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ABSTRACT

PROCESSING MESSAGES FOR RECONCILIATION: WHAT PRODUCES CHANGES IN ATTITUDES INSTEAD OF RESISTANCE?

SEPTEMBER 2016

RACHEL R. STEELE, B.A., SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

M.S., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
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Directed by: Professor Brian Lickel

Conflicts between groups harm positive intergroup relations. Parties to intergroup conflict have developed a variety of methods for fostering reconciliation following conflicts. Out of these different mechanisms, intergroup apology is the most studied empirically but there are still a number of gaps in this research. To address these gaps, my research brought together intergroup apology research, attitude change and persuasion research, and findings on the role of group identification. In this research I assumed that apologies and other efforts for reconciliation function as persuasive messages for intergroup reconciliation. The research assessed the way in which participants from both victim and perpetrator groups cognitively process these messages. According to persuasion research, if an individual is inoculated to a persuasive message prior to hearing it, that person will be more likely to resist attitude change. Studies 1, 2, and 3 were all 2 (victim vs. perpetrator group member) x 2 (inoculation vs. no inoculation) factorial designs with a continuous moderator, with researcher race (person of color vs. White) also examined in Study 1. The context of Study 1 was an interracial injustice committed against African-Americans by the United States government. The context of Study 2
was the long history of interracial violations committed against the largest indigenous group in Chile by the dominant group and government. Finally, the context of Study 3 was the conflict between the political Left and Right in Chile during the dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet. Overall, I found that the way participants processed the messages was related to the outcome variables. Study 1 revealed expected effects of inoculation and similar effects of researcher race. Studies 2 and 3 demonstrated group differences largely in line with positions on each side of the conflicts in Chile. The implication, limitations, and future directions of this research were discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Intergroup conflicts, such as civil wars and racial discrimination, damage the fabric of society and harm relations between groups. Relationships that are broken cannot be reconciled without special efforts once conflicts or injustices end. Social psychological research has begun to study the methods that have been developed to attempt to reconcile intergroup relationships. Research on intergroup apologies, in particular, has begun to expand (Brown, Wohl, & Exline, 2008; Leonard, Mackie, & Smith, 2011; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Philpot & Hornsey, 2011; Wohl, Hornsey, & Bennett, 2012), but this research still has many gaps. For instance, little is known about how individuals actually process these efforts for reconciliation and elaborate on or counter argue messages for reconciliation. Without understanding how people interpret the messages they receive, it will be difficult to identify the most effective ways to promote intergroup reconciliation.

The research conducted in this dissertation attempted to address the gaps in prior research, particularly by developing methods for examining how people process and elaborate on intergroup apologies and other reconciliation messages. A key rationale of my approach is that scholars and practitioners will gain a better understanding of how people respond to messages for reconciliation by drawing from both intergroup apology research as well as research on persuasion and attitude change. To set up my empirical research, I begin by providing an overview of research on intergroup conflict and reconciliation, particularly what is known about reconciliation from intergroup apology research. As part of that discussion, I highlight the gaps that still exist in this research. After that, I discuss how research on
persuasion and attitude change can address these gaps. I conclude by discussing how strength of group identification may moderate individual group member’s responses to messages for reconciliation.

Background on Intergroup Conflict and Reconciliation Processes

Intergroup conflicts may take different forms ranging from implicit prejudice to violent civil conflicts. Furthermore, the psychological underpinnings of intergroup conflict may differ depending on the role each group played during the conflict. To best address the multifaceted character of reconciliation after intergroup conflict, parties to conflicts have developed many different strategies and mechanisms for reconciliation. I review three major issues related to the background on intergroup conflict and reconciliation: 1) the nature of intergroup conflict including the different types of injustices that may occur and stages of conflict, 2) the different psychological processes that come into play during an intergroup conflict and that also affect post-conflict reconciliation, and 3) various efforts that are important in the post-conflict tool kit including truth seeking mechanisms, reparations, and intergroup apologies.

Groups, Stages, and Events Involved in Intergroup Conflict

Intergroup conflicts can take many different forms. For example, wars may occur between nations or between groups of people within a country. In my research I was focused on internal conflicts within countries. The groups embroiled in these kinds of conflicts may be from different racial groups such as the Hutu and the Tutsi in Rwanda (Stover & Weinstein, 2004) or they might be from political groups such as the political Right who were affiliated with Augusto Pinochet’s military dictatorship in Chile and the political Left who opposed the dictatorship (Manzi & González, 2007). Intergroup conflicts may involve violent armed conflict between groups, an ideological struggle, or both. Killings and atrocities may have been
committed by both sides, even if the amount and type of violence was asymmetrical. In other cases, governments may implement discriminatory policies that negatively affect one group (e.g., internment of Japanese-Americans during WWII; Brooks, 1999). Conflict can permeate societal structures even if the country is largely at peace. Often many agencies, institutions, and partners are complicit in the harms (Hayner, 2000), and intergroup injustices can be very complex, spanning long periods of time, and including multiple actors and events (Barkan, 2002).

After conflict escalation plays out, the stages of resolution can begin including cessation of violence, negotiations, and reconciliation (Lund, 1996). My research focused on the stage of reconciliation. In addition to being influenced by events that occurred during the conflict, reconciliation may be affected by the preexisting intergroup dynamics, such as the distribution of power and resources. In conflicts where there is relatively equal power and resources, injustices committed by each side are more likely to be proportional, and resolution will likely be driven by a cost-benefit analysis. Zartman (1985) states that the time when both sides feel that the cost of compromise to end the conflict is less than the cost of continuing the conflict as an ideal time for negotiation to begin. On the other hand, when there is asymmetry in power and resources between the groups involved, injustices may be more severe and one-sided, creating more barriers to reconciliation.

In my research, I sought to better understand the cognitive processes that lead to greater openness to messages for reconciliation after conflict and what processes may make people more resistant to reconciliation. The pre-existing intergroup dynamics and the events during the conflict can influence reconciliation even years later. Intergroup conflicts damage human relationships and cause trust between groups to deteriorate. In the next sub-section I will outline some of the psychological processes that may explain how and in what ways group
roles and collective memories of experiences during the conflict may affect group members’ attitudes and beliefs about openness to reconciliation and rebuilding relationships.

**Psychological Processes of Conflict and Conflict Resolution**

Intergroup conflict often occurs over access to resources (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006). However, once groups have been engaged in conflict, increasing access to resources without addressing the underlying psychological needs of each group involved may not be sufficient to foster reconciliation. According to the negotiation literature, groups’ positions on the distribution of resources and power are often stated directly by the parties, while underlying psychological needs may be the root of the conflict but are often unspoken (Fischer, Ury, & Patton, 1991). Many conflict resolution efforts are only focused on the explicit issues confronting the groups, but reconciliation is also about groups learning how to see each other differently after the conflict (Staub, Pearlman, Gubin, & Hagengimana, 2005). In order for perspective taking of the other side, each group’s psychological needs must be met (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008).

In addition to the divergent experiences and needs of the victim and perpetrator groups in a conflict, contrasting memories of what took place during the conflict can drastically affect the progress of reconciliation. Few conflicts partition roles cleanly into victim and perpetrator; all groups generally suffer during a conflict. When one group perpetrated the majority of the injustices, perpetrator group members may still view themselves as victims, or may believe that their group’s actions were justified (Bilali & Ross, 2012). Each side’s memory of the conflict may not be accurate because collective memory is socially constructed, but the memories people do have feed into their conceptions of their in-group, out-groups, and the status of intergroup relations (Halbwacks, 1980; Schwartz, 2000; Vollhardt, 2012). This is even true of conflicts that
happened long in the past (Volkan, 2001). Victims and perpetrators tend to remember intergroup conflict differently. Victim group members emphasize the long-term consequences of the injustices they suffered, whereas perpetrator group members minimize the consequences of (and focus on the situational variables that influenced) their actions (Baumeister & Catanese, 2001). Or groups may actually disagree about which group has suffered more (e.g., competitive victimhood; Nadler & Saguy, 2004; Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008). All of these factors can impede reconciliation efforts.

**Post-Conflict Reconciliation Methods**

As I discussed in the prior sections, intergroup conflicts can be multifaceted in nature, and the psychological needs of the different groups sometimes compete. Thus, facilitating intergroup reconciliation following these injustices can be similarly complex. A variety of means have been employed to foster reconciliation. In some conflict settings these methods have been used separately, whereas multiple methods have been used in tandem in other conflict settings (e.g., South Africa post-Apartheid). In some instances, third parties acted as brokers and facilitators, and other times parties to the conflict themselves attempted to enact a collaborative plan for national reconciliation. The primary methods that have been developed broadly include *truth telling, reparations*, and public statements of restitution such as *group-based apologies*.

Truth telling mechanisms seek to gather information and establish a shared history of the conflict through testimony of perpetrators and victims alike (Hayner, 2000) and through available documentation (Worden & Steele, 2009). Truth seeking mechanisms, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission conducted in South Africa, can paint a broader picture of the conflict to determine the timeline of events and who was responsible for abuses in
published reports with policy recommendations (Barkan, 2002; Hayner, 2000; Minow, 2002).

Understanding the true nature of the conflict is important because groups may have divergent perspectives on the conflict itself. In other cases, injustices may have occurred secretly, such as the disappearance of political dissidents in Chile during the Pinochet regime (Manzi & González, 2007). Not all nations that implement truth-seeking mechanisms have the same goals, but many have similar methods.

Truth discovery and documentation are sometimes, but not always, coupled with reparation programs. When a perpetrator group is trying to improve relations with the victim group or when a truth seeking mechanism reveals disproportional responsible for atrocities, the perpetrator group will sometimes offer reparations to the victims (Roht-Arriaza, 2004). In other cases, victims or international human rights organizations may pressure perpetrator groups into providing reparations. Reparations can be monetary (Katz et al., 2008), symbolic (Worden & Steele, 2009), or both (Hamber & Wilson, 2002; LaPlante & Theidon, 2007). For example, a 10-million dollar settlement was given to the victims and families of the Tuskegee syphilis study as well as lifetime health insurance (Katz et al., 2008). Likewise, Tuol Sleng, a former site of torture during the rule of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia has been transformed into a museum and a symbol for remembrance (Worden & Steele, 2009).

In addition to truth seeking mechanisms and reparations programs, many perpetrator groups have offered apologies for past injustices (Blatz, Shrumann, & Ross, 2009; Brooks, 1999; Lazare, 2004). For example, the Canadian Prime Minister Steven Harper offered an apology to Chinese-Canadians for discriminatory policies implemented by the government against Chinese immigrants between 1885 and 1947 (Blatz, Day, & Schryer, 2014). Similarly, Australian Prime Minister John Howard apologized to indigenous Australians for the government’s involvement in removing indigenous children from their homes for cultural reeducation (Augoustinos, &
LeCouteur, 2004). Blatz et al. (2009) analyzed thirteen of these apologies and found that they are often quite complex because they address multifaceted injustices (for apologies these researchers have coded, see University of Waterloo, 2013). Apologies, like the other reconciliation mechanisms discussed are most effective when they occur within a broader political context of reconciliation efforts (Wolh, Hornsey, & Philpot, 2011).

As I have reviewed, intergroup conflict and reconciliation are complex. Part of this complexity comes from the divergent experiences of the different groups in the conflict. The different experiences, memories, and needs of the perpetrator and victim groups can make reconciliation more cumbersome. In response to these challenges, parties to intergroup conflict have developed a number of methods to foster intergroup reconciliation such as truth telling, providing reparations to victims, and offering intergroup apologies. Of these methods, an intergroup apology is one of the most tangible because it is a verbal statement that can be recorded or printed (Blatz et al., 2009). The essence of a truth commission may be harder to capture since they can last for months or years and may be mandated to do a variety of tasks (Hayner, 2000). Reparations may be quantified by the total amount of financial support provided but how individual victims qualify for financial support may not be straightforward, and dispersion of funds may only occur after a long lapse in time (LaPlante & Theidon, 2007).

Because apology can be more easily observed than other mechanisms for reconciliation, it has been more intensively studied. In the next section, I review empirical data on intergroup apology that examines potential outcomes of intergroup apologies as well as conditions under which they are likely to be more effective at fostering reconciliation.
**Intergroup Apologies and Intergroup Reconciliation**

Governments and corporations are increasingly offering public apologies to the victims of past injustices (Blatz et al., 2009; Brooks, 1999; Lazare, 2004). For example, the U.S. government apologized for past discriminatory practices committed against African-American men who were victims of the Tuskegee syphilis study (Blatz et al., 2009; Katz et al., 2008). Research has begun to examine the effect of intergroup apologies on intergroup reconciliation (Brown et al., 2008; Leonard et al., 2011; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Philpot & Hornsey, 2011; Wohl et al., 2012). I outline what we know from the research to date, as well as what gaps currently exist in the literature.

**Past Intergroup Apology Research**

Many scholars believe that intergroup apologies improve intergroup relations (Lazare, 2004; Minow, 2002; Tavuchis, 1991), and research has begun to examine this empirically. Researchers have tested various outcomes following apologies. However, as I highlight, there are inconsistencies across studies in the outcome variables that are tested. Furthermore, although most apology research examines intergroup forgiveness, the evidence for an apology-forgiveness link is mixed. Thus, both in the measures used, as well as the outcomes, there are significant inconsistencies in the prior research on intergroup apology.

