

RUNNING HEAD: Explicit and Implicit Intergroup Attitudes

System-perpetuating Asymmetries Between Explicit and Implicit Intergroup Attitudes  
Among Indigenous and Non-indigenous Chileans

Andrés Haye<sup>a</sup>, Roberto González<sup>a</sup>, Gabriela Ordóñez<sup>a</sup>, Gerd Bohner<sup>b</sup>, Frank Siebler<sup>c</sup>,

David Sirlopuá<sup>a</sup>, Andrés Millar<sup>a</sup>, Pablo de Tezanos-Pinto<sup>a</sup>, and David Torres<sup>a</sup>

a Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

b Universität Bielefeld

c Universitetet i Tromsø

This is the final author version of an article published in *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* (The Japanese Group Dynamics Association; The Asian Association of Social Psychology; Blackwell Publishing). The definitive version is available at [www.blackwell-synergy.com](http://www.blackwell-synergy.com).

**Bibliographic details:** Haye, A., González, R., Ordóñez, G., Bohner, G., Siebler, F., Sirlopuá, D., Millar, A., De Tezanos-Pinto, P., & Torres, D. (2010). System-perpetuating asymmetries between explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes among indigenous and non-indigenous Chileans. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *13*, 163-172.

**Link:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2010.01311.x>

Author Note

Andrés Haye, Roberto González, and Gabriela Ordóñez, David Sirlopú, Andrés Millar, Pablo de Tezanos-Pinto, and David Torres: Escuela de Psicología, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile; Gerd Bohner: Abteilung für Psychologie, Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany; Frank Siebler: Institutt for Psykologi, Universitetet i Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway.

Preparation of this manuscript was facilitated by a grant from the Chilean National Board of Scientific and Technological Research (CONICYT) to Roberto González (FONDECYT number 1020954), and by a joint grant (415-alechile/ale-02/21671) from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Chilean National Board of Scientific and Technological Research (CONICYT) to Gerd Bohner and Roberto González.

Address correspondence to Andrés Haye, Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Macul, Santiago, Chile. E-mail address: ahaye@uc.cl.

Abstract

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, explicit measures of attitudes towards the respective ingroup and outgroup were compared with implicit association test scores. Results indicate that members of the low-status minority may explicitly express a moderate evaluative preference for their ingroup but may implicitly devalue it, and that, conversely, members of the high-status majority may implicitly devalue their outgroup but may explicitly express no bias. These results are theoretically framed in terms of system justification, conventional stereotypes, and motivated correction processes.

## System-perpetuating Asymmetries Between Explicit and Implicit Intergroup Attitudes

## Among Indigenous and Non-indigenous Chileans

Minority group members may overtly express an evaluative preference for their ingroup but may at the same time 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 social psychology of intergroup attitudes. Because 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 employing the conventional explicit/implicit distinction. Jost and colleagues (Jost, 2001; Jost & Banaji, 1994) argued that the most straightforward form of false consciousness is the tendency of group members to covertly prefer the outgroup over the ingroup (in what follows, “outgroup

favouritism”), which is the opposite of the traditional ingroup bias predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Research on social cognition, moreover, suggests that automatic tendencies may substantially influence behaviour without conscious awareness (Bargh, 1997; Perugini, 2005). Thus, a covert outgroup favouritism in disadvantaged groups may constrain their emancipation efforts.

This hidden outgroup favouritism might even be shown by minorities active in their struggle for equal rights. Examples are some indigenous peoples in Chile, particularly the Mapuche (see Bengoa, 2000). With approximately 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 over 300 years, in the 18th century the Mapuche forced the Spanish crown to recognize their autonomy; but 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, which 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 ingroup over the outgroup in line with self-esteem and group-promotion motives. But research 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 outgroup favouritism. Despite Mapuche's bravery, their social position as a low-status and powerless minority suggests that they might show this outgroup 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 outgroup favouritism is more likely to be observed by means of indirect attitudinal measures that are assumed to tap automatic and non-conscious processes (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). Therefore, low-status minorities may show ingroup favouritism at the explicit level, but outgroup 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. Because powerless minorities are not in the position to impose beliefs and stereotypes to society, non-indigenous Chileans are expected to display ingroup 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 ingroup bias (Mullen et al., 1992). It is assumed that the extent to which group members seek for a favourable ingroup–outgroup 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 risen along with societal changes in the second half of the 20th century (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Devine, 1989; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost & Burgess, 2000). Because majority members may think that it is socially inappropriate to be overtly prejudiced (van Knippenberg, 1978), their tendency to favour the ingroup over the outgroup may have become covert or even not accessible by introspection. In accordance with this idea, Jost et al. (2002) argued that strong ingroup favouritism in high status majorities may be observed more likely through indirect, unobtrusive attitude measures. Moreover, even if

