyes and nose, but not forehead, hair, ears and mouth). The word stimuli are shown in Appendix I.

The stimuli were presented in blocks of trials. Each block started with a brief explanation of the block's assignment of category labels to the response keys. Then, 40 stimuli were presented one by one and remained visible until the correct key was pressed. The category names that were used in the IAT were 'Mapuche', 'non-indigenous', 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant'.² Following Greenwald *et al.* (1998), our IAT comprised seven trial blocks. In Block 1, the participants assigned group-related targets (either names or names and faces) to the categories of 'Mapuche' and 'non-indigenous', respectively. In Block 2, they assigned pleasant and unpleasant words to the categories 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant', respectively. Block 3 combined the single discrimination tasks from blocks 1 and 2, requiring the participants to

assign stimuli from all four stimulus sets to the two category labels 'Mapuche or pleasant' and 'non-indigenous or unpleasant'. The combined discrimination task, as practised in Block 3, then was repeated with a larger number of stimuli in Block 4. Block 5 again required assigning group-related targets to the categories 'non-indigenous' and 'Mapuche' (just like Block 1), but the left-right assignment of categories was now reversed. The participants then encountered another combined discrimination task in blocks 6 and 7. Specifically, they were asked to assign stimuli from all four stimulus sets to the two category labels of 'non-indigenous or pleasant' and 'Mapuche or unpleasant'. This was done in Block 6 with a smaller number of stimuli for practice purposes and then again in Block 7 with a larger stimulus number.

Measures

Implicit intergroup attitudes. As the indirect measure of intergroup evaluation, an IAT score was computed for each participant by following the IAT scoring algorithm that was proposed by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003). Specifically, we eliminated the responses with a latency of >10 000 ms, replaced the latency of incorrect responses by the respective block's mean latency plus two standard deviations, computed the difference scores between associated blocks and removed the cases with >10% of overly quick responses (i.e. <300 ms) from the dataset. As a result of this latter procedure, 27 Mapuche and 28 non-indigenous participants remained as valid cases.

Each difference score was divided by the pooled standard deviation of both the practice and test blocks, resulting in a measure called 'D'. To account for the participants' ethnicity, the indigenous participants' scores were reverse-coded (multiplying by -1). Thus, a positive sign indicates a relative preference for the in-group over the out-group, whereas a negative sign indicates a relative preference for the out-group over the in-group.

Again according to Greenwald *et al.* (2003), we used the correlation between the IAT scores that were computed from the practice blocks and test blocks (omitting the first two responses from each block) as a measure of internal consistency. The scores correlated positively and substantially ($r(54) = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$), indicating good reliability.

Explicit intergroup attitudes. As the measure of explicit intergroup evaluation (EIE), judgements of the attribute-group associations for each group category target, the Mapuche and non-indigenous, were assessed following Saiz (2002). Based on pilot testing, eight items were used that represented general positive attributes that were applicable to both the Mapuche and the non-indigenous targets. The scores for the negative attributes were reverse-coded

before averaging. The attributes that were used were: 'creative', 'hardworking', 'sociable', 'honest', 'intelligent', 'likeable', 'depressive' and 'industrious'. The participants were instructed to judge how much they believed that each of the attributes is a good descriptor of each of the two social categories, with a scale ranging from 1 ('a little') to 7 ('very much'). The questions' wording was unambiguous regarding the descriptive, rather than prescriptive, nature of the task.

As an index of internal consistency of this measure, Cronbach's alpha was computed separately for the evaluation of the in-group ($\alpha = 0.67$) and for the evaluation of the out-group ($\alpha = 0.68$). The item responses within each of these two measures were averaged, yielding an evaluation score for the in-group and another for the out-group. An index of EIE was obtained by computing the difference between these two scores (evaluation of the in-group minus evaluation of the out-group), such that a positive sign indicates a relative preference for the in-group over the out-group, whereas a negative sign indicates a relative preference for the out-group over the in-group.

