Published in final edited form as:

Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol. 2010 January ; 16(1): 37–49. doi:10.1037/a0015868.

Say “Adios” to the American Dream? The Interplay Between Ethnic and National Identity Among Latino and Caucasian Americans

Thierry Devos, Kelly Gavin, and Francisco J. Quintana

Department of Psychology, San Diego State University

Abstract

In three studies, implicit and explicit measures were used to examine the interconnections between ethnic and national identities among Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans. Consistently, Latino Americans as a group were conceived of as being less American than Caucasian Americans (Studies 1–3). This effect was exhibited by both Caucasian and Latino participants. Overall, Caucasian participants displayed a stronger national identification than Latino participants (Studies 2 and 3). In addition, ethnic American associations accounted for the strength of national identification for Caucasian participants, but not for Latino participants (Study 2). Finally, ethnic differences in national identification among individuals who exclude Latino Americans from the national identity emerged when persistent ethnic disparities were primed, but not when increasing equalities were stressed (Study 3). In sum, ethnic American associations account for the merging versus dissociation between ethnic and national identifications and reflect a long-standing ethnic hierarchy in American society.

Keywords

ethnicity; national identity; identification; prototypicality; implicit

Latino Americans constitute the fastest growing ethnic minority group in the United States. In 2000, 32.8 million Latinos resided in the country, making up 12% of the total population (Therrien & Ramirez, 2000). By the year 2040, a majority of the population in California is expected to be Latino. Despite the fact that Latino Americans represent a substantial portion of the U.S. population, social psychologists have paid little attention to the structure and processes underlying Latino identities (cf. Carpenter, Zárate, & Garza, 2007; Huddy & Virtanen, 1995; Hurtado, Gurin, & Peng, 1994; Uhlmann, Dasgupta, Elgueta, Greenwald, & Swanson, 2002; Zárate & Garza, 2002; Zárate, Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004). In line with a growing interest in multiple social identities (Crisp & Hewstone, 2006; Roccas & Brewer, 2002), the aim of the present research was to shed light on the interconnections between ethnic and national identities among Latino and Caucasian Americans. Are Americans of Hispanic and non-Hispanic backgrounds perceived as being as American? What are the ramifications or correlates of associations between ethnic groups and the American identity? Do Latino Americans feel less American than Caucasian Americans? Is the strength of

© 2010 American Psychological Association

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Thierry Devos, Department of Psychology, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-4611. tdevos@sciences.sdsu.edu.

Portions of this research were presented at the 7th Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Palm Springs, California, January 2006, at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 2006, and at the SPSP Groups and Intergroup Relations Pre-Conference, Memphis, Tennessee, January 2007.

national identification related to the ease with which one's ethnic group is linked to the national identity?¹

Relative Perceived Prototypicality of Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans

The relationship between ethnic and national attachments has been a recurrent topic of debates in American society (Citrin, Wong, & Duff, 2001; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001). Historically, the United States of America is an immigrant nation founded on shared values and beliefs, as opposed to a shared ethnic identity. At the same time, the population of this country is composed of identifiable ethnic groups that vary in terms of power, status, length of immersion into mainstream culture, and conditions of immigration. Recent research suggests that European or White Americans as a group, are seen as being more American than Asian Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Devos & Heng, in press; Devos & Ma, 2008; Nosek, Smyth, et al., 2007). Extending this line of work, a first important goal of the present research was to determine whether Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans differed in terms of their perceived *Americanness*. Is the American identity more strongly associated with one of these groups than with the other? Do individuals who belong to these groups agree on their relative prototypicality or do they display divergent perceptions?

The ingroup projection model provides a useful theoretical framework to address these questions (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). According to this model, the extent to which subgroups are seen as prototypical of a superordinate category is a function of the perceivers' vantage point. Studies examining a variety of intergroup settings revealed that individuals have a propensity to view the subgroup they are members of (ingroup) as being more prototypical of a superordinate category than subgroups they do not belong to (outgroups; e.g., Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Boettcher, 2004; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003). Basically, each group tends to claim a greater relative prototypicality for the superordinate identity.

This being said, this phenomenon depends on certain conditions. Directly relevant to the present research, sociostructural realities can constrain the extent to which an ingroup is viewed as embodying core features of a superordinate identity (Waldzus et al., 2004). More often than not, relations between groups are hierarchically organized (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In other words, social groups rarely occupy interchangeable positions, and groups that enjoy more power or higher status usually remain in that position for extended periods. In the present context, considerations about the relative power and status of Latino and Caucasian Americans in the United States are of paramount importance. Factors such as income, occupation type, and education are common indicators of status in American society. Despite the rapid increase of the Latino population, this group remains largely underprivileged with lower household incomes, higher poverty rates, and less education than Caucasian Americans (Marotta & Garcia, 2003). Undeniably, Latino Americans do not enjoy the resources and opportunities that are available to Caucasian Americans. Given the asymmetrical nature of the relations between these groups, Caucasian Americans are more likely to be viewed as prototypical of the category *American* than Latino Americans. At the same time, the magnitude of this effect might be a function of the perceivers' ethnicity. Even if there is a relative consensus to associate the American identity more strongly with the ethnic majority group (Caucasian Americans) than with the ethnic minority group (Latino

¹In our research, we used the terms Latino Americans to refer to Americans of Hispanic backgrounds, including Americans of Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Central or South American origins. We contrasted this ethnic category to "Caucasian Americans" given that this term is commonly used to describe non-Hispanic Americans of European descent.

Americans), the effect might be more pronounced among Caucasian individuals than among Latino individuals. This would be consistent with the idea that these perceptions are not objective or static but are social constructions reflecting the diverging view points of ingroup and outgroup perceivers (Wenzel et al., 2007).

Relative Perceived Prototypicality as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Ethnic and National Identities

Documenting that the American identity is not as readily ascribed to various ethnic groups is an important step. Investigating the implications or correlates of the relative perceived prototypicality of ethnic groups is also of prime interest. Social dominance theory suggests that the relationship between ethnic and national attachments is asymmetrical across ethnic groups (Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto, 1997; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001). These two identities strongly converge for the dominant ethnic group (Caucasian Americans), whereas they are distinct or in conflict for members of ethnic minorities. Moreover, Caucasian Americans often display a stronger national attachment than do members of ethnic minorities. Survey data from 11 nations support this perspective (Staerklé, Sidanius, Green, & Molina, 2005): compared to ethnic minorities, ethnic majorities showed a higher level of national identification and a more positive relationship between ethnic and national identifications. Other research exploring the relationship between ethnic and national identities has produced mixed evidence for the social dominance framework. To limit our discussion to the case of Latino and Caucasian Americans, some investigators found that these two groups did not differ in the strength of their national identification and that, in both cases, ethnic and national identifications were positively correlated (Huo, 2003). Analyses based on a nationally representative sample of Mexican Americans showed that Mexican Americans were slightly *more* patriotic than Caucasian Americans (de la Garza, Falcon, & Garcia, 1996). These data also revealed that ethnic consciousness was not reliably correlated with national attachment (see also Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997).

The present research goes beyond previous work on this issue by testing whether ethnic differences in national attachment are moderated by the ease or difficulty with which ethnic groups are linked to the national identity. It is our contention that the relative perceived prototypicality of ethnic groups accounts for variations in national attachment across ethnic groups. More precisely, we predicted that the propensity to view Caucasian Americans as embodying the national identity to a greater extent than Latino Americans should be positively related to the strength of national identification among individuals who belong to or identify with the dominant ethnic group (Caucasian Americans). In contrast, we expected that the more Latino Americans hold the idea that their ethnic group does not fully belong to the national entity, the less they themselves identify with the national identity.