The outcomes that the research has examined range from individuals’ personal feelings to their perceptions of the perpetrator group. Leonard et al. (2011) and Philpot and Hornsey (2008) Researchers measured affective variables and found that apology increased satisfaction with (Leonard et al., 2011; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008) and respect for the out-group and decreased anger towards the out-group compared to no apology (Leonard et al., 2011). However, not all research examines these emotions. Moreover, the effect of apology on other
emotions may be limited to certain circumstances. For example, after running one study in which apology did not affect empathy, Philpot and Hornsey (2008) dropped it from three subsequent studies so it is not clear what conditions might be necessary for apology to influence empathy. Some researchers have also tested the effect of apology on judgments about other groups in the conflict (Blatz et al., 2014). For example, Philpot and Hornsey (2008; 2011) found that apology increased perceptions that the perpetrator group had ulterior motives (e.g., to avoid judgment) compared to no apology. Likewise, Brown et al. (2008) found that when Canadians were offered an apology from the U.S. for a friendly fire incident they were more in favor of Canadian troops continuing to support the efforts of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. Other research found effects of apology complexity on perceptions of justice norms in society (Steele & Blatz, 2014). Each of these results is informative, but our overall understanding of the effects of intergroup apology remains limited because a consistent list of outcome variables was not included in all studies.

One point of consistency in past research is the inclusion of intergroup forgiveness as an important outcome of apology. Intergroup apology research has been built in part on principles from interpersonal apology, and forgiveness is an important idea in interpersonal relationships. Thus, most researchers have examined intergroup forgiveness in their studies of intergroup apology (Brown et al., 2008; Leonard et al., 2011; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Philpot & Hornsey, 2011; Steele & Blatz, 2014; Wohl et al., 2012). However, the results of this research are not consistent. Philpot and Hornsey (2008) do not find an apology-forgiveness link, but Leonard et al. (2011) did. When there is an effect of apology it may be moderated by individual differences. For example, Brown et al. (2008) found that an apology led to more forgiveness than no apology, and low identifiers were more willing to forgive than high identifiers. In addition, Wohl et al. (2012) found that participants reported more forgiveness when an apology included
primary emotions compared to when it included secondary emotions (or a no apology control). In response to this mixed evidence, some scholars have argued that forgiveness between groups may not be the most realistic or important outcome for intergroup conflict (Iyer & Blatz, 2012).

The evidence regarding the effect of apologies on intergroup forgiveness is clearly mixed and the effectiveness of apology appears to depend on a set of conditions. Many of the possible moderators of apology have yet to be experimentally examined such as intentionality, severity of the harm, and time since the harm (Blatz & Philpot, 2010). Complexity of an intergroup apology may also matter. For example, Steele and Blatz (2014) found more perceived sincerity and beliefs that the apology affirmed norms of justice in society as the apology became more complex. In addition to the type of apology, Wohl et al. (2011) claim that there are a number of steps that should both precede and follow an intergroup apology to increase its effectiveness. Taken together, this suggests that the quality and timing of an intergroup apology matter for the way in which it is received.

Past research demonstrates that the effect of intergroup apology on forgiveness is conditional, and the possible conditions have only begun to be tested. The way in which people process the message of the apology is likely another important condition that should be examined. People may take different messages from the same apology because of the many elements it includes (Blatz et al., 2009; Steele & Blatz, 2014), and what people take away from an apology may determine how they interpret its overall meaning and intent. Philpot and Hornsey (2011) indirectly examined apology processing by assessing whether or not people remembered actual intergroup apologies. They found that participants from Malaysia, Australia, and the Philippines who remembered an apology by the Japanese for harms committed during WWII perceived more remorse and were more forgiving of the Japanese than those who were unsure or those who said they did not remember an apology. In this study,
however, they did not measure what those who claimed they remembered the apology could actually recall about it.

**Gaps in the Research**

As highlighted in the previous section, evidence for the intergroup apology-forgiveness link is inconsistent. In addition, little is known about how people process intergroup apologies and what they take away from them. Furthermore, a disproportionate amount of the existing research only focuses on either the victim group’s perspective or the perpetrator group’s perspective. Likewise, there are likely more potential moderators of intergroup apologies that have not yet been empirically tested (Blatz & Philpot, 2010).

The most important gap in the intergroup apology research to date is the lack of knowledge about what recipients of an apology take away from the message and how this may differ by group membership. Understanding how people react to and interpret an apology message may serve as a key to predicting when apologies will foster positive intergroup relations and when they might not. Out of all the outcome variables measured in the intergroup apology research, few address people’s thinking about the apology itself. The few that do are focused on the characteristics of the individual(s) offering the apology (e.g., perceived remorsefulness; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Steele & Blatz, 2014; Wohl et al., 2012) and not on the quality or content of the message itself. Research conducted by Philpot and Hornsey (2011) was the closest to examining message processing by measuring whether or not victim group members remembered a real apology for a past offense. However, their research did not assess the strength of or content of these memories, or how the content affected the cognitive processing of the message when it was received.
Most intergroup apology research only examines the victim group’s perspective or the perpetrator group’s perspective; Blatz and Philpot (2010) claim that this limited perspective is a major flaw in the research to date. Shnabel and Nadler (2008) provide evidence that victims and perpetrators do indeed have different psychological needs. According to the needs-based model of reconciliation, victims lack power (Foster & Rusbult, 1999) and perceived control (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994) while perpetrators want to be accepted in the moral community (Tavuchis, 1991). Because of these different perspectives and needs both victim and perpetrator perspectives must be assessed in research on the effect of apologies.

In summary, research on intergroup apology to date is mixed on the apology-forgiveness link. The effect of intergroup apology is conditional; however, many of the possible conditions have not yet been tested. In addition, the perpetrator group’s perspective has received much less attention than the perspective of the victim group; both perspectives need to be examined in tandem. Finally, intergroup apology research has not examined apologies as messages and thus message processing has not been examined. In the next section, I address what we can learn about the role of intergroup apologies and other reconciliation efforts by examining the cognitive process through which people elaborate on, interpret, and encode these messages.

**Applying Persuasion Research to the Study of Intergroup Apologies**

To better understand how people might process messages for reconciliation, I turn to theories and methods used in persuasion and attitude change research. Perpetrator groups may have a number of motivations for offering apologies (Philpot & Hornsey, 2008), but in most cases they offered them to elicit a desired reaction from the victim group (e.g., increased harmony, dropping of legal action, etc.). If an apology was offered due to public pressure
(Barkan, 2002), then the intention may be to appease the wishes of the victim group.

Perpetrator groups that feel guilt for their misdeeds may offer an apology to induce a response from the victim group to help alleviate that feeling (Baumeister et al., 1994) and improve their moral image (Tavuchis, 1991). And, in at least some instances, perpetrators may offer apologies as a genuine effort to foster reconciliation and rebuild relations between groups (de Greiff, 2008). Apologies thus function as persuasive messages to the victim group to adopt specific attitudes about the perpetrators and the intergroup situation.

According to the elaboration likelihood model, persuasive messages can be processed through one of two routes, the central or the peripheral route (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Similarly, in the heuristic-systematic model of information processing, Chaiken and Trope (1999) proposed a model with duel routes for message processing. When people use the central (or systematic) route of processing they elaborate more deeply on the content and source of the message and are less susceptible to attitude change unless the argument is strong. When using the peripheral (or heuristic) route, people are focused on unrelated situational details, and thus may be prone to attitude change when those details are appealing. The chosen route of processing depends on the motivation and ability of the individual to engage with (Petty & Cacioppo, 1979) and to process (Petty, Wells, & Brock, 1976) the message. People tend to have higher motivation to elaborate on messages when they have more knowledge about the message and when it is personally relevant (Ostrom & Brock, 1968; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Sherif & Hovland, 1961). If someone does not have any motivation to engage with the message, they may disengage without elaborating.

Persuasion research has examined and found that individuals employ multiple methods to resist attitude change when they are presented with a persuasive message that is counter to their beliefs. Jacks and Cameron (2003) examined the methods of resistance that are most
commonly used and which are most effective at bolstering resistance to attitude change. In a free response survey, they found that participants reported using counter arguing and attitude bolstering the most. In a follow-up study that tested what methods people actually used, they found that counter arguing and attitude bolstering were the most frequently used methods, and counter arguing was the most effective.

Counter arguing is one way of elaborating on a message that involves stating rebuttals to the persuasive message (Abelson, 1959; Eagly & Chaiken, 1995; Festinger, 1957; McGuire, 1964). In attitude change research the persuasive message is typically about a specific position on an issue (e.g., pro-life). Attitude researchers generally recruit participants who hold views directly opposed to that position (e.g., pro-choice) in order to see if their attitudes can be changed. Unlike the messages used in that research, messages for reconciliation (such as government apologies) are generally more nuanced and multifaceted. Messages for reconciliation may be directly stated (e.g., apology) or the intentions and motivations might be implied based on groups’ actions (e.g., the public statements made and actions taken during the course of a truth and reconciliation commission). When perpetrators make efforts to reconcile, they generally want to portray their group as moral (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008) and to distinguish their current group from the group members that committed injustices in the past (Tavuchis, 1991). Efforts for reconciliation may also communicate that intergroup relations will improve in the future. Thus, counter arguing of reconciliation messages may involve reiterating the gravity of past harm, criticizing the out-group’s efforts, or pointing out the aspects of the intergroup relations that still need to improve.

Counter arguing against a persuasive message requires a certain level of motivation to engage with the message. The role of motivation might influence attitude change in a number of different ways. In reactance theory, Brehm (1966) proposed that if people perceive that they
are being forced to engage with a message, they may react by either reinforcing their existing beliefs (resisting attitude change) or even by developing an attitude directly counter to the message (reactance). Thus, resistance to attitude change is an outcome of infringing upon one’s internal motivation to engage with a message. If internal motivation is not present, individual may disengage and not process any part of the message. Social judgment theories (Hovland & Sherif, 1952; Sherif & Hovland, 1953) suggest that people evaluate messages on a continuum of acceptability called latitudes of acceptance, non-commitment, and rejection. The degree of motivation individuals have to engage with a message increases when the message is within the latitude of acceptance and decreases when the message is within the latitude of rejection, resulting in low elaboration. In this case, someone may exhibit even less attitude change than if they counter argued the message. Thus, lack of motivation to engage will lead people to cling to their preexisting attitudes and beliefs.

In the context of messages for reconciliation, counter arguing and disengagement involve different levels of elaboration on the message, but both strategies may lead to resistance to reconcile with the other group. When people counter argue, they are highly motivated to criticize efforts by the other group, and thus will become more certain that negotiation and dialogue are not the right options. When motivation is completely lacking people may not even be willing to begin a discussion about reconciliation. Therefore, those who disengage may be even less likely to change their attitudes about the out-group than those who criticize the efforts of the other group (but who at least considered the pro-reconciliation message).
Individual Differences that may Moderate Message Processing

The extent to which members of a group process (i.e., elaborate) or ignore messages about reconciliation may depend on their level of in-group identification. Research on intergroup relations has shown that group identification moderates how strongly aligned individuals are with their group’s views of the conflict (e.g., collective memory) and of reconciliation. For example, Brown et al. (2008) found that the extent to which people were willing to forgive following the September 11\textsuperscript{th} attacks decreased as American identification increased. Similarly, Stenstrom, Lickel, Denson, and Miller (2008) found that identification with one’s political party was positively correlated with anger towards the source of a provocation against their party.

Highly identified group members are more likely to have knowledge about reconciliation efforts and to find messages for reconciliation personally relevant. According to conditions outlined by the elaboration likelihood model, individuals with more knowledge and greater personal relevance to a message tend to elaborate more on it (Ostrom & Brock, 1968; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Sherif & Hovland, 1961). Thus, the strongest group advocates are often likely to be those who are highly identified with the group, and who are also the most likely to point out inadequacies and flaws of the out-group’s efforts. Thus, high identifiers should generally be expected to engage in the most counter-arguing. However, it may be that some highly identified group members may feel so strongly about the inadequacies of the out-group’s position on reconciliation that they disengage from messages of reconciliation entirely and ignore, rather than counter-argue, the message. Relatedly, Scott (1968) proposed that when attitudes are embedded in related beliefs and values they are harder to change. Thus, in a post-conflict context a highly identified person is likely to reference the values of their group, which might moderate the extent to which they counter argue reconciliation messages. However, to
date, there is no research that investigates how people actually process intergroup apologies, and so these possible responses from high identifiers were examined in this dissertation.

The extent to which group members are identified with their group may not be the only variable that can influence counter arguing or disengagement from messages of reconciliation. In post-conflict settings, some members of each group may be motivated to spoil reconciliation and fuel conflict by employing a strategy called *inoculation* to convince their fellow group members that the efforts made by the other side are not sincere or sufficient. If group members are “inoculated” to the messages for reconciliation prior to hearing them, they may become more embedded in their in-group’s positions and thus become less willing to compromise with the out-group. Inoculation manipulations expose participants to flaws in the position of the message prior to introducing the persuasive message about the position (McGuire, 1964; see Banas & Rains, 2010 for a meta-analysis of inoculation research). By doing so, the inoculation provides people with more ways to elaborate on and counter argue the persuasive message and thus a greater ability to resist attitude change (and maintain negative attitudes about the out-group and the intergroup relations).

In summary, highly identified group members are more likely to counter argue efforts of reconciliation by the out-group, and their degree of counter arguing is not likely to vary based on other conditions (e.g., the presence or absence of an inoculation). Alternatively, those who are high in identification may be the most likely to disengage from the messages completely. Either way, high identifiers are the least likely to change their attitudes about the out-group or the intergroup situation. Those who are low in identification may be the most susceptible to change the degree to which they counter argue based on the circumstances. For example, they might counter argue more when an inoculation is present because the inoculation can provide additional information about the inadequacies of the reconciliation efforts made by the other
group. Thus, taken together, those who are low in in-group identification are the most likely to be persuaded by a message for reconciliation but only for those who are not exposed to the inoculation.