Results

Analysis of implicit intergroup attitudes

We had hypothesized that the non-indigenous students would show evidence of implicit prejudice towards the Mapuche, whereas the Mapuche students would tend to implicitly favour the non-indigenous Chileans and/or devalue their in-group; that is, to reproduce prejudice towards the Mapuche. The pattern of latencies that is displayed in Table 1 is consistent with this hypothesis. For the non-indigenous, the IAT index ($M = 0.381$) was significantly greater than zero ($t(27) = 3.271$, $p = 0.003$) and for the Mapuche ($M = -0.220$), it was marginally less than zero ($t(26) = -1.883$, $p = 0.071$). A 2 (ethnicity: the Mapuche vs non-indigenous) \times 2 (stimuli: names only vs names and photographs) mixed-model ANOVA was carried out, including the last factor in order to test for relevant differences between the two IATs. The analysis yielded only the

Table 1 Means of the latencies of implicit association, as a function of ethnicity

Ethnic group	In-group unfavourable associations		In-group favourable associations	
Non-indigenous	974.51	(294.80)	873.29	(245.20)
Mapuche	1009.47	(313.40)	1132.75	(388.20)

Scores represent the response latencies in ms. The standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

predicted ethnicity main effect ($F(1, 54) = 14.188$, $p = 0.001$, $MSE = 5.232$). There was neither a stimuli main effect ($F(1, 54) = 2.482$, ns) nor an interaction with ethnicity ($F > 1$), suggesting that the two IATs produced similar outcomes. These results are consistent with our hypothesis that both the Mapuche and the non-indigenous participants hold negative implicit attitudes towards the Mapuche.

Analysis of explicit intergroup attitudes

Table 2 displays the pattern of results regarding the direct measure. For the non-indigenous participants, the EIE index ($M = -0.060$) was not significantly different from zero ($t(27) = -0.287$, ns), whereas for the Mapuche participants ($M = 0.78$), it was significantly greater than zero ($t(26) = 3.613$, $p < 0.001$). A 2 (ethnicity: the Mapuche vs non-indigenous) \times 2 (target: in-group vs out-group) mixed-model ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor yielded only an ethnicity \times target interaction ($F(1, 53) = 7.858$, $p = 0.007$, $MSE = 4.984$). This interaction revealed that the in-group was evaluated systematically better than the out-group only by the Mapuche students, whereas the non-indigenous students evaluated the in-group and the out-group similarly, as shown in Table 2.

Relationship between implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes

One of the intriguing questions that is central to research on implicit attitudes concerns their relationship with explicit attitudes (see Hofmann *et al.*, 2005). Do these types of attitudes correspond to different, independent constructs (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald *et al.*, 1998; Wilson, Lindsay, & Schooler, 2000) or do they represent two aspects of a similar phenomenon in attitudes (Karpinski & Hilton, 2001)? The present data strongly depart from the latter view. First, an overall negative correlation was found between the IAT and explicit evaluation index ($r(25) = -0.278$, $p = 0.040$). However, correlations that were computed for the two ethnic groups were non-

significant: $r(27) = -0.076$ (ns) for the Mapuche and $r(28) = -0.204$ (ns) for the non-indigenous. Second, the separate analyses of the IAT and the EIE scores suggest that there is an inverted pattern of in-group–out-group evaluation between the explicit and the implicit levels. At the explicit level, it has been shown that the Mapuche evaluate their in-group systematically better than the out-group, whereas at the implicit level, they appear to evaluate their in-group less positively than the out-group. To test this, a 2 (ethnicity) \times 2 (measure: direct vs indirect) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was run. As it can be predicted on the basis of the raw means, the ANOVA yielded only a strong interaction effect ($F(1, 53) = 15.784$, $p < 0.001$, $MSE = 14.487$). This interaction suggests that the explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes among the Mapuche and non-indigenous Chileans are different phenomena that might, however, jointly form a socially and psychologically coherent attitudinal pattern, as will be discussed next.

Discussion

Members of low-status minorities might overtly express a moderate evaluative preference for their in-group but, at the same time, might devalue it covertly. Conversely, members of high-status majorities might overtly express no in-group bias but, at the same time, might covertly devalue their out-group. The results of the present study are consistent with both propositions, showing an interaction between the direct versus indirect measures of intergroup attitudes and between high versus low group status. We presented clear support for hypotheses 1, 3 and 4. What are the implications?