Complementarities Between Implicit and Explicit Assessments

An important specificity of the present research is to examine these issues at two distinct levels of responding. A significant portion of contemporary research in social psychology focuses on the distinction between explicit and implicit cognitions (Devos, 2008; Fazio & Olson, 2003; Wittenbrink & Schwarz, 2007). Although much of this work is dedicated to the construct of attitude, interest in the automatic nature of information processing has also been integrated in the study of social identities (Devos & Banaji, 2003). Explicit assessments are assumed to be the product of reflective or deliberative processes. In contrast, implicit assessments are the outcomes of processes occurring outside of conscious control. In the present research, we examined the extent to which implicit and explicit assessments regarding ethnic and national identity yielded convergent or divergent findings. At the onset of this work, we expected that stronger support for our hypotheses would emerge from

responses that people cannot consciously control, rather than from more deliberate judgments. Results from large surveys suggest that Americans hold a fairly liberal or pluralist definition of American identity (Citrin, Hass, Muste, & Reingold, 1994). Moreover, ethnic minorities express a strong national attachment and see themselves as American, even though they might be aware that they are not perceived as such by Caucasian Americans (Barlow, Taylor, & Lambert, 2000; Cheryan & Monin, 2005). At a deliberate level, members of ethnic minorities see their ethnic and national identities as complementary rather than competing (Citrin et al., 2001). However, we expected that the asymmetrical nature of ethnic relations would transpire from assessments of associations operating outside of conscious awareness or control. Indeed, previous research suggests that beliefs and attitudes bolstering the status quo are more readily observable at an implicit level (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). By assessing the constructs of interest both explicitly and implicitly, our goal was to provide a more complete picture of the interconnections between ethnic and national identities. Rather than arguing that priority should be given to one level of analysis (implicit or explicit), an approach that combines these levels of analysis is more likely to shed light on the complex interplay between more or less inclusive social identities.

Study 1: Latino Americans Are Conceived of as Being Less American Than Caucasian Americans

The goal of Study 1 was to determine the extent to which the attribute *American* was implicitly and explicitly linked to Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans. Not only were Latino Americans included as a target group and contrasted to Caucasian Americans, we also compared responses provided by individuals who belong to these two ethnic groups. In line with our discussion of the asymmetrical positions occupied by these groups in American society, we expected that the propensity to link the attribute *American* to the dominant ethnic group rather than to the ethnic minority would not be restricted to individuals belonging to the dominant ethnic group. Even members of an ethnic minority should link the American identity more strongly to the dominant ethnic group, or what is for them an outgroup in relation to their own group. In other words, there should be a relative consensus between both groups that the dominant majority group is perceived as being more prototypical of the superordinate group than the minority group (see also Devos & Banaji, 2005; Nosek, Smyth, et al., 2007; Waldzus et al., 2004). This does not preclude the possibility that the magnitude of the effect varies as a function of respondents' ethnicity.

A variety of terms or labels can be applied to ethnic or racial groups in the United States of America. These terms and labels have specific connotations and inevitably fail to capture the complexity and fluidity of social categories. At the same time, lay people use these terms to make sense of their environment and to define themselves. We carefully selected the terms "Latino American" and "Caucasian American" because we were convinced that they best fit how college students living in Southern California typically conceptualize the distinction between the groups studied in the present context. The term "Hispanic" was not used because it alludes to the Conquistadors from Spain and is particularly offensive to Californians of Latin descent. The distinction between race (Hispanics vs. Non-Hispanics) and ethnicity (White, Black, Asian, etc.) that is often used for official purposes (e.g., Census) was not adopted here because it rarely maps lay categorizations. The terms "White American" or "European American" were deemed problematic for Latinos who might categorize themselves as White or as having a European heritage. In contrast, people of Latin descent rarely use the term "Caucasian American" to define themselves. In sum, after considering several alternatives and consulting a variety of sources, we reached the conclusion that a contrast between "Latino American" and "Caucasian American" would

allow us to capture meaningful distinctions that perceivers may make regarding the relative prototypicality of these groups.

Method

Participants—Participants were 38 undergraduate students at San Diego State University. Fifteen participants were Latinos (12 women and 3 men) and 23 were Caucasians (17 women and 6 men). All participants were U.S. citizens. Participants received partial course credit for their participation. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 38 years old; the median age was 19.

Stimuli—To represent the concepts American and foreign, stimuli were borrowed from previous research (Devos & Banaji, 2005). The six stimuli used to represent the concept *American* were pictures of the Capitol building, the Statue of Liberty, the Golden Gate Bridge, the U.S. flag, the Bald Eagle, and a map of the United States (in blue). The six stimuli selected to represent the concept foreign included images of the Eiffel Tower, the Leaning Tower of Pisa, the Sphinx, the flag of Djibouti, a Flemish lion (emblem of region in Belgium), and a map of Luxembourg (rotated 90 degrees to the left, in green). Given that Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans cannot easily be differentiated based on their physical appearances, last names were used to represent these categories. For the category Latino Americans, we used the 10 following last names: Gonzalez, Lopez, Perez, Sanchez, Garcia, Rodriguez, Mendoza, Hernandez, Camacho, and Herrera. For the category Caucasian Americans, the 10 last names were: Johnson, Taylor, Campbell, McArthur, Patterson, Jameson, Sullivan, McCarthy, Ferguson, and Hamilton.

Procedure—Participants completed implicit and explicit measures administered on personal computers running Inquisit (Draine, 2005). They were told that we were interested in people's impressions of various ethnic groups in the United States and that they would be asked to complete measures assessing their perceptions of Latino American people and Caucasian American people living in the United States.

Implicit ethnic American associations: Participants completed an Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) designed to capture the relative association between the concepts *Latino American* versus *Caucasian American* and the concepts *American* versus *foreign*. The IAT is based on the assumption that the strength of associations between various concepts can be revealed by the ease with which participants combine stimuli representing these concepts under different conditions. The technique does not require introspective access and minimizes the role of conscious control. Given that the different steps of an IAT have been described systematically in many publications (Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2007), the description provided below focuses on key features of the IAT used in the present research and on the two critical blocks of trials (double categorization blocks).

Stimuli were presented sequentially in the center of the computer screen. Participants were asked to categorize, as quickly as possible, each stimulus by pressing a key that was either toward the left or the right of the keyboard. Response times were recorded from the onset of the stimulus to its correct classification. Correct responses terminated a trial and the intertrial interval was 250 ms. Labels for the concepts were positioned at the top left and top right of the screen to indicate the requested pairing. If a stimulus was incorrectly classified, a red "X" appeared below the stimulus. Participants then had to provide the correct answer to move on to the next trial. The single categorization blocks included 20 trials. Each double categorization block included a total of 60 trials with a brief message appearing after the

first 20 trials to remind participants to go fast. Stimuli were selected alternately from each pair of concepts.

In one block of trials, participants were asked to categorize as fast as they can, American symbols and Latino American last names on one side and foreign symbols and Caucasian American last names on the other side. The opposite pairing was presented in the other block of trials. This time, American symbols were combined with Caucasian American last names and foreign symbols shared the same response option as Latino American last names. The order of the two critical blocks was counterbalanced across participants.

Explicit ethnic American associations: After participants completed the IAT, they were asked to fill out a computerized questionnaire including two items assessing the perceived association between ethnic groups and the attribute *American*. Participants were told that we were interested in the extent to which different groups are perceived as being part of America or are identified with America and all things American. Participants were asked: “In your mind, how American are Latino Americans/ Caucasian Americans?” For each ethnic group, responses were provided on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all American*) to 7 (*Absolutely American*). The order of the two items was randomized.