**Perpetrator and Victim Group Responses to Reconciliation Messages**

As we know from research on divergent collective memories of conflict (Bilali & Ross, 2012), the way in which attitudes are influenced by group identification depends not only on the strength of identification but also to which group people consider themselves a member. Attitude change research finds that greater involvement with a message will result in more elaboration and less attitude change. Group identification moderates behavior in other intergroup contexts and may also moderate group members’ responses to inoculation prior to hearing messages for reconciliation. Highly identified individuals are likely to be highly involved in messages for reconciliation and thus be the most critical of them. However, what individuals resistant will also depend on their membership in a victim versus a perpetrator group.

During post-conflict reconciliation, many victim groups demand intergroup apologies (Blatz et al., 2009; Tavuchis, 1991) and other efforts for reconciliation in an attempt to regain power (Foster & Rusbult, 1999) and control (Baumeister et al., 1994). Therefore, highly identified victim group members may be the most likely to highlight the inadequacies of reconciliation efforts. These avid victim group members may strongly counter argue reconciliation messages or completely disengage from any form of elaboration, and thus be more resistant to reconciliation (e.g., attitude change).

Conversely, perpetrator group members may be concerned that offering an apology will portray their group in a negative light (Blatz et al., 2014). Highly identified perpetrator group members may be the most likely to see the efforts their group makes as adequate to address
the previous harms, and thus may disagree with an inoculation if it places qualifications on their group’s efforts for reconciliation. This could cause them to counter argue the inoculation, leading to greater resistance to reconciliation. Therefore, inoculation of an apology may reduce intergroup reconciliation both because it induces members of the victim group to counter-argue the reconciliation message and because it is threatening or insulting to member of the perpetrator group. However, there has been little research that examines the reactions of both victim group members and perpetrator group members to apologies. My research sought to address this gap.

In summary, intergroup conflicts damage relationships and hamper trust between groups. Each group thinks about post-conflict reconciliation with different perspectives and needs. Research on intergroup apology has only begun to understand what conditions are necessary to improve intergroup relations. How people on both sides of a conflict cognitively process efforts that are made for reconciliation is not well understood. In this dissertation, I suggest that combining what is known from both intergroup apology research and attitude change research will increase understanding of how people elaborate on and thus respond to messages for reconciliation. Inoculation prior to persuasive messages for reconciliation may increase counter arguing for some people more than others. In addition, if certain individuals are more likely to disengage from the message they may be more resistant to attitude change than those who engage and elaborate on the message. Identification may moderate the effect of the inoculation, but how this affects outcomes may look different for members of victim and of perpetrator groups. In the next section, I outline how the research tested these ideas of message processing in the context of post-conflict reconciliation.
**Current Research**

In the following three studies, participants in three different contexts read about an intergroup harm and then read about efforts by the perpetrator group to repair. Originally, each study was a 2 (victim vs. perpetrator group) x 2 (inoculation vs. no inoculation) design. In Study 1, researcher race (White vs. person of color) affected the outcomes and thus was analyzed as another independent variable. Half of the participants in each study were randomly assigned to read inoculation information after reading the summary of the harm and before reading about the efforts at repair. The inoculation manipulation was focused on the information from each of the three contexts that served to discredit and minimize the efforts for reconciliation.

These independent variables were tested in two different national contexts, including the United States and Chile. Two different types of intergroup conflicts were examined. The conflicts preceding Studies 1 and 2 involved governments perpetrating abuses against minority groups in each country. Prior to conducting Study 3, two political groups in one country were in conflict. There were well defined victim and perpetrator groups in Study 1, but in Studies 2 and 3, there were reasons why members of the victim group could also be perceived as perpetrators. Although there were some similarities, each conflict was different and each study examined different efforts for reconciliation. These differences could influence the way either victim group members and or perpetrator group members respond. Study 1 focused on a harm, namely the violation of research and medical ethics, that was perpetrated by the U.S. government against African-Americans from 1932-1972 (Katz et al., 2008). I examined Black and White undergraduates’ responses to an actual intergroup apology that was offered. Study 2 was designed around harms committed by the Chilean government and corporations against the indigenous Mapuche people between the time the Spanish settled in Chile up until today,
specifically the seizure of land and infringement of cultural rights (Crow, 2012; Richards, 2013; Rohrer, 2004). I examined responses by Mapuche and non-indigenous undergraduate participants to efforts for reconciliation by the government such as social services and increased acknowledgement of cultural right (Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena, 2013). Study 3 was based on harms committed prior to and during the military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet (from the 1960s to 1990) and the macro-level efforts for reconciliation that took place including a reparation program and intergroup dialogue sessions (Manzi & González, 2007). Undergraduates who identified either with the political Left or the political Right participated. Each study context provided insight into the ways in which individuals on both sides of intergroup conflicts cognitively processed efforts for reconciliation.

For the victim group participants, I hypothesized that inoculation will result in more counter arguing in response to the efforts to repair than for perpetrator group members. Based on methods used in attitude change research, participants responded to an open ended question about the reconciliation effort. Their responses were coded for positive statements in agreement with the efforts and negative statements in disagreement. I hypothesized that victim group members will respond to the inoculation with less positive statements and more negative statements. I also predicted that group identification will moderate the extent to which the inoculation influenced counter arguing such that low identifying victim group members who are in the inoculation condition will be less likely to write positive statements and more likely to write negative statements than low identifiers in the no inoculation condition. Highly identified victim group members will be high in counter arguing in both conditions. Counter arguing will predict both the short and long-term outcomes, but the relationship will be stronger with the short-term outcomes like perceived ulterior motives of the reconciliation efforts compared to long-term outcomes like trust and forgiveness. Short-term variables are
outcomes that are likely to be affected fairly soon after people hear about efforts for reconciliation. Long-term outcomes are important for the goals of intergroup reconciliation but they may take time and further efforts by both groups to develop (Wohl et al., 2011).

I predicted that those who are the most highly identified with the victim group may disengage from the message instead of elaborating on it and counter arguing. Disengagement was operationalized in two ways. First, disengagement vs. engagement was measured by the number of words that participants wrote in response to the open ended question. Second, the amount of time participants spent reading about the reconciliation effort and responding to it was assessed. Correlations between the engagement measures and counter arguing were assessed as well as correlations between the message processing variables (i.e., word count, time, negative statements, and positive statements) and the outcome measures.

I hypothesized that overall the victim group members will counter argue the efforts for reconciliation more than the perpetrator group members. I predicted that perpetrators will write more positive statements and less negative statements than the victim group members. Instead of counter arguing the reconciliation efforts made by their own group, perpetrator group members may defend the efforts made by their in-group.
CHAPTER 2

STUDY 1

The context of Study 1 was an intergroup conflict that involved the U.S. government’s mistreatment of African-Americans. The U.S. Public Health Services conducted the Tuskegee syphilis study at Tuskegee University, a predominantly Black university, in which African-American men who had contracted syphilis were studied without their knowledge or consent (1932-1972) and went untreated for decades after a cure for syphilis was discovered in 1947 (Katz et al., 2008). The study only ended after it was leaked to the press. The government paid a settlement to the victims and their family, but it made no public statement about the study despite the demand for an apology by numerous advocacy groups. Twenty-five years after the study ended, President Bill Clinton apologized in 1997 to the surviving victims and their families (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011).

Study 1 focused on how reading Clinton’s apology affected responses by Black and White participants to intergroup reconciliation variables. Message processing was assessed to determine the degree to which participants engaged with and counter argued the apology message. Perceptions of the intentions and function of the apology were measured with scales that examined the perceived adequacy of the apology, ulterior motives for offering the apology, and the extent to which the apology affirms societal norms of just behavior. Anger was also assessed. Based on theory about the development of reconciliation efforts (Wohl et al., 2011), I defined these as short-term outcomes following an apology. Similarly, I expected beliefs that Blacks and minorities are the target of discrimination to be affected shortly after the apology is read. Outcomes that may take longer to develop include perceptions of discrimination, forgiveness of the out-group (as measured by Brown et al., 2008; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008,
2011; Leonand et al., 2011; Wohl et al., 2012), and trust in the government (de Greiff, 2008), which has not been measured in empirical research.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 225 University of Massachusetts-Amherst undergraduate students. Eighty-six identified as Black, and 139 identified as White. Nine participants were excluded because they either did not report the correct race (five) or did not response to the open ended prompt (four). Of the 86 Black participants in the final sample, 31 were not born in the U.S., not U.S. citizens, identified as African or Caribbean, or some combination of the above. Differences between the subsets of the Black participants were footnoted in the results. There were 185 female and 40 male participants. Differences for biological sex were footnoted in the results. The mean age was 20.10 (SD = 1.90). Data was collected between February 2013 and April 2014.  

**Design**

The original design was a 2 (Black vs. White participants) by 2 (inoculation vs. no inoculation) factorial design. Racial identification was analyzed as a moderating variable. Sessions in the lab were run by four research assistants: a White female, a White male, a Dominican-American female, and a Brazilian-American female. Analyses examined differences across all four research assistants, but the number of participants per group was very small.

1 Data collection took place before some major events that involved government actions and racial discrimination that have shaded much of the current debate on the topic such as the deaths of Eric Garner (July 2014), Michael Brown (August 2014), and Freddie Grey (April 2015).
Since the graphs showed similar patterns across the sessions run by the two White researchers and similar patterns across the sessions run by the two researchers of color researcher race was examined as an additional two-level independent variable. Thus, the study was analyzed as a 2 (Black vs. White participants) by 2 (inoculation vs. no inoculation) by 2 (person of color vs. White researcher) factorial design with race identification as a moderating variable.

**Procedure**

All participants first read a summary of the Tuskegee syphilis study, an injustice committed by the U.S. government against African-American men (Katz et al., 2008; for the materials see Appendix A). In the inoculation condition, participants then read about multiple advocacy groups who were pushing for government action and that it took the government over 25 years to respond. In the no inoculation condition participants did not read the extra information about advocacy or the government’s slow response. All participants then read some excerpts from Clinton’s actual apology for the study (previously used by Steele & Blatz, 2014), and wrote a free response in reaction to the apology based on the following instructions: “Above is an excerpt of the statement by Former President Clinton to the survivors of the Tuskegee syphilis study. We are interested to hear how you evaluate this statement. How does this affect your views of the government generally and its actions in the Tuskegee study? Please elaborate on what it means to you personally and what it means broadly speaking about research practices in this country and the role of the government, past and present. Please be as specific as possible.” After responding to the open-ended question, participants completed the close-ended dependent measures.
Measures

Message Processing Variables

As a measure of engagement with the apology message, the number of words each participant wrote in response to the open-ended question were counted. Higher word counts represented more engagement, while lower word counts represented less engagement with the apology message. The apology message (see Appendix A) was displayed on the same page as the instructions and space for the participants’ response to facilitate their ability to refer back to parts of the apology message while they were writing about it.

The time participants took reading about the apology, reading the instructions, and providing their free-response was measured, but this was added after the pilot data was collected (the first 49 Black participants). The time participants spent reading and writing about the apology was conceptualized as another measure of engagement with the apology. Word count and time were highly correlated, $r = 0.71, p < .001$. For correlations by group see Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Word count</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time (in minutes)</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.16†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative statements</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>- .33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive statements</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The correlations for Black participants were on the bottom left and the correlations for White participants were on the top right. For the measure of time, the correlations for Black participants only represent 39 of the 86 participants.
† p < .100, ** p ≤ .010, *** p ≤ .001

Table 1 Study 1 Correlations between the Message Processing Variables

The first set of variables consisted of measures derived from coding participants’ open-ended responses. Counter arguing was assessed with a method used by Petty and Cacioppo (1977) in which individual statements in the participants’ free response to the apology were coded. I divided the participants’ free responses into individual statements. Most divisions were based on sentence structure; however, sentences contained contradictory ideas were divided, usually prior to a conjunction. Coding was done for each individual statement with regard to the apology message. For the coding team, the apology was summarized as communicate three messages: 1) The perpetrator group is not that bad, 2) injustices will not happen in the future, and 3) intergroup relations will be good. Three research assistants coded +1 for statements in agreement with the apology’s message, -1 for statements in disagreement with the apology’s message, and 0 for statements that were either neutral or irrelevant to the apology’s message. The interrater reliability was excellent, α = .91. The coding was unanimous 67.91% of the time. The final variables (negative statements and positive statements) were based on agreement of two of the three coders, meaning that 25.50% of the time a statement with two positive codes or two negative codes received a neutral code from the third coder.
There were only contradictions (e.g., +1, -1, and -1) 6.59% of the time. Contradictions that involved a different code by each research assistant (e.g., +1, 0, and -1) resulted in a neutral code, and thus were not counted toward positive or negative statement totals; this occurred 1.73% of the time. Negative and positive statements were negatively correlated, $r = -0.21$, $p = .002$. Correlations per group were presented in Table 1.

Overall, word count and negative statements were highly associated, $r = 0.73$, $p < .001$; word count and positive statements were also correlated, $r = 0.28$, $p < .001$. Time was correlated with negative statements, $r = 0.59$, $p < .001$, but not with positive statements, $r = 0.07$, $p = .372$. These strong correlations between the measures of engagement (word count and time) and negative statements address the competing hypotheses about whether participants will counter argue or disengage. Engagement was highly related to counter arguing.