Explaining the asymmetries between explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes

Our results regarding the indirect measure are consistent with the hypothesis that both the Mapuche and the non-indigenous Chileans implicitly evaluate the former as less positively than the latter. This finding is congruent with Rudman *et al.* (2002), who found that minority groups tend to dismiss their own group automatically. Within system justification theory, this could be accounted for as reflecting the fact that the minorities, on an implicit level, are motivated to perceive the system as legitimate, which in turn makes the minority members adopt the attitudes of the dominant group more easily, with the paradoxical consequence of reinforcing the status quo. Complementarily, from a ‘cultural worldview’ interpretation, this could be explained by the presence of the dominant stereotypes in the Mapuche’s knowledge base, which might influence attitude construction and expression. This

Table 2 Means of the explicit intergroup evaluation, as a function of ethnicity

Ethnic group	Evaluation target			
	In-group		Out-group	
Non-indigenous	4.72	(0.96)	4.78	(1.09)
Mapuche	5.30	(1.02)	4.53	(0.72)

Scores represent the average judgement of attribute–group associations, ranging from 1 (‘a little applicable’) to 7 (‘very much applicable’). Higher scores reflect a more positive evaluation of the target. The standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

is expected to happen if people lack the time or motivation to resist the influence of such knowledge (Olson & Fazio, 2004).

However, the results regarding the direct measure of intergroup attitudes revealed a different picture. The Mapuche participants tended to show a slight in-group bias, whereas the non-indigenous Chileans showed no bias. Explicit in-group favouritism on the part of the Mapuche is expected when following traditional social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), but the striking finding is the dissociation between the explicit and the implicit levels of attitudes towards the in-group (relative to the out-group) on the part of the Mapuche. Following system justification theory, this dissociation could be understood as a psychological mechanism of hiding system-justifying orientations under ego- and group-justifying thoughts (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Ego- and group-justifying tendencies are assumed to compete with system-justifying tendencies and to impose their orientation over system justification if there is enough attention devoted to them (Jost *et al.*, 2002). Thus, people are expected to express system-justifying tendencies, particularly when competing motives are low in salience. From this point of view, the Mapuche's more positive explicit attitudes towards the in-group, compared to the out-group, seem to reflect the operation of ego- and group-justifying motives that are assumed to be lacking at the implicit level.

Finally, the relationship between implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes that is expected for majorities is more straightforward. Implicit prejudice against minorities might be hidden by an explicit expression of moderate attitudes towards them. This pattern has been documented by a number of studies (Crosby *et al.*, 1980; Devine, 1989; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost & Burgess, 2000). Interestingly, one can explain this pattern by means of exactly the same theoretical mechanism that accounts for the explicit-implicit dissociation of attitudes among low-status minority members. Thus, the absence of in-group bias among the non-indigenous Chileans might reflect the influence of ego- and group-justifying motives, such as the endorsement of norms of tolerance or the display of self-presentation strategies. Again, these motives might be lacking at the implicit level, at which orientations akin to system perpetuation are more likely being developed. In this case, such implicit orientations can be conceived of as either in-group-favouring beliefs that are 'covered' by more egalitarian considerations or highly accessible knowledge depicting a more positive stereotype of the in-group but subject to inhibition by egalitarian personal beliefs.

Despite the fact that the theoretical approaches that we have used to understand our results differ in their focus and concepts, we argue that it is possible to account for out-group favouritism on the part of low-status groups and

benevolent prejudice on the part of high-status groups with the one-and-the-same rationale.

Integrated view of the underlying processes

The explicit-implicit pattern of privileged and disadvantaged group attitudes can be explained as a function of the social and personal meaning attached to basic stereotypical and evaluative information that is automatically generated from conventional knowledge about relevant social groups (see Ibáñez, Haye, González, Hurtado & Henríquez, 2009 for a more detailed discussion of this theoretical framework). If the stereotypical information is consistent with the social norms that have high personal importance in a given situation or if the generated norms have low personal importance, then an attitude judgement is constructed in line with such stereotypical information (anchor of judgement). Conversely, if it is perceived as inconsistent with highly important norms, attitude judgement is produced in contrast to the anchoring stereotypical information. Consequently, implicit measures should favour an assimilation process, whereas explicit measures should allow judges to engage in motivated correction processes in order to justify the relevant self and the relevant in-group. Ego- and group-justification processes may take place as a form of correction of an automatic tendency.