Demographic information: Participants completed a short demographic questionnaire that included items such as ethnicity, country of citizenship, gender, and age. Finally, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results and Discussion

Data preparation—IAT data were analyzed using the algorithm recommended by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003). The difference between the mean response latencies for the two critical blocks of trials, divided by the standard deviation calculated across all trials (regardless of which block they appeared in), was computed. This quotient was computed separately for the first 20 trials and the last 40 trials; the two values were then averaged. In the present case, this index (IAT D) reflects the extent to which the concept American was linked to the target groups. A positive mean would indicate that the concept American was more strongly associated with Caucasian Americans than with Latino Americans. Statistical analyses were always performed on the IAT D. For ease of interpretation, averaged response latencies in milliseconds are also reported.

Implicit ethnic American associations: Overall, it was easier for participants to associate American symbols with Caucasian American last names and foreign symbols with Latino American last names ($M = 746$, $SD = 151$) than to perform the opposite pairing ($M = 1321$, $SD = 416$; $M_{IAT D} = 0.75$, $SD = 0.36$, $t(37) = 12.92$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.12$). The effect of participants’ ethnicity was significant, $t(36) = 4.23$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.41$. Both ethnic groups implicitly associated the attribute *American* (relative to *foreign*) more strongly with Caucasian Americans than with Latino Americans, but the effect was more pronounced for Caucasian participants (respectively, $M_s = 706, 1425$, $SD_s = 142, 414$, $M_{IAT D} = 0.92$, $SD = 0.26$, $t(22) = 16.61$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.54$) than for Latino participants (respectively, $M_s = 809, 1161$, $SD_s = 146, 378$, $M_{IAT D} = 0.50$, $SD = 0.34$, $t(14) = 8.69$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.51$).

Explicit ethnic American associations—A 2×2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the explicit measure of association with the attribute *American* with target group as a within-subjects factor and participants’ ethnicity as a between-subjects factor.

The main effect of target group was significant, $F(1, 36) = 31.31$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .47$. Caucasian Americans ($M = 6.21$, $SD = 1.21$) were rated as being more American than Latino

Americans ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.41$). This effect was not moderated by participants' ethnicity, $F < 1.3$.

For the first time, Study 1 provides direct evidence for the idea that Latino Americans are conceived of as being less American than Caucasian Americans. Evidence for this effect emerged on a measure tapping responses that are relatively not consciously controllable and on a measure reflecting more deliberative processes. The effects documented here could stem from the fact that several factors concur to link the American identity to a greater extent to Caucasian Americans than to Latino Americans. These two groups differ in a number of ways including numerical status, social status, power, and length of immersion in American society. On all these dimensions, the direction of ethnic differences should foster a stronger linkage between the American identity and Caucasian Americans rather than Latino Americans.

It is also important to point out that participants' ethnicity was a reliable source of variations on the implicit measure, but not on the explicit measure. The fact that Caucasian participants displayed a stronger effect than Latino participants on the IAT is consistent with the idea that implicit associations are rooted in experiences and bear the mark of cultural socialization (Banaji, 2001; Devos, 2008; Rudman, 2004). These variations notwithstanding, it is worth stressing that even members of an ethnic minority were more prone to grant the attribute *American* to Caucasian Americans than to their own group. This effect may contribute to the perceived legitimacy of ethnic hierarchy. Indeed, previous research shows that the perceived legitimacy of status differences is related to the perceived prototypicality of the groups (Weber, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2002). Given that the prototype of the superordinate identity provides a normative standard of comparison, similarity to this standard is evaluated favorably and used to justify the asymmetrical nature of intergroup relations.

Next, we examined the correlation between the implicit and explicit measures. The correlation between the IAT and a difference score computed between the ratings of *Americanness* was marginal for Caucasian participants ($r = +.39$, $p < .07$) and not significant for Latino participants ($r = -.23$, $p > .40$). It should be noted that a difference in the opposite direction might be expected based on research on aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). According to this model, Caucasian participants should not be willing to express the same ethnic American associations explicitly than they hold implicitly because of the social consequences they would face for doing so. In the present context, concerns with appearing prejudiced should be less relevant for Latino participants. The pattern of correlations suggests that self-presentational concerns or social desirability might not be a crucial moderating factor in this case. Instead, it is possible that implicit associations and explicit responses are based on distinct sources of knowledge, and that it is particularly the case for Latino participants.

As stated earlier, contrasting "Latino American" to "Caucasian American" was deemed the most appropriate option in the present context. In other data collections, we found that the concept American was less strongly associated with "Latino American" than with a group labeled as "White American" or "European American" (Devos, 2003; Devos, Stevens, & Anderson, 2009). As indicated previously, last names were used to represent the target groups because it is often difficult to differentiate Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans based on their physical appearances. The last names that we selected could be perceived as representative of non American categories (e.g., Spanish or Mexican for Latino last names and English or Irish for Caucasian last names) as such they may have introduced some interpretation problems. However, similar effects have been replicated using a completely different set of stimuli. The concept American (relative to foreign) was less

strongly associated with pictures of wellknown Latino American celebrities (e.g., Jennifer Lopez, Alex Rodriguez, Eva Longoria, or George Lopez) than with pictures of well-known European American celebrities (e.g., Julia Roberts, Joe Montana, Jessica Simpson, or Robin Williams), and this was the case for both Caucasian respondents and Latino respondents (Devos et al., 2009). In sum, it seems unlikely that the effects documented in the present study stem from the labels or stimuli used to represent the target groups.

Study 2: Ethnic American Associations Moderate Ethnic Differences in National Identification

The results of Study 1 showed that Latino Americans were viewed as being less American than Caucasian Americans. The goal of Study 2 was to explore correlates of this effect. Do ethnic American associations account for the strength of national identification among different ethnic groups? To explore this question, we used a balanced identity design (Greenwald et al., 2002): samples of Latino and Caucasian Americans completed implicit and explicit measures assessing national identification, ethnic identification, and ethnic American associations. As outlined previously and in line with social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 1997; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001), we hypothesized that Latino participants would display a weaker national identification than Caucasian participants. In addition, the relationship between ethnic American associations and national identification should vary as a function of participant's ethnicity or ethnic identification. For Caucasian participants, the propensity to associate their ethnic group with the concept *American* should be positively correlated with the strength of their national identification. In contrast, the relative exclusion of their group from the American identity should be negatively related with the extent to which Latino participants identify with the concept *American*.

Method

Participants—Participants were 110 undergraduate students at San Diego State University. Fifty-three participants were Latinos (36 women and 17 men) and 57 participants were Caucasians (35 women and 22 men). All participants were U.S. citizens. Participants received partial course credit or were paid \$10.00 in return for their participation. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 42 years old; the median age was 19.

Procedure—The order in which implicit and explicit measures were completed was counterbalanced: some participants were administered the IATs before the questionnaire portion of the study; other participants completed self-report measures prior to taking the IATs.

Implicit association tests: Participants completed three IATs. The order of the IATs and the order of the critical blocks for each IAT were counterbalanced across participants. The ethnic American associations IAT combined the concepts *American* versus *foreign* with the concepts *Latino American* versus *Caucasian American*. It was identical to the task used in Study 1.

The national identification IAT captured the strength of associations between the concepts *self* versus *others* and the concepts *American* versus *foreign*. As customary in prior uses of the IAT, words were used to represent the concepts *self* (self, I, me, my, mine) and *others* (others, they, them, their, it) (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000). In one block of trials, participants were asked to pair, as quickly as possible, *self* words with American symbols and *others* words with foreign symbols. In another block of trials, *others* words were combined with American symbols and *self* words were paired with foreign symbols.