In addition to coding the participants’ responses to Clinton’s apology at the beginning of the study, an open ended question was added at the end of the questionnaire (after collecting data from the first 49 Black participants) reminding participants about Clinton’s apology and stating: “Imagine that there is another person who is like you who is going to read the statement. What you would want to tell another person like you about this statement prior to their reading it?” The responses were divided into statements and coded the same way as the initial responses. The positive statements about the apology were correlated with the positive statements about what people would tell someone else, $r = 0.19$, $p = .013$. The negative statements about the apology were correlated with the negative statements about what someone would tell another person, $r = 0.32$, $p < .001$. Thus, there was some degree of

---

2 After pilot data was collected from 49 Black participants, additional questions were added to the study and data collection was extended to include White participants (the dominate group).
relationship between participants’ initial responses to the apology and the content of what they said they would tell another person about it. Analyses were only conducted with the original measures of negative and positive statements.

**Message Proximal Outcome Variables**

All of the close-ended items, unless otherwise noted, were rated on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The first set of close-ended items assessed reactions to the message itself and will be referred to as “message proximal outcome variables.”

Seven items assessed perceived adequacy of Clinton’s response (α = .89). The items asked if “Clinton’s statement was: sincere, remorseful, inadequate” (reverse scored), “a bad apology” (reverse scored), and if participants were “satisfied with Clinton’s statement,” felt “justice was done because of Clinton’s statement,” and felt that “Clinton’s statement adequately addressed the wrong from the past.”

Five items measured the belief that the government only offered an apology for reasons other than repairing the harm (α = .86; adapted from Philpot & Hornsey, 2008). Participants reported if they believed that the statement was an attempt to avoid punishment, an effort to repair their image, or was due to: public pressure, advocacy groups demanding action, and coverage in the national news.

Six items measured the extent to which people believed that the statement affirmed societal norms of just and right behavior (α = .89; adapted from Okimoto & Wenzel, 2009; reported in Steele & Blatz, 2014). Two example items stated, “The statement reinforced values of equality and fair treatment for all people” and “The statement helped people in the government see that their past practices were wrong.”
Feelings of anger towards the government were assessed with three items: I feel “mad,” “enraged,” and “furious” towards the government (α = .93). Empathy toward the government was also measured. After the pilot data was collected (49 Black participants), a measure of empathy toward the government was added: I feel “empathy,” “understanding,” “compassion,” and “sympathy” toward the government (α = .88).

Two other variables were coded by three research assistants from the free-response answers including whether or not participants mentioned Blacks specifically as the targets of prejudice (α = .93) in their responses and whether they mentioned minorities as the targets of prejudice (α = .92). These variables were originally coded as 0 (not present) or the number of times each participant mentioned each of the two target groups (e.g., 1, 2, etc.). However, since these variables were not normally distributed they were recoded as and 0 (not present) or 1 (present). Because the nature of the statements about Blacks and about minorities were so similar, the two dichotomous variables were collapsed to represent if Blacks or minorities were mentioned as the targets of prejudice (α = .94).

**Message Distal Outcome Variables**

The second set of close-ended items assessed reactions to more general or distal outcomes that might be affected by the message and will be referred to as “message distal outcome variables.”

Six items were developed to measure perceived discrimination of one’s racial in-group (α = .97). They stated, “I believe I will be discriminated against because of my race in the future:” “where I live,” “in my place of employment or education,” “by medical research,” “by nurses and doctors,” and “by authorities such as the police.”
Trust in the government was measured with six statements, for example: “The government will uphold agreed-upon ethical standards of research in the future,” “There is reason to believe the government has changed from its past behavior,” and “I trust politicians and other prominent individuals to act fairly in the interest of those who were affected” (α = .84).

Forgiveness statements (“I forgive...”) were asked about each of the following targets: President Clinton, the past government, the government currently, the government in general, research institutions, and people who are White or European-American. In past research on apology, the apologizer is often assessed more favorably than the original offender(s) even though they are the current representative of that group (Tavuchis, 1991), but the reliability was the same with or without the “I forgive Clinton” item, thus all six single-target forgiveness items were averaged into a composite (α = .86).

Similarly, rating of favorability were made about the same six targets: President Clinton, the past government, the government currently, the government in general, research institutions, and people who are White or European-American, and were included in a composite (α = .71). These items were asked on a scale from 0 (extremely unfavorable) to 100 (extremely favorable).

Intergroup forgiveness of the government was measured with a 30-item scale (α = .95; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008) that includes three sub-scales: affective (e.g., I feel warm toward the government), cognitive (e.g., I think the government is immoral - reverse scored), and behavioral (e.g., I would, or would want others, to get even with the government).
Moderator Variables

Race-based identification was adapted from a 16-item scale ($\alpha = .94$) by Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, and Eidelson (2008). Two items stated, “It is important to me that others see me as Black” and, “Blacks are better than other groups in all respects.” With the exception of the pilot data (49 Black participants), identification with the United States was measured with the same scale adapted for national identification (Roccas et al., 2008). The 16-item scale had excellent reliability ($\alpha = .93$), although it included two sub-scales of attachment ($\alpha = .92$) and glorification ($\alpha = .89$) of the U.S. Only the composite was reported both for race and for national identification.

An emotion regulation individual difference measure was included for the degree to which people think about planning revenge against individuals who wrong them. This variable was measured with 11 items that were added after the pilot data (49 Black participants) was collected ($\alpha = .94$). An example items stated, “When someone makes me angry I can’t help thinking about how to get back at this person.”

Results

In moderated regression analyses, it is standard practice to conduct the analysis with all of the simple effects and interaction terms (See Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). This study was a four-way design: participants race (Black vs. White), inoculation (present vs. no present), researcher race (person of color vs. White), and race identification (continuous). The initial analysis included one four-way interaction term, four three-way interaction terms, six two-way interactions terms, and four simple effect terms. If the highest order interaction was not significant, it was dropped and the analysis was re-run and so forth. First, the overall results (interactions and simple effects) were reported for each dependent variable based on the
general linear model analysis of variance output. Next, the highest order interaction was decomposed. For example, when there was a four-way interaction, it was reported if there was a three-way interaction for one group but not the other. If the highest order interaction was a three-way interaction, any two-way interactions including those three independent variables were reported. If there was a two-way interaction, pair-wise comparisons were reported. Graphs were generally only included for the highest order effect(s). Lower order effects were broken down, but must be interpreted in the context of the higher order effects.

**Message Processing Variables**

**Word Count**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting word count, $F(1, 208) = 0.47, p = .493$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$, or any significant three-way interactions, $ps \geq .077$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and the inoculation, $F(1, 213) = 7.16, p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .033$. There was also a two-way interaction between participant race and researcher race, $F(1, 213) = 4.04, p = .046$, $\eta_p^2 = .019$. The other two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .181$. Overall, Black participants ($M = 132.92, SD = 93.17$) wrote more than White participants ($M = 109.24, SD = 47.38$) in response to Clinton’s apology, $F(1, 213) = 15.57, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .068$. The other simple effects were non-significant, all $ps \geq .055$. The effect of participant race was conditional on the inoculation, and it was conditional on researcher race (see below the description of the two two-way interactions).³

³ Overall, female participants ($M = 122.67, SD = 71.21$) wrote significantly more words than male participants ($M = 98.63, SD = 55.03$), $t(223) = 2.01$, $p = .046$, $d = 0.35$. When biological sex was added as an independent variable to the analyses, there was a three-way interaction between participant race, participant sex, and researcher race, $F(1, 198) = 4.66$, $p = .032$, $\eta_p^2 = ...
Participant Race and Inoculation

The interaction between participant race and the inoculation was such that in the inoculation condition, Black participants ($M = 155.28, SD = 120.21$) wrote more than White participants ($M = 103.36, SD = 48.58$) in response to Clinton’s apology, $t(102) = 3.12$, $p = .002$, $d = 0.64$. See the difference between the solid black bars in Figure 1. However, in the no inoculation condition, Black participants ($M = 116.49, SD = 60.85$) and White participants ($M = 114.71, SD = 45.89$) wrote the same number of words, $t(119) = 0.18$, $p = .855$, $d = 0.03$. White participants wrote the same number of words across the no inoculation and the inoculation conditions, $t(137) = 1.42$, $p = .159$, $d = 0.24$, and, Black participants wrote marginally more when the inoculation was present vs. not present, $t(137) = 1.96$, $p = .054$, $d = 0.43$ (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1](image_url)

Figure 1 Interaction between Participant Race and Inoculation

.023, such that Black female participants wrote more than everyone else, but not all of the pairwise comparisons reached significance, all $ps$ ranged from .002 - .166.
Participant Race and Researcher Race

The interaction between participant race and researcher race was such that Black participants wrote more when a researcher of color was present ($M = 158.12, SD = 122.03$) compared to a White researcher ($M = 116.92, SD = 63.17$), $t(137) = 1.42, p = .159, d = 0.24$ (see the difference between the gray and black bars on the right side of Figure 2). On the other hand, White participants wrote more when a White researcher was present ($M = 116.43, SD = 48.34$) compared to when a researcher of color was present ($M = 96.82, SD = 43.38$), $t(137) = 2.39, p = .018, d = 0.42$. In addition, when a researcher of color was present Black participants wrote more than White participants, $t(83) = 3.30, p = .001, d = 0.73$, but when a White researcher was present, Black participants and White participants wrote the same amount, $t(138) = 0.05, p = .959, d = 0.01$ (see Figure 2).\(^4\)

\(^4\) The presence of a research of color amplified the effect of the inoculation according to a marginal three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race, $F(1, 209) = 3.16, p = .077, \eta^2_p = .015$, such that Black participants in the inoculation condition with a researcher of color wrote significantly more than Black participants or White participants in any other conditions (no inoculation vs. inoculation and White researcher vs. researcher of color), all $ps \leq .008$. 
Interaction between Participant Race and Researcher Race

**Negative Statements**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting negative statements, $F(1, 208) = 1.29$, $p = .257$, $\eta^2_p = .006$, or any three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .287$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and researcher race, $F(1, 213) = 10.30$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .046$. All other two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .060$. Black participants ($M = 3.91, SD = 3.02$) wrote more negative statements than White participants ($M = 3.20, SD = 2.31$) in response to Clinton’s apology, $F(1, 213) = 6.74$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2_p = .031$, but this effect was conditional on researchers race (see below). There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .243$.

---

5 Overall, female participants ($M = 3.62, SD = 2.76$) wrote significantly more negative statements than male participants ($M = 2.83, SD = 1.53$), $t(102.01) = 2.50$, $p = .014$, $d = 0.31$. Biological sex did not moderate any of the other effects, all $ps \geq .067$. 

---

Figure 2 Interaction between Participant Race and Researcher Race
**Participant Race and Researcher Race**

The interaction between participant race and researcher race was such that Black participants wrote more negative statements when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 4.82, SD = 3.59$) vs. White ($M = 3.33, SD = 2.41$), $t(84) = 2.32, p = .023, d = 0.51$. Conversely, White participants wrote more negative statements when the researcher was White ($M = 3.63, SD = 2.53$) vs. a person of color ($M = 2.47, SD = 1.54$), $t(137) = 2.95, p = .004, d = 0.52$ (see Figure 3). When the researcher was a person of color, Black participants wrote more negative statements than White participants, $t(83) = 4.15, p < .001, d = 0.92$, but when the researcher was White, Black and White participants did not differ in the number of negative statements they wrote, $t(138) = 0.69, p = .494, d = 0.12$.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) The inoculation manipulation functioned similarly to the race of the researcher, according to a marginal two-way interaction between participant race and the inoculation, $F(1, 213) = 3.56, p = .060, \eta^2_p = .016$, such that when the inoculation was present, Blacks wrote more negative statements than White participants.

\(^7\) Of the 86 Black participants, 31 were not born in the U.S., were not U.S. citizens, claimed African or Cape Verdean as their race, or some combination of the above. Black participants with some evidence of immigrant status wrote significantly less negative statements ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.78$) than those who were not immigrants ($M = 4.56, SD = 3.35$), $t(84) = 2.75, p = .007, d = 0.62$. When only non-immigrant Black participants were included in the analyses, the interaction between participant race and researcher race was still significant, $F(1, 181) = 8.47, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .045$. The pattern of the interaction was the same, but Black participants wrote marginal more (instead of significantly more) negative statements when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 5.54, SD = 4.00$) vs. White ($M = 3.81, SD = 2.57$), $t(53) = 1.95, p = .053, d = 0.51$.\(^7\)
Positive Statements

There was not a four-way interaction predicting positive statements, $F(1, 208) = 1.19, p = .276$, $\eta^2_p = .006$. There was a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race, $F(1, 209) = 9.64, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .044$. The other three-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .067$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and researcher race, $F(1, 209) = 4.07, p = .045, \eta^2_p = .019$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, $F(1, 209) = 4.68, p = .032, \eta^2_p = .022$. The other two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .156$. There were no simple effects on the number of positive statements participants wrote in response to Clinton’s apology, all $ps \geq .145$. The lower order (two-way) interactions must be interpreted in the context of the three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race.
Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race

The three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race was such that for Black participants there was an interaction between the inoculation and researcher race predicting positive statements, $b = -3.33$, $SE = 1.20$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2_p = .035$, but not for White participants, $b = -0.96$, $SE = 0.59$, $p = .106$, $\eta^2_p = .013$. When the inoculation was present, Black participants wrote more positive statements when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 2.26$) versus when the researcher was White ($M = 1.30$, $SD = 1.59$), $t(35) = 2.12$, $p = .041$, $d = -0.70$ (see the fourth set of bar in Figure 4), but in the no inoculation conditions the number of positive statements Black participants wrote did not differ based on researcher race (researcher of color, $M = 1.79$, $SD = 1.37$; White researcher, $M = 1.66$, $SD = 1.43$), $t(47) = 0.16$, $p = .873$, $d = 0.05$ (see the third set of bars in Figure 4).
Participant Race and Researcher Race

There was a two-way interaction between participants race and researcher race (collapsing across the inoculation and the no inoculation conditions) such that when the researcher was White, White participants wrote marginally more positive statements ($M = 2.00, SD = 1.40$) compared to Black participants ($M = 1.52, SD = 1.49$), $t(138) = 1.92, p = .057, d = 0.34$, but when the researcher was a person of color, Black ($M = 2.12, SD = 1.92$) and White participants ($M = 1.82, SD = 1.35$) wrote the same number of positive statements, $t(83) = 0.83, p = .409, d = 0.19$. White participants wrote the same number of positive statements when there was a White ($M = 2.00, SD = 1.40$) or a researcher of color ($M = 1.82, SD = 1.35$), $t(137) = 0.73, p = .469, d = 0.13$. Black participants wrote the same number of positive statements when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 2.12, SD = 1.92$) and when the researcher was White ($M = 1.52, SD = 1.49$), $t(84) = 1.62, p = .108, d = 0.36$. 