Our claim is that the pattern of explicit and implicit attitudes in both the Mapuche's out-group favouritism and the non-indigenous Chileans' benevolent prejudice can be predicted on the basis of this simple process model. Members from both groups would generate automatic evaluative reactions in line with the dominant stereotypes that favour the non-indigenous Chileans and engage in controlled correction for these allegedly automatic orientations, in line with ego- and group-justification motives. Our results suggest that out-group favouritism on the part of low-status groups may be observed only at the implicit level, consistent with assuming them to be automatic evaluative orientations towards the in-group and the out-group. At the explicit level, low-status group members might have carried out an inhibition-like correction of the automatic out-group favouritism. Research that has been inspired by Devine's (1989) approach suggests that controlled processes are involved mainly in the inhibition of the automatic orientations that work as the starting point in attitude construction. Conversely, benevolent prejudice on the part of high-status groups might develop only at the explicit level as elaborated evaluative judgements of the in-group and the out-group, based on an inhibition-correction process. At the implicit level, both as theoretically predicted and as empirically found, high-status group members would show in-group bias.

Present and future research

The main contribution of the present research was to replicate the system-perpetuating asymmetries phenomenon with a complete framework, comprising both indirect and direct measures and the complementary perspectives of both a high-status majority and a low-status minority, in a novel population involving real, opposing indigenous and non-indigenous groups. Comparable studies on the Chilean population (Uhlmann, Dasgupta, Elgueta, Greenwald, & Swanson, 2002) have focused on the non-indigenous Chileans only.

Another contribution of the present research was to describe such system-perpetuating asymmetries among indigenous and non-indigenous school students. The importance of studying implicit intergroup attitudes among young people, especially implicit out-group favouritism, rests upon the crucial role that has been theoretically assigned (Devine, 1989) to internalized, socially widespread views of social groups and their relative status. In this respect, our findings suggest that prejudice and legitimizing beliefs might exist already at the early stages of socialization. This is consistent with recent research concerning the development of implicit attitudes. For example, Rutland, Cameron, Milne, and McGeorge (2005) assessed both explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes in majority children, suggesting that implicit in-group preference in the racial and national intergroup context is formed and acquires its adult-like strength even before 10 years of age. In the same line, Dunham, Baron, and Banaji (2008) argued that implicit preference for the in-groups, as well as for the dominant social groups, is developed from childhood. Our present findings directly reinforce this view by demonstrating that the predicted interaction between direct versus indirect measures of intergroup attitudes and between high versus low group status clearly can be observed already among children of ~13 years. If early implicit intergroup attitudes tend to be stable across the life span (Dunham *et al.*), this might contribute to the system-perpetuating character of the asymmetries between explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes that we have described. Further studies should offer a more in-depth examination of minorities' implicit out-group favouritism among children in order to explore the basis of system-justifying ideologies.

Some methodological limitations of this study must be considered. First, the order of compatible and incompatible blocks in the IAT was not counter-balanced, thus involving a confound: for the Mapuche participants, the compatible block always came first, but for the non-indigenous participants, the incompatible block always came first. However, the order of compatible versus incompatible blocks normally affects the IAT scores, such that they are larger when the compatible block comes first (see Greenwald *et al.*,

1998; Fig. 2). A mere order effect speaks against finding a pro-in-group bias among the non-indigenous Chileans, but we found it nevertheless. Likewise, it speaks for easily finding a pro-in-group bias in the Mapuche, but empirically we found the opposite (just as predicted). Future studies should balance the order of the blocks. The effects that we reported in the present article are likely to show even more strongly.

Second, our explicit measure contained positive and negative attributes, but also a mix of what might be reconstructed as warmth- and competence-related adjectives (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999). This might represent another confound, as Fiske *et al.* have argued that these are two different dimensions of stereotype content, independent of their positive or negative valence. For instance, it is possible to think that the Mapuche might evaluate themselves more positively in terms of warm attributes and evaluate the non-indigenous Chileans more positively in terms of competence attributes. Following this line of reasoning, it is important to differentiate between these dimensions of stereotype content more systematically in future research.