majority members show implicit ingroup favouritism, the explicit subscription to values such as tolerance and equity may 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 may express, at the explicit level, an evaluation of the minority as favourable as their ingroup evaluation (Glick & Fiske, 2001), but a clear preference for their ingroup 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 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 has been largely 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 (Fazio,



Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Bargh, 1997; 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 implicit aspects of attitudes is the Implicit Association Test (IAT) as developed by Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz (1998).

The development of the IAT has spurred interest in the distinction and possible relations between implicit and explicit cognition. Research on prejudice that used both indirect measures (i.e., the IAT) and direct measures (i.e., self-reports) has 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 suggests 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 suggest that the pattern of relations between implicit and explicit attitudes of nationhood among ethnic groups

depends upon on the socio-cultural 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 outgroup favouritism in powerless minorities and of benevolent prejudice in dominant majorities offer an interesting field to study the interplay between implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. Our research aims at further exploring this, building upon other theoretical developments (Devine, 1989; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Burgess, 2000).

#### *Outgroup 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 outgroup 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 may influence the construction of explicit evaluative judgements and of social action, normally in interaction with more controlled processes such as impression management, self-esteem concerns, and elaborated thought. The author developed these ideas to account for the difference between automatic activation

of stored knowledge about a given social group and endorsement of an attitude towards it. In fact, people may hold beliefs about a given social group quite different from the dominant stereotype, because their knowledge of the stereotype does not imply its acceptance. Research 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.

These ideas are thus particularly relevant to the phenomenon of benevolent prejudice. Nevertheless, we think Devine's approach can be extended to the analysis of outgroup favouritism. According to these assumptions, outgroup favouritism shown by minorities may be explained as reflecting the most accessible knowledge about the social groups within society, which would certainly include the dominant perspective that even minority members are most frequently exposed to. 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 groups' 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 Jost's system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 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 outgroup favouritism at its core. In this line, outgroup favouritism is understood as an ambivalent attitude (Jost & Burgess, 2000) reflecting 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 may reveal ingroup favouritism because its expression is assumed to satisfy ego- and group-justifying motives. Benevolent prejudice would again reflect an ambivalent attitude (Glick & Fiske, 2001) that may result from group justification being realized through an implicit

derogation of a minority whereas ego justification is achieved via 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 outgroup favouritism does on the part of dominated groups (Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay, Jost, & Young, 2005; Jost & Kay, 2005).

Proponents of system justification theory state that indirect and direct measures of attitude refer to independent tendencies that may differ in varying degrees, thus provoking a dissonance that the perceiver ought to reduce in some way. A feasible way to reduce this dissonance is moderating one's own ingroup favouritism, which in extreme cases is achieved by means of dissociating ingroup 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 outgroup favouritism on the part of low status group members and benevolent prejudice on the part of dominant majority members (see Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). According to the theory, in both cases the implicit level is not passively confined to unawareness but may influence both subjective experience and overt behaviour. For

instance, in the case of low status group members, implicit tendencies may produce frustration (Lerner, 1980) and may inhibit behaviour that challenges the social system (Rudman et al., 2002). In the case of dominant majority members, implicit tendencies may 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 (H1) Mapuche would show evidence of ingroup favouritism at the explicit level, but (H2) of outgroup favouritism at the implicit level, whereas (H3) non-indigenous Chileans would express, at the explicit level, an evaluation of the Mapuche as favourable as their ingroup evaluation, but (H4) a clear preference for their ingroup at the implicit level.