Following the same logic, the ethnic identification IAT assessed the direction and strength of ethnic identification by combining the concepts *self* versus *others* with the concepts *Latino American* versus *Caucasian American*. In one block of trials, participants were asked to pair, as quickly as possible, *self* words with Latino last names and *others* words with Caucasian last names. In another block of trials, the opposite pairing was presented: *self* words were combined with Caucasian last names and *others* words were paired with Latino last names.

Explicit measures: Participants completed a series of computerized questionnaires assessing the explicit counterparts of the IATs. The measure of explicit ethnic American associations was identical to the measure used in Study 1. To assess explicit identifications, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they identified with the following groups: Americans, foreigners, Latino Americans, and Caucasian Americans. Responses were provided on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Completely*). The order of the four items was randomized. Finally, participants completed a short demographic questionnaire and were debriefed.

Results and Discussion

Data preparation and mean differences between latino and caucasian participants—IAT data were analyzed following the steps described for Study 1. Data from two participants were discarded because they responded at a rate faster than 300 ms on more than 10% of the trials, leaving 108 participants for analysis. Data from these two participants were also discarded for analyses conducted on the explicit measures. Means and standard deviations for the implicit and explicit measures are reported in Table 1. The findings on the implicit and explicit measures of ethnic American associations replicated the patterns obtained in Study 1. In terms of national identification, ethnic differences emerged at both levels of responding with Latino participants showing a weaker national identification than Caucasian participants. Not surprisingly, Latino and Caucasian participants (implicitly and explicitly) identified with the ethnic group they belong to.

Interconnections between ethnic and national identifications—Bivariate correlations among the dependent variables are reported separately for Latino and Caucasian participants in Table 2. Correlations between ethnic and national identifications revealed important differences between Caucasian and Latino participants. Ethnic and national identifications were positively correlated for Caucasian participants ($r_{\text{Implicit}} = +.33, p < .02, r_{\text{Explicit}} = +.60, p < .001$), whereas no significant association between these two measures was found for Latino participants ($r_{\text{Implicit}} = +.01, p > .95, r_{\text{Explicit}} = -.20, p > .15$). Correlations for Caucasian participants and Latino participants were marginally different at the implicit level ($Z = 1.71, p < .09$) and significantly different at the explicit level ($Z = 4.49, p < .001$). These findings support the idea that ethnic and national identities overlap for Caucasians, whereas these identities are more distinct for Latinos.

The most important question addressed in Study 2 pertains to the correlates of the relative prototypicality of ethnic groups. To test our hypotheses, hierarchical regression analyses were used. First, implicit national identification (criterion variable) was regressed on ethnicity, implicit ethnic American associations, and the interaction between these variables. The IAT effect reflecting participants' ethnic American associations was centered and the interaction term (cross-product of the separate predictors) was computed following standard practice (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). These variables accounted for a significant proportion of variance, $R^2 = .17, F(3, 104) = 7.10, p < .001$ (see Table 3, Analysis 1). More important, the predicted interaction was significant ($p < .009$) (see Figure 1). Simple slopes analysis revealed that the relative exclusion of Latino Americans from the American identity

accounted for the strength of national identification for Caucasian participants ($B = 0.58$, $SE = 0.14$, $p < .001$), but not for Latino participants ($B = 0.04$, $SE = 0.14$, $p > .75$). At 1 SD above the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations, Caucasian participants displayed a stronger national identification than Latino participants ($p < .03$). The effect of ethnicity was not reliable at 1 SD below the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations ($p > .10$).

Instead of considering ethnicity as a binary variable, a regression analysis was conducted using implicit ethnic identification as a predictor. Implicit national identification was the criterion variable and was regressed on implicit ethnic identification, implicit ethnic American associations, and the interaction between these variables. Results were highly convergent with those reported for the first regression analysis (see Table 3, Analysis 2). Once implicit ethnic American associations, implicit ethnic identification, and the interaction between these terms were introduced in the regression, a significant proportion of variance was accounted for, $R^2 = .17$, $F(3, 104) = 7.29$, $p < .001$. Here also, the interaction was significant ($p < .02$). To aid in interpreting this interaction we examined simple slopes for values 1 SD above and below the mean on the (centered) ethnic American associations and (centered) ethnic identification IATs. When participants displayed a Caucasian identity, the more they excluded Latino Americans from the American identity, the more they identified with American ($B = 0.51$, $SE = 0.14$, $p < .001$). In contrast, when participants displayed a Latino identity, their identification with American was unrelated to their propensity to exclude Latino Americans from the American identity ($B = 0.07$, $SE = 0.12$, $p > .55$). At 1 SD above the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations, participants who identified with Caucasian Americans displayed a stronger national identification than participants who identified with Latino Americans ($p < .001$). The effect of ethnic identification was not reliable at 1 SD below the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations ($p > .45$).

Similar analyses were conducted to test our hypotheses on self-report measures. To parallel the format of analyses performed on the IAT data, difference scores were computed for explicit measures of ethnic American associations, ethnic identification, and national identification. When explicit national identification was regressed on ethnicity, explicit ethnic American associations, and the interaction between these variables, a significant proportion of variance was accounted for, $R^2 = .14$, $F(3, 104) = 5.47$, $p < .003$ (see Table 3, Analysis 3). The predicted interaction was significant ($p < .008$). The relative exclusion of Latino Americans from the American identity accounted for the strength of national identification for Caucasian participants ($B = 0.51$, $SE = 0.21$, $p < .03$), but not for Latino participants ($B = -0.22$, $SE = 0.15$, $p > .15$). At 1 SD above the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations, Caucasian participants displayed a stronger national identification than Latino participants ($p < .001$). The effect of ethnicity was not reliable at 1 SD below the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations ($p > .95$).

When ethnic identification, rather than ethnicity, was introduced as a predictor (see Table 3, Analysis 4), a significant proportion of variance was accounted for, $R^2 = .22$, $F(3, 104) = 7.29$, $p < .001$. However, the interaction was not significant ($p > .10$). Only the effect of ethnic identification was significant in this analysis ($p < .001$). The fact that the predicted interaction was not obtained might point to the limitations of the fairly simple and direct measures of identification used in the present study.

As predicted, ethnic American associations moderate the relationship between ethnicity and national identification. For Caucasian participants, ethnic American associations covary with a strong national identity. However, Latino participants do not show a weaker national

identification as a function of ethnic American associations. This finding reveals a relative dissociation between group-identity associations and self-identity associations. In contrast to the view that members of ethnic minorities experience tension or confusion regarding their ethnic and national identities, individuals can display a strong attachment to both their ethnic and national identities. This observation is consistent with contemporary research on multicultural identities showing that individuals can successfully internalize or identify with more than one culture (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Devos, 2006; Gong, 2007; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000). This being said, compared to Caucasian participants, Latino participants cannot rely on their ethnicity to achieve a national identity. In that sense, the relative inclusion of ethnic groups in the American identity accounts for the merging versus dissociation of ethnic and national identifications. In line with social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 1997; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001), ethnic and national identities are inextricably linked for Caucasians, whereas these identities are distinct for Latinos. Thus, a clear asymmetry characterizes the interrelations between ethnic and national identities for the Caucasian majority and the Latino minority.