Figure 4 Interaction between Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race
Participant Race and Race Identification

There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, such that for Blacks the slope of race identification was negative, $b = -0.38, SE = 0.20, p = .064, \eta_p^2 = .016$, meaning that the more highly identified Black participants were, they wrote marginally less positive statements. However, for White participants, the slope of race identification was not different from zero, $b = 0.11, SE = 0.14, p = .416, \eta_p^2 = .003$.

Repeated Measures Analyses of Statement Type

The interaction analyses above did not account for the fact that the level of positive and negative statements may be different; therefore, additional analyses were run examining negative and positive statements as repeated measures. In a mixed model with participant race and researcher race entered as between-subjects factors and type of the statements (negative vs. positive) as a within-subjects variable, there was a three-way interaction, $F(1, 221) = 4.27, p = .040, \eta_p^2 = .019$. The nature of the three-way interaction was such that there was a marginal two-way interaction between statement type and researcher race for White participants, $F(1, 137) = 3.42, p = .067, \eta_p^2 = .024$, but not for Black participants, $F(1, 84) = 1.33, p = .252, \eta_p^2 = .016$. Pair-wise comparisons between the repeated measures revealed that all groups reported more negative statements than positive statements, but these effects varied in magnitude. The largest effect was for Black participants when a person of color was the researcher; they wrote more negative statements, $M = 4.82, SE = 0.62, 95\% CI [3.57, 6.08]$, than positive statements, $M = 2.12, SE = 0.33, 95\% CI [1.45, 2.79], F(1, 33) = 15.41, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .318$ (see the fourth set of bars in Figure 5). The next largest effect was for Black participants with a White research; they wrote more negative statements, $M = 3.33, SE = 0.33, 95\% CI [2.66, 4.00]$, than positive statements, $M = 1.52, SE = 0.21, 95\% CI [1.10, 1.93], F(1, 51) = 16.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .248$ (see the
third set of bars in Figure 5). White participants in sessions with a White researcher wrote more negative statements, $M = 3.63, SE = 0.27, 95\% CI [3.09, 4.16]$, than positive statements, $M = 2.00, SE = 0.15, 95\% CI [1.70, 2.30]$, $F(1, 87) = 20.66, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .192$ (see the first set of bars in Figure 5). Finally, White participants with a researcher of color wrote more negative statements, $M = 2.47, SE = 0.22, 95\% CI [2.04, 2.90]$, than positive statements, $M = 1.82, SE = 0.19, 95\% CI [1.44, 2.20]$, $F(1, 50) = 4.11, p = .048$, $\eta^2_p = .076$ (see the second set of bars in Figure 5), but this effect was the smallest.

![Figure 5 Interaction between Participant Race, Researcher Race, and Statements](image)

Another mixed model was run with participant race and the inoculation entered as between-subjects factors and type of the statements as a within-subjects variable, but the three-way interaction did not reach significance, $F(1, 221) = 2.79, p = .096$, $\eta^2_p = .012$. There was no a two-way interaction between statement type and the inoculation for Black participants, $F(1, 84) = 1.52, p = .221$, $\eta^2_p = .018$, or for White participants, $F(1, 137) = 1.11, p = .293$, $\eta^2_p = .008$. Pair-wise comparisons were conducted between the repeated measures. In all conditions,
participants wrote more negative than positive statements, but the magnitude of these effects differed. The largest effect was for Black participants in the inoculation condition; they wrote more negative, $M = 4.62$, $SE = 0.54$, 95% CI [3.54, 5.71], than positive statements, $M = 1.92$, $SE = 0.33$, 95% CI [1.25, 2.59], $F(1, 36) = 18.51$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .340$. The next largest effect was for Black participants in the no inoculation condition; they wrote more negative, $M = 3.39$, $SE = 0.39$, 95% CI [2.61, 4.17], than positive statements, $M = 1.63$, $SE = 0.20$, 95% CI [1.23, 2.03], $F(1, 48) = 13.90$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .225$. The effect size for White participants in the no inoculation condition was similar; they wrote more negative, $M = 3.40$, $SE = 0.27$, 95% CI [2.87, 3.93], than positive statements, $M = 1.88$, $SE = 0.15$, 95% CI [1.57, 2.18], $F(1, 71) = 19.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .213$. The effect size was the smallest for White participants in the inoculation condition; they wrote more negative, $M = 2.99$, $SE = 0.28$, 95% CI [2.42, 3.55], than positive statements, $M = 2.00$, $SE = 0.18$, 95% CI [1.64, 2.36], $F(1, 66) = 6.72$, $p = .012$, $\eta^2_p = .092$.

Based on these results an exploratory mixed model four-way interaction was run with participant race, the inoculation, and research race as between-subjects factors and statement type as a within-subjects factor, but the four-way interaction was not significant, $F(1, 217) = 1.78$, $p = .183$, $\eta^2_p = .008$. Therefore, follow up analyses were not conducted.

**Summary**

Overall, analyses of the message processing variables revealed that Black participants were more engaged than White participants, but this was only true when the inoculation was present. Similarly Black participants wrote more words than White participants when a researcher of color versus a White researcher was present in the room. In addition, within each race group, participants wrote more when the researcher was similar to themselves versus different, meaning perhaps it was easier to share their opinion more freely about an act of
racism when the researcher was perceived as similar. This trend in engagement (i.e., word count) held for counter arguing (i.e., negative statements), meaning that White participants had more contrary things to say about Clinton’s apology when a White researcher was present; Black participants had more negative commentary about his apology when the researcher was a person of color. However, the pattern for affirmation of Clinton’s apology (i.e., positive statements) was slightly different. Black participants said more positive things when the researcher was a person of color. Exploration through a mixed model analysis revealed that the largest difference between negative and positive statements was for Black participants when the researcher was a person of color, meaning that Black participants reported more negative statements than positive statements. Similarly, Black participants in the inoculation condition had the largest difference between negative and positive statements compared to Black in the no inoculation or White participants in either condition.

**Message Proximal Outcome Variables**

**Adequate Effort**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting beliefs about the adequacy of the government’s efforts, $F(1, 208) = 0.04, p = .836, \eta^2_p = .000$. All three-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .064$. All two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .257$. White participants thought that the government’s efforts were more adequate than Black participants did, $F(1, 219) = 10.06, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .044$, but all other simple effects were non-significant, all $ps \geq .251$. 

Ulterior Motives

There was not a four-way interaction predicting the belief that the government had ulterior motives, $F(1, 208) = 0.08, p = .774, \eta_p^2 = .000$. All three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .095$, and two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .253$. There were no simple effects, all $ps \geq .181$.

Justice Norms

There was not a four-way interactions predicting beliefs that Clinton’s apology affirmed norms of justice, $F(1, 207) = 0.07, p = .795, \eta_p^2 = .000$. There were no three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .115$, or two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .185$. All simple effects were non-significant, all $ps \geq .090$.

Anger

There was not a four-way interaction predicting anger at the government generally, $F(1, 207) = 1.74, p = .189, \eta_p^2 = .008$. There were no three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .634$. All two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .076$. There were no simple effects, all $ps \geq .072$.

Blacks and Minorities as Targets of Prejudice

Since the coding of Blacks and minorities being mentioned as targets of prejudice was dichotomous, a logistic regression analysis was conducted with all the interaction terms and simple effects that have been included in the other analyses. There was not a four-way interaction predicting the probability that Blacks and minorities were mentioned as the target of prejudice, $B = 0.05, SE = 1.91, Wald = 0.001, p = .979, e^B = 1.05$. All three-way interactions were not significant, all $ps \geq .052$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and the
inoculation, $B = 2.02, SE = 0.93$, $Wald = 4.73, p = .030, e^B = 7.58$. All other two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .266$. There were no simple effects, all $ps \geq .117$.

### Participant Race and Inoculation

The predictors (participant race and inoculation) and outcome (present vs. no present) were both dichotomous, thus, cross tabs analyses were run to break down the interaction between participant race and the inoculation. First, cross tabs were run with the four conditions as one variable and the mention of Blacks and minorities as the targets of prejudice as the other. The frequency of mentioning the targets of prejudice was not distributed across the four conditions by chance, $\chi^2(3) = 33.16, p < .001, \phi = 0.38$ (for the frequencies see Table 2). To break this down, $\chi^2$ tests were conducted for Black participants and White participants separately to determine if the frequencies were different based on the inoculation manipulation. For Black participants, the frequencies were marginally different than chance, $\chi^2(1) = 3.38, p = .066, \phi = 0.20$, meaning that Black participants mentioned Blacks and minorities as the target of prejudice more frequently when they were in the inoculation condition compared to the no inoculation condition. For White participants, the frequencies were not different than chance, $\chi^2(1) = 1.67, p = .196, \phi = -0.11$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Participants</th>
<th>White Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Inoculation</td>
<td>Inoculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Inoculation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoculation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 The Frequency of Mentioning the Target of Prejudice
**Empathy for the Government**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting empathy for the government generally, $F(1, 206) = 0.37$, $p = .543$, $\eta^2_p = .002$. There were no three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .370$, and there were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .126$. There was an effect of race identification, $F(1, 217) = 4.39$, $p = .037$, $\eta^2_p = .020$, such that as race identification increased so did empathy for the government generally. All other simple effects were non-significant, all $ps \geq .056$.

**Summary**

There were few effects for most of the message proximal variables. The inoculation manipulation and the researcher’s race did not affect ratings of how adequate Clinton’s efforts were, perceptions of the government having ulterior motives, perceptions of whether the apology signified that justice would be done in society, the degree to which participants felt anger or empathy toward the government, or the degree to which they thought Blacks and minorities were being targeted by prejudice. White participants felt that Clinton’s efforts were more adequate than Black participants. Perhaps, most interesting is that Black participants wrote about Blacks and minorities being targeted by discrimination more when the inoculation was present vs. not. Lastly, as both Black and White participants became more identified with their race, they reported more empathy toward the government generally.

**Message Distal Outcome Variables**

**Perceived Discrimination**

There was a four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification predicting perceived discrimination, $F(1, 208) = 5.97$, $p = .015$, $\eta^2_p = .028$. There was a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and
researcher race, \( F(1, 208) = 5.66, p = .018, \eta^2 = .026 \), and a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and race identification, \( F(1, 208) = 4.15, p = .043, \eta^2 = .020 \). The other three-way interactions were non-significant, all \( ps \geq .114 \). There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, \( F(1, 208) = 11.65, p = .001, \eta^2 = .053 \). All other two-way interactions were not significant, all \( ps \geq .054 \). Black participants \((M = 4.67, SE = 1.39)\) reported more perceived discrimination than White participants \((M = 1.98, SD = 0.99)\), \( F(1, 208) = 52.60, p < .001, \eta^2 = .202 \). Participants who were more identified with their race group reported more perceived identification based on race, \( F(1, 208) = 13.87, p < .001, \eta^2 = .063 \), but these lower order interactions and simple effects can only be interpreted in the context of the higher order effects. All other simple effects were non-significant, all \( ps \geq .237 \).

**Four-Way Interaction**

In order the break down four-way interaction that include race identification as a continuous moderators, the slope of race identification was examined by group and condition. Then differences between Black and White participants were examined at both high (+1 SD above the mean) and low (+1 SD above the mean) race identification. The nature of the four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification predicting perceived discrimination was such that for Black participants in the inoculation condition with a researcher of color race identification and perceived discrimination were highly positively associated, \( b = 2.00, SE = 0.60, p = .001, \eta^2 = .051 \) (see the solid line in the top right graph of Figure 6). Similarly, for Black participants in the no inoculation condition with a White researcher identification and perceived discrimination were positively correlated, \( b = 0.54, SE = 0.23, p = .019, \eta^2 = .026 \). All other slopes were not different than zero, all \( ps \geq .217 \) (see the solid line in the bottom left graph of Figure 6). Comparisons between Black and White
participants at high and low identification in each condition revealed that Black participants perceived significantly more discrimination than White participants, all ps ≤ .009, with the exception of Black and White participants low in identification in the inoculation condition when a person of color was the researchers, $b = 1.96, SE = 1.38, p = .159, \eta_p^2 = .010$ (see the left side of the top right graph of Figure 6). Black participants who were low in identification reported the same amount of perceived discrimination as White participants.