Concerning theoretical issues, a number of open questions must be addressed. For instance, future studies need to be developed to empirically disentangle the different theoretical approaches that we used to interpret our results. Specifically, studies involving an experimental manipulation of ego- and group-justifying motives or personal and social norms are critical. In the same vein, Olson and Fazio (2004) have posed an alternative model that might help to explain our data in a different fashion. These authors have shown that the standard IAT taps both the personal attitude towards an object and the cultural knowledge about this object and that a slight modification to the attribute category labels and attribute items reduces the effect of 'extra-personal associations', thus measuring the personal attitude more purely. In their theoretical account, attitude is a personal association that is stored in memory and norms are cultural dispositions. Direct attitude measures presumably tap the distortion of true attitudes by cultural norms. Indirect attitude measures are aimed at grasping the personal association as independently from cultural norms as possible. According to this view, both implicit out-group favouritism on the part of low-status groups and benevolent prejudice on the part of high-status groups may be regarded as artefacts due to the contamination of attitudes by other associations that are available in memory; namely, cultural knowledge about the target. If such contaminating associations are removed or reduced, then one should expect a traditional in-group bias among both the Mapuche and non-indigenous Chileans. In order to explore this hypothesis, a replication of the present study involving a 'personalized IAT' (Olson and Fazio) is in order.

Acknowledgements

The preparation of this manuscript was facilitated by a grant from the Chilean National Board of Scientific and Technological Research to Roberto González (FONDECYT no. 1020954) and by a joint grant from the German Academic Exchange Service and the Chilean National Board of Scientific and Technological Research to Gerd Bohner and Roberto González (no. 415-alechile/ale-02/21671).

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Bargh, J. A. (1997). The automaticity of everyday life. In: R. S. Wyer, ed. *Advances in Social Cognition*, Vol. 10, pp. 1–61. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bengoa, J. (2000). *Historia del Pueblo Mapuche (Siglo XIX y XX)*. Santiago, Chile: LOM.
- Bohner, G., Siebler, F., González, R., Haye, A. & Schmidt, E. A. (2008). Situational flexibility of ingroup-related attitudes: A single category IAT study of people with dual national identity. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 11, 301–317.
- Chen, M. & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 541–560.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S. & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 546–563.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotype and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5–18.
- Devos, T. & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 447–466.
- Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S. & Banaji, M. R. (2008). The development of implicit intergroup cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 12, 248–253.
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C. & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1013–1027.
- Fiske, S., Cuddy, A., Glick, P. & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902.
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 473–491.
- Gawronski, B., Hofmann, W. & Wilbur, C. (2006). Are implicit attitudes unconscious? *Consciousness and Cognition*, 15, 485–499.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (2001). Ambivalent stereotypes as legitimizing ideologies: Differentiating paternalistic and envious prejudice. In: J. Jost & B. Major, eds. *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*, pp. 278–306. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenwald, A. G. & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27.
- Greenwald, A. G. & Nosek, B. A. (2001). Health of the Implicit Association Test at age 3. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie*, 48, 85–93.
- 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.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A. & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 197–216.
- Hinkle, S. W. & Brown, R. J. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In: D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg, eds. *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*, pp. 48–70. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H. & Schmitt, M. (2005). A meta-analysis on the correlation between the Implicit Association Test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1369–1385.
- Ibáñez, A., Haye, A., González, R., Hurtado, E. & Henríquez, R. (2009). Multi-level analysis of cultural phenomena: The role of ERPs approach to prejudice. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 39, 81–110.
- Jost, J. T. (2001). Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: A paradigm for investigating the effects of socioeconomic success on stereotype content. In: G. Moskowitz, ed. *Cognitive Social Psychology: The Princeton Symposium on the Legacy and Future of Social Cognition*, pp. 89–102. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jost, J. T. & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1–27.
- Jost, J. T. & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 293–305.
- Jost, J. & Kay, A. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 498–509.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R. & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–919.
- Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W. & Carvallo, M. R. (2002). Non-conscious forms of system justification: Implicit and behavioral preferences for higher status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 586–602.