Study 3: The Interplay Between Ethnic and American Identity in Hierarchy-Enhancing and Hierarchy-Attenuating Contexts

The findings of Study 2 are consistent with the idea that ethnic hierarchy continues to shape the interface between ethnic and American identity, but they do not provide direct evidence for the role of status and power. The purpose of Study 3 was to test more directly the impact of ethnic hierarchy on the relationship between ethnic and national identities. Study 3 compared Latino and Caucasian Americans in contexts that enhanced or attenuated ethnic hierarchy. In some contexts, thoughts about ethnic hierarchy or inequalities are highly salient or easily activated, whereas other contexts can be characterized by an emphasis on the progression toward greater equality (Sinclair, Sidanius, & Levin, 1998). Here, we investigated whether priming different perspectives on societal inequalities moderated the relation between ethnic American associations and national identification. After completing an implicit measure of ethnic American associations, Latino and Caucasian participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions. In the hierarchy-enhancing condition, participants completed a questionnaire designed to make salient pervasive asymmetries in terms of status and power between Latino and Caucasian Americans. In the hierarchy-attenuating condition, participants completed a questionnaire activating the idea that inequalities between Latino and Caucasian Americans are declining. Following the experimental induction, participants completed an implicit measure of national identification. We predicted that the priming manipulation would moderate the pattern obtained in Study 2 such that hierarchy-enhancing primes should magnify ethnic differences in national identification, whereas hierarchy-attenuating primes should reduce these differences. More precisely, our goal was to determine whether the relations between individual differences in ethnic American associations and the strength of national identification could be affected by priming different perspectives on the current positions that Latinos and Caucasians hold in American society. Instead of trying to change robust associations between ethnicity and American identity, we tried to identify contexts that may bolster or undermine their implication for self-definitions displayed by Latino and Caucasian individuals.

Method

Participants—Participants were 140 undergraduate students at San Diego State University. Sixty-three participants were Latinos (46 women and 17 men) and 77 participants were Caucasians (64 women and 13 men). All participants were U.S. citizens.

Participants received partial course credit or were paid \$10.00 in return for their participation. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 27 years old; the median age was 19.

Procedure

Implicit ethnic American associations: First, participants completed an IAT measuring the direction and strength of associations between the concepts *Latino American* versus *Caucasian American* and the concepts *American* versus *foreign*. This IAT was identical to the task used in Studies 1 and 2.

Manipulation of perceived ethnic hierarchy: At this point, participants completed a 12-item questionnaire that either made salient pervasive inequalities between Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans (hierarchy-enhancing condition) or activated the idea that disparities between these groups were fading (hierarchy-attenuating condition). In the hierarchy-enhancing condition, participants were asked to answer questions such as “Is the percentage of Latinos in the United States who are going to college *more* or *less* than 50%?” or “The average household income is approximately \$45,000 in the United States. Is the average income for Latinos in the United States *more* or *less*?” After participants answered each question, the correct answer was provided. For example, the answer to the first question listed above was “The correct answer is *less*. Only 14% of Latinos are going to college. This number falls far below the national average.” In the hierarchy-attenuating condition, participants would complete symmetrical questions such as: “Has the number of Latinos in the United States who have at least a bachelor’s degree *increased* or *decreased* since 1990?” or “Has there been a *decrease* or *increase* in the household wealth of Latinos in the United States over the past decade?” Here also, once participants provided an answer, the correct response was presented. For example, the answer to the first question listed here was “The correct answer is *increase*. The number of Latinos in the United States who have at least a bachelor’s degree has more than doubled since 1990.” These questions were developed using reliable sources and covered topics such as education, employment, economic resources, political power, or numerical status that are relevant to the characterization of ethnic relations in the United States. The information included in these questions was simplified to ensure that participants were able to understand and respond to all questions.

Implicit national identification: Following the experimental manipulation, participants completed an IAT measuring the strength of their national identification. This task was identical to the IAT used in Study 2.

Perception of ethnic hierarchy: After participants completed the implicit measures, they were asked to fill out a series of questionnaires including three items assessing the perceived economic resources, power, and social status of Latino Americans and Caucasian Americans. Participants were asked to indicate “how do Latino Americans/ Caucasian Americans do economically compared to other ethnic groups in America” on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Very poorly*) to 7 (*Very well*) (economic resources). They were also asked to indicate “how much power and influence do Latino Americans/ Caucasian Americans have compared to other ethnic groups in America” on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Very little power*) to 7 (*Very much power*) (power). Finally, they were asked to indicate “how much respect and social status do Latino Americans/Caucasian Americans get compared to other ethnic groups in America” on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*Very little respect*) to 7 (*Very much respect*) (social status). Finally, participants completed a short demographic questionnaire and were debriefed.

Results and Discussion

Ethnic American associations—An IAT D index was computed to reflect the strength of the connection between ethnic groups and the concept *American* (relative to *foreign*). A 2×2 ANOVA was performed on this IAT D index with participants' ethnicity and condition as between-subjects factors. The effect of participants' ethnicity was significant, $F(1, 136) = 10.88, p < .002, \eta_p^2 = .07$. As was the case in Studies 1 and 2, both ethnic groups implicitly perceived Latino Americans as being less American than Caucasian Americans, but the effect was more pronounced for Caucasian participants ($M_{\text{IAT D}} = 0.78, SD = 0.32, t(76) = 21.24, p < .001, d = 2.44$) than for Latino participants ($M_{\text{IAT D}} = 0.60, SD = 0.34, t(62) = 13.95, p < .001, d = 1.77$). The main effect of condition and the interaction between ethnicity and condition were not significant, $F_s < 0.5$.

Manipulation of perceived ethnic hierarchy—The number of correct answers for the experimental manipulation questionnaire ranged from 8 to 12 out of a total possible of 12, with a mean of 10.96 ($SD = 0.98$). A 2×2 ANOVA was performed on this indicator with participants' ethnicity and condition as between-subjects factors. The main effects for ethnicity or condition were not significant, $F_s < 0.5$. There was a significant interaction effect between ethnicity and condition, $F(1, 136) = 4.87, p < .03, \eta_p^2 = .04$. Simple effect tests indicated that Latino participants performed slightly better in the hierarchy-enhancing condition ($M = 11.13, SD = 0.94$) than in the hierarchy-attenuating condition ($M = 10.71, SD = 1.10$), $F(1, 136) = 2.89, p < .10, \eta_p^2 = .02$, whereas there was a nonsignificant difference in the opposite direction for Caucasian participants (respectively, $M_s = 10.85, 11.16, SD_s = 0.98, 0.87$), $F(1, 136) = 1.99, p < .15, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Although there were slight variations in the performances of Latino and Caucasian participants across conditions, overall participants were able to understand and complete the task without difficulty.

ANOVAs performed on the measures of economic resources, $F(1, 136) = 537.98, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .80$, power, $F(1, 136) = 381.71, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .74$, and social status, $F(1, 136) = 240.67, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .64$, revealed significant main effects of target groups. Caucasian Americans were rated as doing better economically ($M = 6.32, SD = 0.92$), as having more power and influence ($M = 6.26, SD = 0.92$), and as getting more respect and social status ($M = 6.00, SD = 0.98$) than Latino Americans (respectively $M_s = 3.56, 3.64, 3.85, SD_s = 1.24, 1.28, 1.24$). More important, the interaction between target group and condition was significant on the measures of economic resources, $F(1, 136) = 29.30, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .18$, power, $F(1, 136) = 6.22, p < .02, \eta_p^2 = .04$, and social status, $F(1, 136) = 6.97, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .05$. In all cases, the magnitude of perceived inequalities was reliably reduced in the hierarchy-attenuating condition compared to the hierarchy-enhancing condition. The three-way interaction between target group, ethnicity, and condition never reached the traditional significance level, $F_s < 1.5$.