Figure 6 Four-Way Interaction Predicting Perceived Discrimination
Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race

The nature of the three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race was that for White participants there was an interaction between the inoculation and researcher race predicting perceived discrimination, $b = 2.21$, $SE = 0.93$, $p = .018$, $\eta^2_p = .027$, but for Black participants there was not, $b = -0.25$, $SE = 0.46$, $p = .583$, $\eta^2_p = .001$. White participants in the inoculation condition perceived marginally more discrimination when the researcher was a person of color, $t(65) = 1.73$, $p = .089$, but in the no inoculation condition perceived discrimination did not differ based on researcher race, $t(70) = 0.14$, $p = .893$ (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7 Interaction between Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race](image)

Participant Race, Inoculation, and Identification

The nature of the three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and race identification was such that for Black participants race identification and perceived discrimination were positively associate in the inoculation conditions, $b = 0.70$, $SE = 0.29$, $p <
.017, $\eta_p^2 = .026$, and in the no inoculation condition, $b = 0.46$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .026$.

However, for White participants there was no association between perceived discrimination and race identification in the inoculation condition, $b = -0.06$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = .692$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, or in the no inoculation condition, $b = 0.13$, $SE = 0.15$, $p = .387$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$.

**Participant Race and Identification**

There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification (collapsing across the inoculation manipulation and researcher race). Perceived discrimination went up for Black participants as they became more identified, $b = 0.53$, $SE = 0.15$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .050$, but for White participants perceived discrimination did not vary based on the strength of race identification, $b = 0.03$, $SE = 0.10$, $p = .754$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$.

**Trust in the Government**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting trust in the government, $F(1, 208) = 0.71$, $p = .400$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$. There was a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race, $F(1, 209) = 5.27$, $p = .023$, $\eta_p^2 = .025$. There were no other three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .135$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, $F(1, 209) = 13.14$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .059$. No other two-way interactions were significant, all $ps \geq .326$. There were no simple effects, all $ps \geq .593$.

---

8 Overall, female participants ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.08$) reported more trust in the government than male participants ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.14$), $t(223) = 2.23$, $p = .027$, $d = 0.39$. The effect of biological sex was also moderated by the inoculation, $F(1, 208) = 4.70$, $p = .031$, $\eta_p^2 = .022$. When the inoculation was present, female participants ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.00$) were more trusting than male participants ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 1.11$), $t(102) = 2.85$, $p = .005$, $d = 0.67$. All other pairwise comparisons were not significant, all $ps \geq .174$. 
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Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race

The nature of the three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race was such that for the Black participants there was a two-way interaction between the inoculation and researcher race predicting trust in the government, $b = -1.73, SE = 0.87, p = .049, \eta^2 = .019$, but not for White participants, $b = 0.59, SE = 0.43, p = .174, \eta^2 = .009$.

For Black participants when the inoculation was not present there was no difference in trust when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 3.35, SD = 0.72$) or White ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.10$), $t(47) = 0.52, p = .606, d = 0.16$. In the inoculation condition, there was no difference in trust based on the race of the researcher, $t(35) = 0.79, p = .435, d = 0.26$; for Black participants trust when the researcher was a person of color ($M = 3.34, SD = 0.98$) was the same as when the researcher was White ($M = 3.12, SD = 0.74$, see Figure 8).

Figure 8 Interaction between Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race
Participant Race and Identification

The two-way interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for White participants as they became more identified with their race group, they reported more trust in the government, $b = 0.35, SE = 0.10, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .056$. Conversely, for Black participants, the more identified they were with their race, the less they trusted the government, $b = -0.31, SE = 0.15, p = .034, \eta_p^2 = .020$.

Forgiveness of Those who Represent the Perpetrators

There was a four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification predicting forgiveness of the specific target groups, $F(1, 207) = 5.04, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .024$. There was a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race, $F(1, 207) = 16.31, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .073$. There was a three-way interaction between the inoculation, researcher race, and identification, $F(1, 207) = 12.46, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .057$. There were not any other three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .057$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and identification, $F(1, 207) = 12.33, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .056$. There was a two-way interaction between the inoculation and identification, $F(1, 207) = 9.82, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .045$. There was a two-way interaction between the inoculation and researcher race, $F(1, 207) = 9.30, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .043$. All other two-way interactions were not significant, all $ps \geq .131$. Forgiveness of the targets was higher when the researcher was a person of color, $F(1, 207) = 7.50, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .035$, but this effect must be interpreted in the context of the four-way interaction. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .113$.

Four-Way Interaction
The four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification predicting forgiveness of the specific targets was such that the slope of race identification was negative for Black participants in the inoculation condition when a researcher of color was present, $b = -1.99, SE = 0.65, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .043$. The slope of race identification for White participants in the no inoculation condition when the researcher was a person of color was positive, $b = 1.00, SE = 0.27, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .061$. All other slopes were not different from zero, all $ps \geq .108$. To further uncover the nature of the four way interaction, the level of forgiveness Black and White participants reported was compared at both high and low levels of race identification in all conditions. When race identification was low, Black participants reported more forgiveness than White participants in the inoculation condition with a researcher of color, $b = 4.84, SE = 1.51, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .048$ (see the left side of the top right graph of Figure 9). In addition, Black participants reported more forgiveness than White participants when identification was low in the no inoculation condition with a White researcher, $b = 1.56, SE = 0.61, p = .011, \eta^2_p = .031$. All other mean differences at high and low levels of identification were non-significant, all $ps \geq .114$. 
Participant Race, Inoculation, and Researcher Race

The three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race was such that for Black participants there was a two-way interaction between the inoculation and researcher race, \( b = -3.99, SE = 1.01, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .070 \), but there was not for White participants, \( b = 0.56, SE = 0.50, p = .235, \eta_p^2 = .006 \). However, Black participants did not differ in their level of forgiveness in the no inoculation conditions when the research was a person of color (mean = 4.15, SD = 1.24) or White (mean = 4.45, SD = 1.53), \( t(47) = 0.69, p = .495 \). \( d = 0.21 \). For Black participants in the inoculation conditions their level of forgiveness also did not differ based on the presence of a researcher of color (mean = 4.35, SD = 1.53) vs. a White researcher (mean = 3.60, SD = 1.30), \( t(35) = 1.62, p = .114 \). \( d = 0.54 \) (see Figure 10).
Inoculation, Researcher Race, and Identification

The nature of the three-way interaction between the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification was such that as race identification increased (for Black and White participants combined) forgiveness of the targets increased only in the no inoculation condition when a researcher of color was present, $b = 0.60$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .044$, but not when the researcher was White, $b = 0.24$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .055$, $\eta_p^2 = .017$. There was no relation between race identification and forgiveness in the inoculation condition when the researcher was White, $b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = .928$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, or a person of color, $b = 0.05$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .794$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$.

Participant Race and Identification

The two-way interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for White participants, race identification and forgiveness were positively associated, $b = 0.39$, ...
There was no relation between race identification and forgiveness for Black participants, $b = -0.13$, $SE = 0.18$, $p = .479$, $\eta^2_p = .002$.

**Inoculation and Identification**

The two-way interaction between the inoculation manipulation and race identification was such that regardless of participant race and researcher race, identification and forgiveness were positively associated in the no inoculation condition, $b = 0.34$, $SE = 0.10$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .047$, but not in the inoculation condition, $b = 0.04$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = .716$, $\eta^2_p = .001$.

**Inoculation and Researcher Race**

The nature of the two-way interaction between the inoculation manipulation and researcher race (regardless of participant race) was not interpreted because all of the pairwise comparisons were non-significant, all $ps \geq .105$.

**Favorability of Those who Represent the Perpetrators**

There was a four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification predicting favorability of the target groups, $F(1, 205) = 6.51$, $p = .011$, $\eta^2_p = .031$. There were no three-way interactions, all $ps \geq .080$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and identification, $F(1, 205) = 21.17$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .094$. There was a two-way interaction between the inoculation and identification, $F(1, 205) = 7.12$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2_p = .034$. There were no other two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .107$, and no simple effects, all $ps \geq .134$.

**Four-Way Interaction**
The four-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation, researcher race, and race identification was such that as Black participants became more highly identified they rated the targets as less favorable in the inoculation condition when the researcher was a person of color, $b = -17.22, SE = 7.12, p = .017, \eta^2_p = .028$ (see the solid line in the top right graph of Figure 11), but the association between race identification and forgiveness was not significant for any other group of Black participants, all $p$s $\geq .191$. The association between identification and favorability was significant and positive for White participants in three of the four conditions. As White participants became more highly identified they rated the targets more favorably in the no inoculation condition when the researcher was White, $b = 8.99, SE = 2.28, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .071$, and a person of color, $b = 8.15, SE = 3.04, p = .008, \eta^2_p = .034$, and in the inoculation condition when the researcher was a person of color, $b = 8.91, SE = 2.83, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .046$, but not when the researcher was White, $b = 3.31, SE = 2.09, p = .116, \eta^2_p = .012$ (see the dashed line in the top left graph of Figure 11).
To further decompose the four-way interactions, comparisons were made between Black participants and White participants at both high and low identification in each of the conditions. The largest difference in favorability between Black and White participants was for the low identifiers in the inoculation condition with a researcher of color; Black participants reported more favorability, $b = 38.82, SE = 16.41, p = .019, \eta^2_p = .027$ (see the left side of the top right graph of Figure 11). However, when race identification was high in this same condition, Black participants reported less favorability than White participants, $b = -20.36, SE = 6.15, p =$
.001, \eta_p^2 = .051. A similar flip effect occurred in the no inoculation condition with a White researcher (see the bottom left graph of Figure 11). When identification was low, Black participants reported more favorability than White participants in the no inoculation condition with a White researcher, \( b = 14.61, SE = 6.68, p = .030, \eta_p^2 = .023 \), but when identification was high, Black participants responded with less favorability, \( b = -13.77, SE = 5.10, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .034 \). In the inoculation condition with a White researcher, there were no group differences based on level of identification predicting favorability, all \( ps \geq .083 \). In the no inoculation condition with researcher of color, Black participants reported less favorability than White participants when identification was high, \( b = -14.21, SE = 6.87, p = .040, \eta_p^2 = .020 \), but not when identification was low, \( b = -7.77, SE = 8.61, p = .367, \eta_p^2 = .004 \).

**Participant Race and Identification**

The two-way interaction between participants race and identification was such that (collapsing across the experimental conditions and the researcher race) for White participants race identification and favorability were positively correlated, \( b = 6.81, SE = 1.29, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .114 \), but there was no association between favorability and identification for Black participants, \( b = -3.35, SE = 1.94, p = .086, \eta_p^2 = .013 \).

**Forgiveness of the Government Generally**

There was not a four-way interaction predicting forgiveness of the government generally, \( F(1, 207) = 3.06, p = .082, \eta_p^2 = .015 \). There were no three-way interactions, all \( ps \geq .370 \). There was a two-way interaction between participant race and identification, \( F(1, 212) = 6.58, p = .011, \eta_p^2 = .030 \). There were no other two-way interactions, all \( ps \geq .368 \). There were no simple effects, all \( ps \geq .157 \).
Participant Race and Identification

The two-way interaction between participants race and identification was such that (regardless of condition or researcher race) White participants were more forgiving of the government generally when they were more identified with their race, \( b = 0.22, SE = 0.07, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .040 \). However, for Black participants there was no association between forgiveness of the government and identification, \( b = -0.14, SE = 0.11, p = .218, \eta^2_p = .007 \).

Summary

For the message distal outcomes—beliefs and attitudes that may require more cognitive processing after exposure to the apology message—a few consistent patterns emerged. For Black participants in the inoculation condition with a researcher who was a person of color, perceived discrimination, forgiveness of the targets, and favorability of the targets depended on the level of race identification. As Black participants became more identified, they perceived more discrimination and reported less forgiveness and less favorability of the targets. For White participants, favorability ratings and identification were positively associated.

There were three-way interactions between participant race, the inoculation, and researcher race predicting: perceived discrimination, trust in the government, and forgiveness of the targets. For all three of these outcomes, there was a significant two-way interaction between the inoculation manipulation and researcher race for Black participants but not for White participants. However, due to low power none of the pairwise comparisons were significant.
Additional Analyses

National Identification

After the pilot data was collected (49 of the 86 Black participants), a measure of national identification (Roccas et al., 2008) was added. Since data was missing for two-thirds of the Black participants moderation analyses were run for the White sample only (n = 139). There were no three-way interactions between the inoculation manipulation, researcher race, and national identification predicting any of the outcomes, all ps ≥ .090. Similarly there were no two-way interactions (inoculation x national identification or researcher race x national identification), all ps ≥ .089. National identification was associated with many of the outcomes for White participants; national identification was negatively associated with word count, $b = -7.74$, $SE = 3.70$, $p = .038$, $\eta^2_p = .031$, and with anger, $b = -0.31$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2_p = .056$. National identification was positively associated with the belief that Clinton’s efforts were adequate, $b = 0.20$, $SE = 0.09$, $p = .032$, $\eta^2_p = .034$, the belief that Clinton’s efforts promote norms of justice, $b = 0.31$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .087$, empathy with the government, $b = 0.39$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .129$, forgiveness of the targets, $b = 0.49$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .166$, favorability of the targets, $b = 6.82$, $SE = 1.06$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .235$, and trust in the government generally, $b = 0.47$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .175$.