End notes

1. These data are a subset of a larger dataset, which is discussed in another article (Siebler *et al.*, 2010) with respect to the methodological issues of indirect attitude measurement, rather than theoretical questions.
2. The Spanish labels were ‘Mapuche’ and ‘Chileno no indígena’ for the group categories and ‘agradable’ and ‘desagradable’ for the word categories.

- Karpinski, A. & Hilton, J. L. (2001). Attitudes and the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 774–788.
- Katz, I. & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 893–905.
- Kay, A. & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of 'poor but happy' and 'poor but honest' stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 823–837.
- Kay, A., Jost, J. & Young, S. (2005). Victim derogation and victim enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychological Science*, 16, 240–246.
- van Knippenberg, A. (1978). Status difference, comparative relevance and intergroup differentiation. In: H. Tajfel, ed. *Differentiation Between Social Groups*, pp. 179–199. London: Academic Press.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The Belief in a Just World: A Foundational Delusion*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lewin, K. (1941). Self-hatred among Jews. In: K. Lewin, ed. *Resolving Social Conflict*, pp. 186–200. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1846). *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R. & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103–122.
- Nier, J. (2005). How dissociated are implicit and explicit racial attitudes? A bogus pipeline approach. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 8, 39–52.
- Nosek, B., Banaji, M. & Greenwald, A. (2002). Math = male, me = female, therefore math ≠ me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 44–59.
- Nosek, B. A. & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The go/no-go association task. *Social Cognition*, 19, 625–666.
- O'Brien, L. T. & Major, B. (2005). System-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being: The roles of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1718–1729.
- Olson, M. A. & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Reducing the influence of extra-personal associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalizing the IAT. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 653–667.
- Perugini, M. (2005). Predictive models of implicit and explicit attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 29–45.
- Rudman, L. A., Feinberg, J. & Fairchild, K. (2002). Minority members' implicit attitudes: Automatic ingroup bias as a function of group status. *Social Cognition*, 20, 294–320.
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A. & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development*, 76, 451–466.
- Saiz, J. L. (1986). Estereotipos adscritos al indígena mapuche por adultos no Mapuche de Chile meridional. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 20, 55–68.
- Saiz, J. L. (2002). Atribución de estereotipos: Los indígenas Mapuche que perciben los chilenos. In: J. F. Morales, D. Páez, A. L. Kornblit & D. Asún, eds. *Psicología Social*, pp. 145–151. Buenos Aires: Prentice Hall–Pearson Education.
- Sibley, C. G. & Liu, J. H. (2007). New Zealand = bicultural? Implicit and explicit associations between ethnicity and nationhood in the New Zealand context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1222–1243.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1993). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Siebler, F., González, R., Ordóñez, G., Bohnner, G., Haye, A., Sirlopú, D. et al. (2010). The role of category focus in the Implicit Association Test. *Social Psychology*, 41, 105–110.
- Strack, F. & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 220–247.
- Strack, F., Schwarz, N., Bless, H., Kübler, A. & Wänke, M. (1993). Awareness of the influence as a determinant of assimilation versus contrast. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 53–62.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: W. G. Austin & S. Worchel, eds. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, pp. 33–48. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Uhlmann, E., Dasgupta, N., Elgueta, A., Greenwald, A. & Swanson, J. (2002). Subgroup prejudice based on skin color among Hispanics in the United States and Latin America. *Social Cognition*, 20, 198–226.
- Wegener, D. T. & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. In: M. Zanna, ed. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 29, pp. 141–208. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilson, T., Lindsay, S. & Schooler, T. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, 107, 101–126.

Appendix I

Implicit Association Test stimuli

- 1 Non-indigenous names: Morales, Pérez, Rodríguez, Sánchez, Salinas, Ramírez.
- 2 Mapuche names: Paylaqueo, Manquelafqué, Paylahueque, Huilcaleo, Huichaquelen, Huayquipan.

- 3 Pleasant words: fiesta (party), dulce (sweet), paz (peace), regalo (gift), amor (love), alegría (happiness), abrazo (hug).
- 4 Unpleasant words: basura (rubbish), castigo (punishment), choque (crush), guerra (war), tristeza (sadness), veneno (poison), dolor (pain).