National identification—An IAT D index was computed to reflect the strength of national identification. To test our main hypothesis, national identification (criterion variable) was regressed on participants' ethnicity, condition, ethnic American associations, and the interactions among these variables. A significant portion of variance was accounted for when these three predictors and the interaction terms were included in the model, $R^2 = .17, F(7, 132) = 3.93, p < .002$. A significant three-way interaction between condition, ethnicity, and ethnic American associations was found ($p < .009$). In order to interpret this interaction, simple slope analyses were conducted for each cell of the design (see Figure 2). Simple slope analyses were based on values 1 SD above and below the mean of the ethnic

American IAT. The simple slopes were used to capture the direction and strength of the relationship between ethnic American associations and national identification. For Latino participants in the hierarchy-enhancing condition, the relationship between ethnic American associations and national identification was not significant ($B = -0.17$, $SE = 0.15$, $p > .25$). In contrast, for Caucasian participants in the hierarchy-enhancing condition, the more they associated American with Caucasian American (relative to Latino American), the more they identified with American ($B = 0.50$, $SE = 0.15$, $p < .002$). In the hierarchy-enhancing condition, at 1 *SD* above the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations, Caucasian participants displayed a stronger national identification than Latino participants ($p < .001$), but the effect of ethnicity was not reliable at 1 *SD* below the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations ($p > .80$). In other words, the pattern in the hierarchy-enhancing condition was similar to that obtained in Study 2. In the hierarchy-attenuating condition, the relationships between ethnic American associations and national identification were not significant for Latino participants ($B = 0.26$, $SE = 0.17$, $p > .12$) and for Caucasian participants ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.15$, $p > .60$). In the hierarchy-attenuating condition, ethnic differences in terms of national identification were not significant at 1 *SD* above ($p > .70$) or below ($p > .14$) the mean on the (centered) measure of ethnic American associations.

As expected, hierarchy-enhancing primes increased awareness of existing ethnic inequalities, whereas hierarchy-attenuating primes focused attention on movement toward the reduction of those inequalities. More important, priming different perspectives on ethnic inequalities affected the interplay between ethnic American associations and national identification: differences in the strength of national identification between Latino and Caucasian participants emerged only in the hierarchy-enhancing condition and among individuals who (prior to the experimental manipulation) excluded Latino Americans from the national identity. In contrast, there were no ethnic differences in the strength of national identification in the hierarchy-attenuating condition even among individuals who (prior to the experimental manipulation) displayed an exclusionary definition of the American identity. These results suggest that the hierarchy-attenuating condition successfully reduced differences in the strength of national identification between Latinos and Caucasians. An important contribution of Study 3 is to highlight the context-sensitivity of the interconnections between ethnicity and American identity. The propensity to equate American with Caucasian American accounts for national identification when ethnic inequalities are primed, but not when progression toward a greater equality is emphasized. To put it simply, Caucasians identify more with America than Latinos when they exclude the ethnic minority from the national identity and ethnic inequalities are primed.

General Discussion

The current research focuses on the interface between ethnic and national identity in the United States. Consistently, the data indicate that the American identity is strongly identified with a specific ethnic group, Caucasian Americans, and that an ethnic minority, Latino Americans, is placed at the margin despite the fact that it represents a substantial portion of the population. The tendency to associate the American identity more strongly to Caucasian Americans than to Latino Americans is not restricted to individuals who belong to the ethnic majority group. This effect is also displayed by Latino Americans. In line with the ingroup projection model (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel et al., 2007), the extent to which a group can be thought of as prototypical of a superordinate category is strongly constrained by sociostructural realities. Reflecting differences based on power, status, length of immersion into mainstream culture, and conditions of immigration, Caucasian Americans are viewed as being more prototypical of the American identity than Latino Americans. The relative consensus in these perceptions should not obliterate the ethnicity of respondents

being a reliable source of variations on the implicit assessment of ethnic American associations. More precisely, Caucasian Americans claim a greater relative prototypicality than they are granted by Latino Americans. This finding is consistent with the notion that these perceptions are, to some extent, shaped by the perceivers' vantage point (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel et al., 2007).

In line with social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 1997; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001), our data provide further evidence for the idea that Latino Americans display a weaker national identification than Caucasian Americans. Also fitting with this influential theoretical framework is the fact that ethnic and national identifications tend to overlap for Caucasian individuals, but not for Latino individuals. An important contribution of the present research is to document that ethnic American associations moderate the relationship between ethnicity and national identification. The propensity to link the attribute *American* to Caucasian Americans rather than to Latino Americans accounts for a strong national identity among Caucasian Americans, but it is not related to national identification among Latino Americans. Another way to emphasize the novelty of our findings is to stress that ethnic differences in terms of national identification only emerge to the extent that Caucasian Americans are seen as being more prototypical of the American identity than Latino Americans. When these two ethnic groups are not differentiated in regard to their perceived *Americanness*, similar levels of national identification are observed among Caucasian and Latino respondents. In sum, the interconnections between ethnic and national attachments are a function of the tendency to equate American with Caucasian.

Although it has long been recognized that individuals belong to a variety of social groups, research on the interconnections between multiple social identities has been limited (Crisp & Hewstone, 2006; Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Moreover, the majority of work conducted on this topic has relied on self-report measures. In contrast to previous work on ethnic and national attachments (e.g., Huo, 2003; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Sidanius et al., 1997), an important aim of the present research was to study how processes of social identification operate without introspective access or deliberative thought. The present findings lend support to the idea that the implicit social cognition framework is a viable approach to revealing the subtle but crucial ways in which sociocultural realities shape social identities. Initially, we expected to find stronger support for our hypotheses on assessments of responses that people cannot consciously control than on measures reflecting processes that are more consciously controllable. Explicit responses are often shaped by normative pressures, whereas implicit responses are relatively immune to social desirability. However, by and large, the present studies yielded convergent findings at both levels of responding. Nonetheless, it appears that implicit measures are more likely to reveal the impact of group membership (e.g., ethnicity) on the structure and processes underlying multiple social identities and could be used more systematically to complement traditional investigative techniques.

For the present research, we relied on a widely used technique developed to assess implicit social cognitions. A dominant feature of the IAT is that it captures the relative associations between two pairs of concepts. A technique assessing relative associations is particularly useful when the contrasting categories are carefully selected to operationalize a specific theoretical construct. Given the goals of the present research, it seemed appropriate to contrast concepts such as Latino Americans versus Caucasian Americans or American versus foreign. It would nevertheless be of some interest to be able to decompose what is driving the effects documented in this paper. Some researchers have analyzed subsets of IAT trials with the aim of obtaining two separate assessments of association strengths (de Jong, Pasman, Kindt, & van den Hout, 2001; Gamar, Segal, Sagrati, & Kennedy, 2001), but Nosek, Greenwald, and Banaji (2005) showed that the structure of the IAT does not permit

this aim. More precisely, their data suggest that each response trial in the IAT is indicative of the IAT effect as a whole, rather than a response to a specific concept or exemplar abstracted from the context of the task. In other words, each trial in the IAT reflects some aspect of the relative comparison between the target concepts and analyzing subsets of IAT trials is not an analytic strategy that is empirically justified. Several techniques have been developed to provide more independent assessments of associations (e.g., De Houwer, 2003; Karpinski & Steinman, 2006; Nosek & Banaji, 2001). These techniques would allow the isolation of the role of associations about each ethnic group or each target concepts. It is possible that some of the effects documented using the IAT are driven to a greater extent by some associations than by others. Future research, relying on these techniques, should determine whether it is more appropriate to state that Latino Americans are excluded from the American identity or to point that Caucasian Americans are overwhelmingly seen as prototypical of the American identity.