To the present, research inspired by system justification theory was focused on implicit intergroup attitudes (e.g., Jost, 2001; Jost et al., 2002), including the perspective of both high- 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 Major and O'Brien (2006) and in Nosek, Banaji, and Greenwald (2002) involves a systematic analysis of reciprocal attitudes between high- 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 4 schools in Santiago, Chile, participated in the study. Participants were selected from school grades corresponding to students aged around 12 to 14 years. All 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. There were 22 boys and 37 girls in the whole sample, evenly distributed between Mapuche and non-indigenous.<sup>1</sup>

### *Procedure and Design*

Computer laboratories of schools were used for running the study and recording 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 then 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 by 2 design with ethnicity of participant (Mapuche vs. non-indigenous) as a between-subjects factor and type of attitude measure (direct vs. indirect) as a within-subjects factor.

*Instructions to participants.* 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 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 practiced the discrimination task by assigning the names of well-known Chilean athletes to the categories “soccer” or “tennis”, respectively.

*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 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 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, or mouth). Word stimuli are shown in the Appendix.

The stimuli were presented in blocks of trials. Each block started with a brief explanation of the block’s assignment of category labels to response keys. Then, 40 stimuli were presented one by one and remained visible until the correct key was

pressed. The category names used in the IAT were “Mapuche”, “Non-indigenous”, “Pleasant”, and “Unpleasant.”<sup>2</sup> Following Greenwald et al. (1998), our IAT comprised seven trial blocks. In Block 1, participants assigned group-related targets (either names or names plus faces) to the categories “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 participants to assign stimuli from all four stimulus sets to the two category labels “Mapuche or Pleasant” and “Non-indigenous or Unpleasant”, respectively. The combined discrimination task as practiced in Block 3 was then 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. 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 “Non-indigenous or Pleasant” and “Mapuche or Unpleasant”, respectively. 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 following the IAT scoring algorithm proposed by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003). Specifically, we eliminated responses with a latency of more than 10,000 ms; replaced the latency of incorrect responses by the respective block's mean latency plus two standard deviations; computed difference scores between associated blocks; and removed cases with more than ten percent of overly quick responses (i.e., less than 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 practice and test blocks, resulting in a measure called  $D$ . To account for participant ethnicity, indigenous participants' scores were reverse-coded (multiplying by  $-1$ ). Thus, a positive sign indicates a relative preference for the ingroup over the outgroup, whereas a negative sign indicates a relative preference for the outgroup over the ingroup.

Again according to Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003) we used the correlation between IAT scores computed from 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,  $r(54) = .64$ ,  $p < .001$ , indicating good reliability.

*Explicit intergroup attitudes.* As the measure of explicit intergroup evaluation (EIE), judgements of attribute–group associations for each group category target, Mapuche and Non-indigenous, were assessed following González and Brown (1999). Based on pilot testing, 8 items were used which represented general positive attributes applicable to both Mapuche and the non-indigenous targets. Scores for negative attributes were reverse-coded before averaging. The attributes employed were: *creative*, *hardworking*, *sociable*, *honest*, *intelligent*, *likable*, *depressive*, and *industrious*. 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). Question 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 ingroup ( $\alpha = .67$ ) and for the evaluation of the outgroup ( $\alpha = .68$ ). Item responses within each of these two measures were averaged, yielding an evaluation score for the ingroup and another for the outgroup. An

index of EIE was obtained by computing the difference between these two scores (Evaluation of the Ingroup minus Evaluation of the Outgroup), such that a positive sign indicates a relative preference for the ingroup over the outgroup, whereas a negative sign indicates a relative preference for the outgroup over the ingroup.

## 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 and/or devalue their ingroup, that is, to reproduce prejudice towards the Mapuche. The pattern of latencies displayed in Table 1 is consistent with this hypothesis. For the non-indigenous the IAT index ( $M = .381$ ) was significantly greater than zero,  $t(27) = 3.271$ ,  $p = .003$ , and for the Mapuche ( $M = -.220$ ) it was marginally less than zero,  $t(26) = -1.883$ ,  $p = .071$ . A 2 (Ethnicity: Mapuche vs. Non-indigenous) by 2 (Stimuli: names only vs. names plus pictures) mixed model analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out, including the last factor in order to test for relevant differences between the two IATs. The analysis yielded only the predicted Ethnicity main effect,  $F(1,54) = 14.188$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $MSE = 5.232$ . 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 non-indigenous participants the EIE index ( $M = -.060$ ) was not significantly different from zero,  $t(27) = -.287$ , ns, whereas for Mapuche participants ( $M = .78$ ) it was significantly greater than zero,  $t(26) = 3.613$ ,  $p < .001$ . A 2 (Ethnicity: Mapuche vs. Non-indigenous) by 2 (Target: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor yielded only an Ethnicity by Target interaction,  $F(1,53) = 7.858$ ,  $p = .007$ ,  $MSE = 4.984$ . This interaction revealed that the ingroup was evaluated systematically better than the outgroup only by the Mapuche students, whereas the non-indigenous students evaluated the ingroup and the outgroup similarly, as shown in Table 2.