Revenge Planning

A measure of revenge planning was also added to the study after the pilot data was collected (49 of 86 Black participants). Thus, moderation analyses were tested with only the White participants. There was a three-way interactions between the inoculation, researcher race, and revenge planning predicting empathy, $F(1, 130) = 5.78$, $p = .018$, $\eta^2_p = .043$, however, the slope of revenge planning was not different than zero in any condition, all ps ≥ .066. There
was also a three-way interaction predicting trust, $F(1, 131) = 4.47, p = .036, \eta^2_p = .033$, such that in the no inoculation condition with a researcher of color, trust in the government and revenge planning were negatively associated, $b = -0.65, SE = 0.29, p = .027, \eta^2_p = .037$; all other slopes were non-significant, $ps \geq .334$. The three-way interaction for forgiveness of the government generally was marginal, $F(1, 130) = 3.84, p = .052 \eta^2_p = .029$, meaning that in the no inoculation condition with a researcher of color, participants forgave the government less as revenge planning increased, $b = 0.40, SE = 0.19, p = .036, \eta^2_p = .033$. All other slopes were non-significant, all $ps \geq .063$. There was a three-way interaction predicting favorability, $F(1, 130) = 8.68, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .063$, such that in the inoculation condition with a White researcher, favorability decreased as revenge planning increased, $b = -6.40, SE = 2.45, p = .010, \eta^2_p = .050$. All other slopes were not different from zero, all $ps \geq .075$.

**Discussion**

The goal of Study 1 was to examine how Black and White participants responded to an apology for the Tuskegee experiment. Overall, examination of message processing variables revealed that when Black participants (compared to White participants) were more engaged with the apology message they counter argued (i.e., negative statements) against the apology more. This was especially the case when the researcher was a person of color and when the participants were exposed to inoculation information prior to reading the apology. The inoculation highlighted the 25-year delay between the end of the injustice (i.e., the Tuskegee study) and Former President Bill Clinton’s apology. In addition, all participants wrote significantly more negative statements about the apology than positive statements, but this difference was most pronounced for Black participants when the researcher was a person of color and for Black participants when the inoculation was present. Black participants perceived
the most discrimination, reported the least forgiveness, and the least favorability when the research was a person of color and the inoculation was present, and this difference was less pronounced when race identification was low. Overall, White participants rated Clinton’s apology as more adequate than Black participants.

In this study, Black and White participants read about a past event of racism committed by the government against African-Americans. Although most people know that regulations about research ethics and consent have changed since the time of the abuse, prominent examples of racism and discrimination are very real today (e.g., the death of Michael Brown, Freddie Gray, Eric Garner). In the current context of racist events against Black students on the UMass campus (Lederman, 2014) and around the country, Black participants spoke up about discrimination and their displeasure with the White establishment. However, in an environment in which there is backlash against people who confront racism it was necessary for Blacks to know the full (and unfortunate) truth about the government’s unwillingness to apologize for Tuskegee and to be with someone who was similar (another racial minority) to feel comfortable expressing their discontent.


CHAPTER 3

STUDY 2

Study 2 was based on the conflict between the Mapuche people, the largest indigenous group in Chile, and non-indigenous Chileans. When Spanish settlers first came to Chile, they fought against the Mapuche, who suffered from disease and starvation and eventually were defeated after 300 years of conflict (Bengoa, 2000). Even though the conflict in Chile has historic roots in colonial era violence, it still exists today in more subtle ways. Currently the government and large timber companies have taken away the Mapuche’s rights to their ancestral land (Rohter, 2004). In modern Chilean society, Mapuche cultural beliefs and practices have been suppressed, and they suffer from social and economic deprivation (Čehajić, González, & Manzi, 2009; Instituto Nacional de Estadística, 2002). Conflict between the Mapuche and the non-indigenous Chileans has become more of a public topic due to clashes between extreme Mapuche activists and the timber companies and farmers who settle on Mapuche land (Santiago Times, 2013).

The government of Chile has currently made some efforts to address the conflict such as including the Mapuche language in schools with at least twenty percent Mapuche students and discussing plans for reparations (Crow, 2013). Recently, a working group (The National Indigenous Development Corporation) was established by the government to outline actions that should be taken to improve the status of Mapuche and improve relations with them (Brown, González, Zagefka, Manzi, & Čehajić, 2008). One challenge for developing mechanisms for reconciliation is that there is not one Mapuche voice, but rather multiple Mapuche leaders and communities have different demands of the government and differing levels of willingness to sustain dialogue about improving intergroup relations (Crow, 2013; Richards, 2013). The
nature of Mapuche identity has also been changing from stigmatized to acknowledged (Saiz, 2002). And overall, it is believed that Mapuche advocates identify more with the political Left than with the political Right, which may add a further political complication in reconciliation efforts.

The goal of Study 2 was to extend the ideas tested in Study 1 by examining a context in which the conflict is still ongoing and in which a formal apology has not been offered (Under Represented Nations and Peoples Organization, 2013). By examining participants’ responses to efforts for reconciliation that are different than an apology, I gained understanding of how a broader set of reconciliation efforts were cognitively processed. Study 2 was conducted in Santiago, Chile in collaboration with Roberto González and Jorge Manzi at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (PUC) and the Interdisciplinary Center for Intercultural and Indigenous Studies at PUC.

**Method**

**Participants and Design**

Mapuche and non-indigenous Chileans were initially recruited through psychology classes at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Interested students provided their email addresses and were emailed a link to the study. They were entered into a lottery for prizes as compensation. Because it was difficult to find Mapuche individuals who were willing to participate in this study, my Chilean collaborators Roberto González and Jorge Manzi asked for assistance from contacts at the Interdisciplinary Center and at universities in the southern part of Chile where there is a higher concentration of Mapuche. However, recruiting Mapuche individuals who were willing to participate in research was challenging, thus the Mapuche sample only included 13 individuals. There were 92 people who identified as non-indigenous.
Of the total participants, 54 identified as female, 37 as male, and 14 did not indicate biological sex. The mean age was 19.66 (SD = 2.13). The study was a 2 (Mapuche vs. non-indigenous) by 2 (inoculation vs. no-inoculation) factorial design with a continuous moderator of race identification.

**Procedure**

Participants were asked their racial identification (Mapuche or non-indigenous) in an online survey and then completed a measure of race identification. All participants read a summary of the abuses committed against the Mapuche by the government and forestry companies (see Appendix B). The participants that were randomly assigned to the inoculation condition also read about the inability and unwillingness of the government to meet the Mapuche’s demands. All participants read about the efforts the government has made and were asked to write a response to them. They read, “On the page above information about the history of injustices suffered by the Mapuche people is provided. Also mentioned are the efforts made by the Chilean State to repair the harm. We would like now for you to write in the space below, your opinion about these issues, answering the following questions: How do you evaluate the repair efforts of the Chilean State to address the injustices suffered by the Mapuche people? How do you evaluate the role that the State has played in this conflict? What does the subject of human rights mean to you personally? Please be as specific as possible in your answer.”

---

9 Overall, there were no differences between female participants and male participants on any of the processing or outcome measures, all $p \geq .116$. Since there were only two male Mapuche participants, additional analyses with biological sex were conducted for the non-indigenous individuals only.
Measures

Message Processing Variables

Engagement with the message about the government’s repair efforts was measured with word count and time. As in Study 1, counter arguing was assessed with a method used by Petty and Cacioppo (1977) in which individual statements in the participants’ responses were coded. Two Spanish speaking research assistants read the open-ended responses and divided them into statements. They divided the statements based largely on sentence structure but each noted that the responses in Chilean Spanish were quite wordy and often lacked punctuation. To ensure that a uniform method of division was used, each coder divided half of the responses into individual statements, and then the second coder checked the divisions for disagreement. Disagreements were settled through discussion. They then coded the open-ended responses. Each statement was coded as positive (commending the repair effort), negative (highlighting the inadequacies of the repair efforts), or neutral (discussing an unrelated topic). The interrater reliability was fair, α = .66. Since there were only two coders there was no tie breaker. The coders only contradicted each other 1.5% of the time, which resulted in a neutral code. To address the lack of a tie breaker, statements were only coded as negative or as positive if both coders agreed; 61.1% of the coding was unanimous between the two coders (out of 584 statements).

Unlike in Study 1, word count and time were not correlated, $r = 0.01$, $p = .929$. Word count may be the better measure of engagement in Study 2 because it was correlated with negative statements, $r = 0.30$, $p = .004$, while time was not associated with either negative, $r = -0.07$, $p = .535$, or positive statements, $r = -0.04$, $p = .727$. Even though word count and positive statements were not related, $r = -0.02$, $p = .824$, negative and positive statements were
negatively associated, $r = -0.22$, $p = .038$ (for the correlations between the message processing variable by group see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Word count</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time (in minutes)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative statements</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive statements</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.56†</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The correlations for the Mapuche participants were on the bottom left and the correlations for the non-indigenous participants were on the top right. 
† $p < .100$, * $p ≤ .05$

Table 3 Study 2 Correlations between the Message Processing Variables

**Message Proximal Outcome Variables**

Seven items were drafted to measure the adequacy of the government’s efforts to address the mistreatment of the Mapuche in Chile. They were entered into an exploratory factor analysis along with five of the items from Study 1 about the adequacy of the government’s efforts. Maximum likelihood extraction was used with direct oblimin rotation. The model produced a three-factor solutions, but warned of communality estimates greater than one. Nine of the 12 items double loaded on at least two of the factors. Thus, the analysis was run again, this time forcing a two factor solution. The rotation converged in five iterations. The first factor included nine items. One item was dropped because it cross loaded with the second factor at over the acceptable cutoff of .30 (.32; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), and was dropped as an indicator of factor one. The reliability of the remaining eight items was excellent, $\alpha = .93$. Two items were dropped because their factor loadings were below the accepted cut-off of .40 (.37, .17, and .17; Velicer & Fava, 1998). In the end, no indicators loaded onto the second
factor at an acceptable level; therefore, only factor one (i.e., adequacy of the government’s efforts) was analyzed.

Ulterior motives of the government (Philpot & Hornsey, 2008) were measured with the same five-item scale from Study 1. The reliability was good, $\alpha = .73$.

**Message Distal Outcome Variables**

Two items measured in-group victimization, including: “Indicate to what degree you consider yourself—or your immediate family and close friends—directly victimized by the Mapuche / non-Mapuche” (Manzi & González, 2007). They were positively correlated $r = 0.51$, $p < .001$. Perceived discrimination was measured with four of the six items from Study 1, $\alpha = .86$. In-group favorability and out-group favorability were each measured with one item. Favorability was the only variable measured on a scale from 0 (extremely unfavorable) to 100 (extremely unfavorable); all other constructs were measured on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The desire for out-group remorse was measured with five items, $\alpha = .92$, adapted from Manzi and González (2007), and included statements such as: “Mapuche / non-Mapuche should express regret for their misdeeds.” Out-group empathy was measured with six items, $\alpha = .88$. For example, “I try to understand the point of view of Mapuche / non-indigenous Chileans.” Out-group forgiveness was measured with 10 items ($\alpha = .85$) drawn from the full 30-item scale (Philpot & Hornsey, 2008) used in Study 1.

Favorability of the government and the security forces was measured with six items on a scale from 0 (extremely unfavorable) to 100 (extremely favorable), $\alpha = .81$. Targets included the current president, the current government, the State, the army, the police, and the legal system.
Eight questions were drafted about support for policies that help the Mapuche people including: returning land, giving reparations, striking down the anti-terrorism law, creating a council of indigenous people, recognizing them in the constitution, representing them in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, teaching their language in public schools, and incorporating traditional Mapuche medicine into the health system, $\alpha = .87$. Each of these policies have been demanded by Mapuche activist groups (Under Represented Nations and Peoples Organization, 2013).

Trust in the government was measured with two of the items from Study 1, $r = 0.44$, $p < .001$. These items were, “In the future, the Chilean State will comply with the ethical standards of conduct agreed upon with members of the Mapuche people” and “There are reasons to believe that the Chilean State has changed from its past behavior.”

Desire for the truth about past harms committed against the Mapuche was measured with four items (Manzi & González, 2007), $\alpha = .89$. An example statement was, “Knowing how law enforcement agents treat Mapuche / non-indigenous individuals accused of crimes is important to me.”

**Moderator**

Racial group identification was measured with a five item scale. An example item was, “I identify with the Mapuche / non-indigenous people.” The reliability of the race identification measure was excellent for the Mapuche, $\alpha = .80$, and for the non-indigenous, $\alpha = .85$.

**Results**

For consistency with Study 1, a similar data analysis approach was reported, but due to the small sample of Mapuche participants, the results for this group are best viewed as exploratory analyses. The same set of analyses were conducted again but only for the non-
indigenous participants. Participants also included open ended responses and these data were rare, thus a summary of these qualitative data was also reported.

**Message Processing Outcome Variables**

**Word Count**

There was not a three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation manipulation, and race identification predicting word count, $F(1, 95) = 2.01, p = .159, \eta_p^2 = .021$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .572$, or any simple effects, all $ps \geq .480$.

**Time**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting time, $F(1, 97) = 1.39, p = .241, \eta_p^2 = .014$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .112$, or simple effects, all $ps \geq .159$.

**Negative Statements**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting negative statements, $F(1, 86) = 0.78, p = .380, \eta_p^2 = .009$. There was a marginally significant two-way interaction between participant race and the inoculation manipulation predicting the number of negative statements participants wrote, $F(1, 87) = 3.00, p = .087, \eta_p^2 = .033$. There were no other interactions, all $ps \geq .386$, and no simple effects, all $ps \geq .403$.