The pervasiveness of group-based hierarchies is an important factor to consider when examining the relationship between ethnic and national identities. The fact that a particular ethnic group enjoys benefits that are routinely denied to other ethnic groups has important ramifications on the interconnections between ethnic and national identities. A core idea of social dominance theory is that the relationship between ethnic and national identities is shaped by the existence of ethnic hierarchy (Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The present studies provide further evidence for the idea that individuals who belong to the dominant ethnic group, Caucasian Americans, display a stronger sense of national attachment in comparison to members of other ethnic groups. In addition, ethnic and national identifications are positively correlated for the dominant ethnic group, whereas these identifications are weakly related among members of an ethnic minority. As such, these new studies show very clearly that the effect of ethnicity on an individual's national identity is asymmetrical across different ethnic groups. The placement of a person's ethnic group in society accounts for variations in the intensity of national attachment. Ethnic hierarchy is therefore an essential piece of the puzzle in efforts to achieve a better understanding of the interconnections between ethnic and national identities (see also Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2007).

There are many ways to define the "American dream." The term is often associated with the aspirations and experiences of immigrant groups. In that context, it refers to the idea that one's opportunities and rights in life are not constrained by a rigid hierarchical structure defined based on class, race, ethnicity, or gender. Instead, one's prosperity should depend upon one's own abilities and efforts. The present research suggests that a very basic right to a national identity is not equally accessible to all Americans. More precisely, the national identity is more readily granted to members of the dominant ethnic group than to members of an ethnic minority. The exclusionary definition of the American identity emerging from the present work contrasts with principles of equal opportunity and social justice. At the minimum, all ethnic groups are not created equal in their pursuit of the "American dream" and their aspirations to acquire the national identity. Some individuals are relegated at the margin of the American identity because their group does not fit its prototypical definition. As such, these findings contribute to a growing literature on the ramifications and consequences of defining a superordinate identity in a way that excludes some subgroups.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by National Institute of Mental Health Grants R24 MH 065515 and T34 65183, and a Faculty Grant-in-aid for Research (San Diego State University).

References

- Banaji, MR. Implicit attitudes can be measured. In: Roediger, HL., III; Nairne, JS.; Neath, I.; Surprenant, A., editors. *The nature of remembering: Essays in honor of Robert G. Crowder*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2001. p. 117-150.
- Barlow KM, Taylor DM, Lambert WE. Ethnicity in America and feeling “American. *Journal of Psychology*. 2000; 134:581–600. [PubMed: 11092413]
- Benet-Martínez V, Leu J, Lee F, Morris MW. Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2002; 33:492–516.
- Carpenter S, Zárate MA, Garza AA. Cultural pluralism and prejudice reduction. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2007; 13:83–93. [PubMed: 17500597]
- Cheryan S, Monin B. “Where are you really from?”: Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 89:717–730. [PubMed: 16351364]
- Citrin J, Haas EB, Muste C, Reingold B. Is American nationalism changing? Implications for foreign policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 1994; 38:1–31.
- Citrin, J.; Wong, C.; Duff, B. The meaning of American national identity: Patterns of ethnic conflict and consensus. In: Ashmore, RD.; Jussim, L.; Wilder, D., editors. *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2001. p. 71-100.
- Cohen, J.; Cohen, P.; West, SG.; Aiken, LS. *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 3. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2003.
- Crisp, RJ.; Hewstone, M., editors. *Multiple social categorization: Processes, models and applications*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press; 2006.
- De Houwer J. The extrinsic affective Simon task. *Experimental Psychology*. 2003; 50:77–85. [PubMed: 12693192]
- de Jong PJ, Pasman W, Kindt M, van den Hout MA. A reaction time paradigm to assess (implicit) complaint-specific dysfunctional beliefs. *Behaviour Research & Therapy*. 2001; 39:101–113. [PubMed: 11125719]
- de la Garza RO, Falcon A, Garcia FC. Will the real Americans please stand up: Anglo and Mexican-American support of core American political values. *American Journal of Political Science*. 1996; 40:335–351.
- Devos, T. Unpublished raw data. 2003. Latino Americans are conceived of as being less American than White/Caucasian Americans.
- Devos T. Implicit bicultural identity among Mexican American and Asian American college students. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2006; 12:381–402. [PubMed: 16881745]
- Devos, T. Implicit attitudes 101: Theoretical and empirical insights. In: Crano, WD.; Prislin, R., editors. *Attitudes and attitude change*. New York, NY: Psychology Press; 2008. p. 61-84.
- Devos, T.; Banaji, MR. Implicit self and identity. In: Leary, MR.; Tangney, JP., editors. *Handbook of self and identity*. New York, NY: Guilford Press; 2003. p. 153-175.
- Devos T, Banaji MR. American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 88:447–466. [PubMed: 15740439]
- Devos T, Heng L. Whites are granted the American identity more swiftly than Asians: Disentangling the role of automatic and controlled processes. *Social Psychology*. (in press).
- Devos T, Ma D. Is Kate Winslet more American than Lucy Liu? The impact of construal processes on the implicit ascription of a national identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 47:191–215. [PubMed: 17621413]
- Devos, T.; Stevens, A.; Anderson, KJ. Ethnic minority perspectives on the American identity. Paper presented at the 89th Annual Convention of the Western Psychological Association; Portland, OR. 2009.
- Dovidio JF, Gaertner SL, Saguy T. Another view of “we”: Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 2007; 18:296–330.
- Draine, SC. *Inquisit 2.0*. [Computer Software.]. Seattle, WA: Millisecond Software; 2005.

- Fazio RH, Olson MA. Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and uses. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2003; 54:297–327.
- Gaertner, SL.; Dovidio, JF. The aversive form of racism. In: Dovidio, JF.; Gaertner, SL., editors. *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1986. p. 61-89.
- Gaertner, SL.; Dovidio, JF. *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press; 2000.
- Gemar MC, Segal ZV, Sagrati S, Kennedy SJ. Moodinduced changes on the Implicit Association Test in recovered depressed patients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2001; 110:282–289. [PubMed: 11358022]
- Gong L. Ethnic identity and identification with the majority group: Relations with national identity and self-esteem. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2007; 31:503–523.
- Greenwald AG, Banaji MR, Rudman LA, Farnham SD, Nosek BA, et al. A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review*. 2002; 109:3–25. [PubMed: 11863040]
- Greenwald AG, Farnham SD. Using the implicit association test to measure self-esteem and self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000; 79:1022–1038. [PubMed: 11138752]
- Greenwald AG, McGhee DE, Schwartz JLK. Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 74:1464–1480. [PubMed: 9654756]
- Greenwald AG, Nosek BA, Banaji MR. Understanding and using the implicit association test: 1. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2003; 85:197–216. [PubMed: 12916565]
- Huddy L, Virtanen S. Subgroup differentiation and subgroup bias among Latinos as a function of familiarity and positive distinctiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1995; 68:97–108. [PubMed: 7861317]
- Huo YJ. Procedural justice and social regulation across group boundaries: Does subgroup identity undermine relationship-based governance? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2003; 29:336–348. [PubMed: 15273011]
- Hurtado A, Gurin P, Peng T. Social identities: A framework for studying the adaptations of immigrants and ethnics: The adaptations of Mexicans in the United States. *Social Problems*. 1994; 41:129–151.
- Jost JT, Banaji MR, Nosek BA. A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*. 2004; 25:881–919.
- Karpinski A, Steinman RB. The single category implicit association test as a measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2006; 91:16–32. [PubMed: 16834477]
- Marotta SA, Garcia JG. Latinos in the United States in 2000. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2003; 25:13–34.
- Mummendey A, Wenzel M. Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 1999; 3:158–174. [PubMed: 15647144]
- Nosek BA, Banaji MR. Measuring implicit social cognition: The go/no-go association task. *Social Cognition*. 2001; 19:625–666.
- Nosek BA, Greenwald AG, Banaji MR. Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2005; 31:166–180. [PubMed: 15619590]
- Nosek, BA.; Greenwald, AG.; Banaji, MR. The implicit association test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review. In: Bargh, JA., editor. *Social psychology and the unconscious: The automaticity of higher mental processes*. New York, NY: Psychology Press; 2007. p. 265-292.
- Nosek BA, Smyth FL, Hansen JJ, Devos T, Lindner NM, et al. Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 2007; 18:36–88.
- Phinney JS, Devich-Navarro M. Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 1997; 7:3–32.
- Roccas S, Brewer M. Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2002; 6:88–106.