#### *Relationship Between Implicit and Explicit Intergroup Attitudes*

One of the intriguing questions central to research on implicit attitudes concerns their relationship with explicit ones (see Hofmann, Gawronski., Gschwendner, Le, &

Schmitt, 2005). Do these types of attitudes correspond to different, independent constructs (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald et al., 1998; Wilson et al., 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. Firstly, an overall negative correlation was found between the IAT and explicit evaluation index,  $r(25) = -.278$ ,  $p = .040$ . However, correlations computed for the two ethnic groups resulted non-significant:  $r(27) = -.076$ , ns, for the Mapuche, and  $r(28) = -.204$ , ns, for the non-indigenous.

Secondly, the separate analyses of the IAT and the EIE scores suggest that there is an inverted pattern of ingroup–outgroup evaluation between the explicit and the implicit level. At the explicit level it has been shown that Mapuche evaluate their ingroup systematically better than the outgroup, whereas at the implicit level they appear to evaluate their ingroup less positively than the outgroup. To test this, a 2 (Ethnicity) by 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,  $F(1,53) = 15.784$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $MSE = 14.487$ . This interaction suggests that explicit and implicit intergroup attitudes among Mapuche and non-indigenous

Chileans are different phenomena that, however, may jointly form a socially and psychologically coherent attitudinal pattern, as will be discussed next.

### Discussion

Members of low-status minorities may overtly express a moderate evaluative preference for their ingroup but, at the same time, may devalue it covertly. Conversely, members of high-status majorities may overtly express no ingroup bias but, at the same time, may covertly devalue their outgroup. The results of the present study are consistent with both propositions, showing an interaction between direct vs. indirect measures of intergroup attitudes on the one hand, and high vs. low group status on the other. 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 implicitly evaluate the former 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 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 Mapuche's knowledge base, which may influence attitude construction and expression. This is expected to happen if people lack the time or motivation to resist the influence of such knowledge (Olson & Fazio, 2004).

Results regarding the direct measure of intergroup attitudes, on the other hand, revealed a different picture: Mapuche participants tended to show a slight ingroup bias whereas the non-indigenous showed no bias. Explicit ingroup favouritism on the part of the Mapuche is expected 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 ingroup (relative to the outgroup) 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, Mapuche's more positive explicit attitudes towards the ingroup compared to the outgroup 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 expected for majorities is more straightforward. Implicit prejudice against minorities may be hidden by an explicit expression of moderate attitudes towards them. This pattern has been documented by a number of studies (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Devine, 1989; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost & Burgess, 2000). Interestingly, one can explain this pattern by means of exactly the same theoretical mechanism accounting for the explicit-implicit dissociation of attitudes among low-status minority members. Thus, the absence of ingroup bias among non-indigenous may 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 may 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 ingroup-favouring beliefs that are “covered” by more egalitarian considerations, or highly accessible knowledge depicting a more positive stereotype of the ingroup but subject to inhibition by egalitarian personal beliefs.

Despite the fact that the theoretical approaches we have employed to understand our results differ in their focus and concepts, we argue that it is possible to account for outgroup favouritism on the part of low-status groups and benevolent prejudice on the part of high-status groups with one and the same rationale.

#### *Integrated view of 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 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 stereotypical information is consistent with social norms that happen to have high personal importance in a given situation, or if generated norms happen to 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 ingroup. 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 Mapuche's outgroup favouritism and non-indigenous' 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 favouring the non-indigenous, and engage in controlled correction for these allegedly automatic orientations, in line with ego- and group-justification motives. Our results suggest that outgroup 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 ingroup and the outgroup. At the explicit level, low-status group members may have performed an inhibition-like correction of the automatic outgroup favouritism.