- Rudman LA. Sources of implicit attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2004; 13:79–82.
- Sidanius J, Feshbach S, Levin S, Pratto F. The interface between ethnic and national attachment: Ethnic pluralism or ethnic dominance? *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 1997; 61:102–133.
- Sidanius, J.; Petrocik, JR. Communal and national identity in a multiethnic state: A comparison of three perspectives. In: Ashmore, RD.; Jussim, L.; Wilder, D., editors. *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict resolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2001. p. 101-129.
- Sidanius, J.; Pratto, F. *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
- Sinclair S, Sidanius J, Levin S. The interface between ethnic and social system attachment: The differential effects of hierarchy-enhancing and hierarchy-attenuating environments. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1998; 54:741–757.
- Staerklé C, Sidanius J, Green E, Molina L. Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry and attitudes towards immigrants across 11 Nations. *Psicologia Politica*. 2005; 30:7–26.
- Therrien, M.; Ramirez, RR. *The Hispanic population in the United States: March 2000, Current population reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2000.
- Tsai JL, Ying YW, Lee PA. The meaning of “being Chinese” and “being American:” Variation among Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2000; 31:302–332.
- Uhlmann E, Dasgupta N, Elgueta A, Greenwald AG, Swanson J. Subgroup prejudice based on skin color among Hispanics in the United States and Latin America. *Social Cognition*. 2002; 20:198–226.
- Waldzus S, Mummendey A, Wenzel M, Boettcher F. Of bikers, teachers and Germans: Groups’ diverging views about their prototypicality. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2004; 43:385–400. [PubMed: 15479537]
- Weber U, Mummendey A, Waldzus S. Perceived legitimacy of intergroup status differences: Its prediction by relative ingroup prototypicality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2002; 32:449–470.
- Wenzel M, Mummendey A, Waldzus S. Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 2007; 18:331–372.
- Wenzel M, Mummendey A, Weber U, Waldzus S. The ingroup as pars pro toto: Projection from the ingroup onto the inclusive category as a precursor to social discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2003; 29:461–473. [PubMed: 15273001]
- Wittenbrink, B.; Schwarz, N., editors. *Implicit measures of attitudes: Procedures and controversies*. New York, NY: Guilford Press; 2007.
- Zárate MA, García B, Garza AA, Hitlan RT. Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2004; 40:99–105.
- Zárate MA, Garza AA. In-group distinctiveness and self-affirmation as dual components of prejudice reduction. *Self and Identity*. 2002; 1:235–249.

Figure 1.

Study 2: Implicit national identification (IAT D) as a function of ethnicity (Latino Participants vs. Caucasian Participants) and implicit ethnic American associations (Weak vs. Strong American = Caucasian $\neq$ Latino Effect).

Figure 2.

Study 3: Implicit national identification (IAT D) as a function of condition (Hierarchy-Enhancing vs. Hierarchy-Attenuating), ethnicity (Latino Participants vs. Caucasian Participants) and implicit ethnic American associations (Weak vs. Strong American = Caucasian $\neq$ Latino Effect).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Implicit and Explicit Measures of Ethnic-American Associations, National Identification, and Ethnic Identification, Study 2

Participants' ethnic identity	Latino participants		Caucasian participants	
	(n = 53)		(n = 55)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Implicit ethnic-American associations				
Caucasian American + American vs. Latino American + foreign	713	167	691	128
Latino American + American vs. Caucasian American + foreign	909	242	1094	400
IAT D effect	0.42	0.35	0.77	0.33
Implicit national identification				
Self + American vs. others + foreign	679	157	662	103
Self + foreign vs. others + American	900	256	978	358
IAT effect	0.55	0.39	0.70	0.36
Implicit ethnic identification				
Self + Caucasian American vs. others + Latino American	821	166	690	121
Self + Latino American vs. others + Caucasian American	699	128	863	271
IAT D effect	-0.36	0.32	0.43	0.35
Explicit association with American				
Latino Americans	5.06	1.31	4.89	1.41
Caucasian Americans	6.21	1.20	6.16	0.71
Explicit identification				
Identification with Americans	5.57	1.39	6.09	1.17
Identification with foreigners	3.94	1.56	3.29	1.47
Identification with Latino Americans	5.93	1.17	3.38	1.53
Identification with Caucasian Americans	4.02	1.84	6.12	1.23

Note. Average response latencies are reported in ms for ease of interpretation. Statistical analyses were performed on IAT D indexes.

Table 2

Correlations Between Implicit and Explicit Measures of Ethnic-American Association, National Identification, and Ethnic Identification

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Implicit ethnic-American associations	—	+ .04	-.09	+ .18	+ .01	-.34*
2. Implicit national identification	+ .53**	—	+ .01	-.10*	+ .29*	-.15
3. Implicit ethnic identification	+ .03	+ .33*	—	+ .15	-.17	+ .19
4. Explicit ethnic-American associations	-.04	+ .00	+ .20	—	-.18	-.08
5. Explicit national identification	-.16	-.19	-.25	+ .33*	—	-.20
6. Explicit ethnic identification	-.21	-.21	-.03	+ .31*	+ .60**	—

Note. Constructs were assessed using the IAT at the implicit level and the difference scores between single-item measures at the explicit level. Correlations for Latino participants are above the diagonal, correlations for Caucasian participants are below the diagonal. For both groups, measures of ethnic identifications were scored such that positive values reflected identification with the ethnic group participants belong to and negative values reflected identification with the other ethnic group.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Table 3

Regression Analyses: National Identification as a Function of Ethnicity, Ethnic Identification, and Ethnic-American Associations

Regression analysis	β	t	R^2	p
1. Implicit national identification				
Ethnicity	.06	0.60		
Implicit ethnic-American associations	.04	0.30		
Ethnicity $\times$ implicit ethnic-American associations	.36	2.71**	.17	.000
2. Implicit national identification				
Implicit ethnic identification	.14	1.41		
Implicit ethnic-American associations	.29	3.02**		
Implicit ethnic identification $\times$ implicit ethnic-American associations	.21	2.38*	.17	.000
3. Explicit national identification				
Ethnicity	.27	2.93**		
Explicit ethnic-American associations	-.16	-1.41		
Ethnicity $\times$ explicit ethnic-American associations	.31	2.74**	.14	.002
4. Explicit national identification				
Explicit ethnic identification	.44	5.04**		
Explicit ethnic-American associations	.02	0.18		
Explicit ethnic identification $\times$ explicit ethnic-American associations	.14	1.48	.22	.000

*
 $p < .05$.

**
 $p < .01$.