Research inspired in Devine's 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 may develop only at the explicit level, as elaborated evaluative judgements of the ingroup and the outgroup based on an inhibition correction process. At the implicit level, both as theoretically predicted and empirically found, high-status group members would show ingroup 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 Chilean population (Uhlmann, Dasgupta, Elgueta, Greenwald, & Swanson, 2002) have focused on non-indigenous 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, and especially implicit outgroup 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 may exist already at 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 ingroup preference in racial and national intergroup context is formed, and acquires its adult-like strength, even before 10 years old. In the same line, Dunham, Baron, and Banaji (2008) have argued that implicit preference for the ingroups, as well as for dominant social groups, is developed from childhood. Our present findings directly reinforces this view by demonstrating that the predicted interaction between direct vs. indirect measures of intergroup attitudes on the one hand, and high vs. low group status on the other, can be clearly observed already among children about 13 years old. If early implicit intergroup attitudes tend to be stable across the life span (Dunham, Baron, & Banaji, 2008), this may 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 outgroup favouritism among children, in order to explore the basis of system justifying ideologies.

Some methodological limitations of this study must be considered. Firstly, the order of compatible and incompatible blocks in the IAT was not counterbalanced, thus involving a confound: For Mapuche participants the compatible block always came first, but for non-indigenous participants the incompatible block always came first. However, the order of compatible vs. incompatible blocks normally has the effect that IAT scores are larger when the compatible block comes first (see Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998, Figure 2). A mere order effect speaks against finding a pro-ingroup bias among the non-indigenous, but we find it nevertheless. Likewise, it speaks for easily finding a pro-ingroup bias in the Mapuche, but empirically we find the opposite (just as predicted). Future studies should balance the order of blocks. The effects that we reported in the present paper are likely to show even more strongly.

Secondly, our explicit measure contained positive and negative attributes, but also a mix of what might be reconstructed as warmth and competence related adjectives (Fiske et al., 1999). This might represent another confound, since Fiske and colleagues

have argued that these are two different dimensions of stereotype content independently of their positive or negative valence. For instance, it is possible to think that the Mapuche may evaluate themselves more positively in terms of warm attributes and evaluate the non-indigenous 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 remain to be addressed. For instance, future studies must be developed to empirically disentangle the different theoretical approaches we employed 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 which may help 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 reduce the effect of “extra-personal associations”, thus measuring the personal attitude more purely. In their theoretical account, attitude is a personal association 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 independent from cultural norms as possible. According to this view, both implicit outgroup favouritism on the part of low-status groups and benevolent prejudice on the part of high-status groups may be regarded as an artefact due to the contamination of attitudes by other associations available in memory, namely, cultural knowledge about the target. If such contaminating associations are removed or reduced, then one should expect a traditional ingroup bias among both Mapuche and non-indigenous Chileans. To explore this hypothesis, a replication of the present study involving a “personalized IAT” (Olson & Fazio, 2004) is in order.

## References

- Aidman, E., & Carroll, S. (2003). Implicit individual differences: Relationships between implicit self-esteem, gender identity, and gender attitudes. *European Journal of Personality, 17*(1), 19–36.
- 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, (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 & Intergroup Relations, 11*, 301–317.
- Chen, M. and Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*(5), 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. and 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. (2007). Attitudes as Object-Evaluation Associations of Varying Strength. In B. Gawronski (ed.), What is an attitude? *Social Cognition*, *25*, 603-637.
- 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*(6), 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*(6), 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.

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.

González, R. & Brown, R. J. (1999). *The role of categorization, group status and group*

*size in mediating inter-nation attitudes in the European Union*. Paper presented at

the Social Psychology Annual Meeting, British Psychological Society, University

of Lancaster.

Gawronski, B., Hofmann, W., & Wilbur, C. (2006). Are implicit attitudes unconscious?

*Consciousness and Cognition*, *15*, 485-499.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem,

and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4–27.

- 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. (2001). Health of the Implicit Association Test at age 3. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie, 48*, 85–93.
- 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. & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester.
- Hoffman, C. & Hurst, N. (1990). Gender stereotypes: Perception or rationalization? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 197–208.
- Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., and 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*(10), 1369-1385.

Ibáñez, A., Haye, A., González, R., Hurtado, E. and Henríquez, R. (2009). Multi-level analysis of cultural phenomena: The role of ERPs approach to prejudice. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 39(1), 81–110.

Jellison, W., McConnell, A., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Implicit and Explicit Measures of Sexual Orientation Attitudes: Ingroup Preferences and Related Behaviors and Beliefs Among Gay and Straight Men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(5), 629–642.

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(3), 293–305.

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, US: 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., 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*(6), 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.

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*(5), 823–837.

Kay, A., Jost, J., & Young, S. (2005). Victim Derogation and Victim Enhancement as

Alternate Routes to System Justification. *Psychological Science, 16*(3), 240–246.

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*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1846/1970). *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 & Intergroup relations*, 8(1), 39–52.

Nosek, B. A. & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The go/ no-go association task. *Social Cognition*, 19, 625–66.

Nosek, B., Banaji, M., & Greenwald, A. (2002). Math = male, me = female, therefore math ≠ me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(1), 44–59.



- 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*(5), 653–667.
- Perugini, M. (2005). Predictive models of implicit and explicit attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 29–45.
- Richeson, J., & Ambady, N. (2001). Who's in charge? Effects of situational roles on automatic gender bias. *Sex Roles, 44*(9), 493–512.
- Rudman, L. A., Feinberg, J., & Fairchild, K. (2002). Minority members' implicit attitudes: automatic ingroup bias as a function of group status. *Social Cognition, 20*(4), 294–320.
- Rudman, L., & Goodwin, S. (2004). Gender Differences in Automatic In-Group Bias: Why Do Women Like Women More Than Men Like Men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(4), 494–509.
- 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. and Liu, J.H. (2007). New Zealand = bicultural? Implicit and explicit associations between ethnicity and nationhood in the New Zealand context. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol., 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., Bohner, G., Haye, A., Sirlopú, D., Millar, A, de Tezanos-Pinto, P, & Torres, D. (2009). *The Role of Category Focus in the Implicit Association Test*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Strack, F. & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and Impulsive Determinants of Social Behavior. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 8*(3), 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 and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Monterrey, 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*(3), 198–226.

van Knippenberg, A. (1978). Status difference, comparative relevance and intergroup differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups*. London: Academic Press.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 141–208). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Wilson, T., Lindsay, S., & Schooler, T. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*(1), 101-126.

Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> These data are a subset of a larger dataset which is discussed in another paper (Siebler, González, Ordóñez, Bohner, Haye, Sirlopu, Millar, de Tezanos-Pinto, & Torres, 2009) with respect to methodological issues of indirect attitude measurement rather than theoretical questions.

<sup>2</sup> The Spanish labels were “Mapuche” and “Chileno no indígena” for the group categories, and “Agradable” and “Desagradable” for the word categories.

Appendix

Implicit Association Test Stimuli

*Non-indigenous Names*

Morales, Pérez, Rodríguez, Sánchez, Salinas, Ramírez.

*Mapuche Names*

Paylaqueo, Manquelaqué, Paylahueque, Huilcaleo, Huichaquelen, Huayquipan.

*Pleasant Words*

Fiesta (party), Dulce (sweet), Paz (peace), Regalo (gift), Amor (love), Alegría  
(happiness), Abrazo (hug).

*Unpleasant Words*

Basura (rubbish), Castigo (punishment), Choque (crush), Guerra (war), Tristeza  
(sadness), Veneno (poison), Dolor (pain).

Table 1

*Means of latencies of implicit association as a function of ethnicity*

Ethnic Group	Ingroup unfavourable		Ingroup favourable	
	associations		associations	
Non-indigenous	974.51	(294.80)	873.29	(245.20)
Mapuche	1,009.47	(313.40)	1,132.75	(388.20)

*Notes.* Scores represent response latencies in milliseconds. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

Table 2

*Means of explicit intergroup evaluation as a function of ethnicity*

Ethnic Group	Evaluation target			
	Ingroup		Outgroup	
Non-indigenous	4.72	(.96)	4.78	(1.09)
Mapuche	5.30	(1.02)	4.53	(.72)

*Notes.* Scores represent average judgement of attribute–group associations ranging from 1 to 7 from “a little applicable” to “very much applicable”. Higher scores reflect a more positive evaluation of the target. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.