**Participant Race and Inoculation**

The marginal two-way interaction between participant race and the inoculation manipulation was such that in the no inoculation condition, Mapuche participants ($M = 2.75, SD = 2.22$) wrote marginally more negative statements than non-indigenous participants ($M = 1.48, SD = 1.91$), $t(46) = 1.90, p = .064, d = 0.66$ (see the striped bars in Figure 12), but in the
inoculation condition, Mapuche ($M = 1.33, SD = 1.37$) and non-indigenous participants ($M = 1.90, SD = 1.24$) reported the same number of negative statements, $t(44) = 1.03, p = .307, d = 0.45$ (see the solid black bars in Figure 12). The Mapuche participants did not differ in the number of negative statements they wrote in the inoculation condition compared to the no inoculation condition, $t(8) = 1.27, p = .242, d = 0.82$. The non-indigenous participants also did not differ in the number of negative statements they wrote in the inoculation condition compared to the no inoculation condition, $t(82) = 1.60, p = .114, d = 0.26$.

![Negative Statements](image)

**Figure 12 Interaction between Participant Race and Race Identification**

**Positive Statements**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting positive statements, $F(1, 86) = 0.09, p = .762, \eta_p^2 = .001$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .585$, or simple effects, all $ps \geq .225$ predicting the number of positive statements participants wrote.
Repeated Measures Analysis of Statement Type

An analysis was run examining negative and positive statements as repeated measures. In a mixed model with participant race entered as a between-subjects factor and type of the statements (negative vs. positive) as a within-subjects variable there was not an interaction, $F(1, 92) = 0.18, p = .669, \eta^2_p = .002$. However, collapsing across both groups, participants wrote significantly more negative statements, $M = 1.70, SE = 0.13, 95\% CI [1.44, 1.97]$, than positive statements, $M = 0.20, SE = 0.05, 95\% CI [0.09, 0.29]$, $F(1, 93) = 99.01, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .516$.

Summary

In summary, there were no significant differences in engagement with the government’s efforts at repair according to word count and time. There were no differences in the number of positive statements participants wrote about the government’s efforts, but in the no inoculation condition Mapuche participants wrote marginally more negative statements than non-indigenous participants. Overall, participants wrote more negative statements than positive statements.

Message Proximal Outcome Variables

Perceived Adequacy

There was not a three-way interaction predicting the belief in the adequacy of the government’s efforts, $F(1, 94) = 0.02, p = .881, \eta^2_p = .000$. There was a significant two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, $F(1, 95) = 4.21, p = .043, \eta^2_p = .042$, but there were no other interactions, all $ps \geq .415$, or simple effects, all $ps \geq .196$. 
Participant Race and Identification

The two-way interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for the Mapuche participants there was a marginal negative association between race identification and perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $b = -0.64, SE = 0.32, p = .051$, $\eta^2_p = .038$, however for the non-indigenous participants there was not an association between race identification and perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $b = 0.15, SE = 0.12, p = .216$, $\eta^2_p = .016$ (see Figure 13). To further explore moderation by race identification, comparisons were made between the groups at both high and low levels of race identification. When identification was high, Mapuche participants reported less perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts than non-indigenous participants, $b = -1.34, SE = 0.63, p = .036$, $\eta^2_p = .044$, but at low identification Mapuche and non-indigenous participants did not differ, $b = 0.44, SE = 0.46, p = .349$, $\eta^2_p = .009$ (see Figure 13).

![Figure 13 Interaction between Participant Race and Race Identification](image-url)
Ulterior Motives

There was not a three-way interaction predicting ulterior motives of the government, \( F(1, 90) = 0.39, p = .533, \eta^2_p = .004 \). There were no two-way interactions, all \( ps \geq .258 \), or simple effects, all \( ps \geq .602 \).

Summary

The more identified Mapuche participants were with their group, the less adequacy they perceived the government’s efforts at repair, but due to the small number of Mapuche participants this association was not significant. There were no other effects on perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts or on the perception that the government had ulterior motives for attempting to address the harm committed against the Mapuche people.

Message Distal Outcome Variables

In-Group Victimization

There was a three-way interaction between race, the inoculation, and race identification predicting perceived in-group victimization, \( F(1, 85) = 8.25, p = .005, \eta^2_p = .089 \). There was a two-way interaction between the inoculation manipulation and race identification, \( F(1, 85) = 8.08, p = .006, \eta^2_p = .087 \), but there were no other interactions, all \( ps \geq .237 \). The Mapuche participants perceived that their group was victimized more \( (M = 3.27, SD = 1.74) \) than the non-indigenous participants \( (M = 1.73, SD = 1.14) \), \( F(1, 85) = 15.13, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .151 \), but there were no other simple effects, all \( ps \geq .269 \).
Participant Race, Inoculation, and Identification

The three-way interaction between participant race, the inoculation manipulation, and race identification was such that for the Mapuche participants in the no inoculation condition, the association between identification and in-group victimization was positive, $b = 1.97$, $SE = 0.69$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2_p = .087$, but for the Mapuche participants in the inoculation condition, there was not an association between identification and perceived in-group victimization, $b = 0.05$, $SE = 0.18$, $p = .769$, $\eta^2_p = .001$. For the non-indigenous participants there was no association between race identification and perceptions of in-group victimization in the inoculation condition, $b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.17$, $p = .944$, $\eta^2_p = .000$, or in the no inoculation condition, $b = -0.03$, $SE = 0.17$, $p = .874$, $\eta^2_p = .000$ (see Figure 14). In the inoculation condition Mapuche participants reported more in-group victimization than non-indigenous participants when identification was low, $b = 2.57$, $SE = 0.84$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2_p = .100$, but not high, $b = 0.71$, $SE = 0.97$, $p = .466$, $\eta^2_p = .006$ (see the top graph of Figure 14). In the no inoculation condition, Mapuche participants reported more in-group victimization than non-indigenous participants when identification was high, $b = 3.72$, $SE = 1.06$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .126$, but the groups did not differ at low identification, $b = 0.77$, $SE = 0.97$, $p = .433$, $\eta^2_p = .007$ (see the bottom graph of Figure 14).
There was a two-way interaction between the inoculation manipulation and race identification. However, there was not as association between identification and perceived in-group victimization in either the no inoculation condition, $b = -0.84$, $SE = 0.66$, $p = .205$, $\eta^2_p = .019$, or the inoculation condition, $b = -0.07$, $SE = 0.18$, $p = .722$, $\eta^2_p = .001$. 

Figure 14 Interaction between Participant Race, Identification, and Inoculation
Perceived Discrimination

There was not a three-way interaction predicting perceived discrimination, $F(1, 83) = 0.35, p = .553, \eta^2_p = .004$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .240$. The non-indigenous participants were more likely to perceive that their group was discriminated against ($M = 5.13, SD = 1.08$) compared to the Mapuche participants ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.33$), $F(1, 87) = 30.09, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .257$, but there were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .276$.

In-Group Favorability

There was not a three-way interaction predicting in-group favorability, $F(1, 87) = 0.35, p = .557, \eta^2_p = .004$. All two-way interactions were non-significant, all $ps \geq .233$. In-group favorability was marginally higher in the inoculation condition ($M = 63.10, SD = 16.54$) compared to the no inoculation condition ($M = 54.57, SD = 22.63$), $F(1, 91) = 3.32, p = .072, \eta^2_p = .035$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .522$.

Out-Group Favorability

There was not a three-way interaction predicting out-group favorability, $F(1, 88) = 0.01, p = .905, \eta^2_p = .000$. There was a participant race by identification interaction predicting out-group favorability, $F(1, 89) = 4.43, p = .038, \eta^2_p = .047$. There were no other interactions, all $ps \geq .200$. The Mapuche participants reported more out-group favorability ($M = 70.33, SD = 15.93$) than the non-indigenous participants ($M = 56.93, SD = 16.89$), $F(1, 89) = 6.74, p = .011, \eta^2_p = .070$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .148$.

Participant Race and Identification

The interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for the Mapuche participants race identification and out-group favorability were positively associated, $b
= 8.38, \(SE = 4.30, p = .055, \eta_p^2 = .039\), but not for the non-indigenous participants, \(b = -1.41, SE = 1.62, p = .285, \eta_p^2 = .008\). The Mapuche participants reported more out-group favorability than the non-indigenous participants only when identification was high, \(b = 27.34, SE = 8.37, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .104\), but not low, \(b = 5.31, SE = 6.39, p = .408, \eta_p^2 = .007\) (see Figure 15).

![Figure 15 Interaction between Participant Race and Race Identification](image)

**Desire for Out-Group Remorse**

There was not a significant three-way interaction predicting the desire for out-group remorse, \(F(1, 85) = 2.32, p = .132, \eta_p^2 = .027\). All two-way interactions, all \(ps \geq .866\) and simple effects, all \(ps \geq .123\), were not significant.

**Out-Group Empathy**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting empathy of the out-group, \(F(1, 82) = 1.22, p = .273, \eta_p^2 = .015\), but there was a marginal two-way interaction between participant race and the inoculation manipulation, \(F(1, 83) = 2.92, p = .091, \eta_p^2 = .034\). There were no other two-way interactions, all \(ps \geq .167\). The non-indigenous participants reported more out-group
empathy ($M = 5.51, SD = 1.01$) than the Mapuche participants ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.36$), $F(1, 83) = 4.80, p = .031, \eta^2_p = .055$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .131$. 

**Participant Race and Inoculation**

The interaction between participant race and the inoculation was such that in the inoculation condition, the non-indigenous participants ($M = 5.65, SD = 0.88$) expressed more out-group empathy than the Mapuche participants ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.54$), $t(44) = 2.93, p = .005, d = 1.29$, but in the no inoculation condition Mapuche ($M = 5.29, SD = 0.98$) and non-indigenous participants ($M = 5.37, SD = 1.10$) did not differ on empathy, $t(42) = 1.30, p = .897, d = 0.07$ (see Figure 16). For the Mapuche participants, there was no difference in out-group empathy between the inoculation condition and the no inoculation condition, $t(8) = 1.03, p = .334, d = 0.66$. For the non-indigenous participants, there was no difference in out-group empathy between the inoculation condition and the no inoculation condition, $t(78) = 1.27, p = .210, d = 0.28$.

![Figure 16 Interaction between Participant Race and Inoculation](image-url)
Out-Group Forgiveness

There was not a three-way interaction predicting out-group forgiveness, $F(1, 84) = 0.00, p = .998, \eta_p^2 = .000$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .438$, or simple effects, all $ps \geq .123$.

Summary

In summary, for the message distal outcomes regarding intergroup attitudes there was some moderation of participant race by identification. In addition, non-indigenous participants reported more perceived discrimination. Mapuche participants were more favorable of the out-group as race identification increased (regardless if the inoculation was present or not). For the Mapuche participants in the no inoculation condition, in-group victimization and race identification were positively associated. In the inoculation condition, the non-indigenous participants expressed more out-group empathy than the Mapuche participants. There were no other effects.

Favorability of the Government and Security Forces

There was not a three-way interaction predicting favorability of the government and security forces, $F(1, 88) = 1.68, p = .199, \eta_p^2 = .019$. There was a two-way interaction between participant race and race identification predicting favorability, $F(1, 89) = 7.29, p = .008, \eta_p^2 = .076$. There were no other interactions, all $ps \geq .169$. There were no simple effects, all $ps \geq .187$.

Participant Race and Identification

The nature of the two-way interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for the Mapuche participants as race identification increased favorability of the government and security forces decreased, $b = -8.54, SE = 4.46, p = .059, \eta_p^2 = .038$ (see Figure...
In contrast, for the non-indigenous participants, as race identification increased favorability of the government and security forces also increased, $b = 6.04, SE = 1.67, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .122$. The Mapuche participants reported less favorability of the government and security forces than the non-indigenous when identification was high, $b = -25.29, SE = 8.67, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .085$, but there was no difference when identification was low, $b = 7.52, SE = 6.62, p = .259, \eta^2_p = .014$.

![Figure 17 Interaction between Participant Race and Race Identification](image)

**Support for Policies that Help the Mapuche**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting support for polices that help the Mapuche, $F(1, 87) = 1.73, p = .192, \eta^2_p = .019$. There was a marginal two-way interaction between participant race and race identification, $F(1, 88) = 3.31, p = .072, \eta^2_p = .036$, but there were no other two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .152$. Participants in the inoculation condition were more in support of policies that benefit the Mapuche ($M = 5.53, SD = 0.98$) than those in the no inoculation condition ($M = 4.64, SD = 1.52$), $F(1, 91) = 9.05, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .090$. All other simple effects were non-significant, all $ps \geq .266$. 
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**Participant Race and Identification**

The interaction between participant race and race identification was such that for the non-indigenous participants as race identification increased support for policies that help the Mapuche decreased, $b = -0.31, SE = 0.13, p = .018, \eta^2_p = .060$, but for the Mapuche participants there was no association between race identification and support for policies that help the Mapuche, $b = 0.51, SE = 0.34, p = .131, \eta^2_p = .025$ (see Figure 18). The Mapuche participants reported more support of the policies than the non-indigenous participants when identification was high, $b = 1.67, SE = 0.66, p = .012, \eta^2_p = .067$, but not when it was low, $b = 0.18, SE = 0.50, p = .721, \eta^2_p = .001$.

![Figure 18 Interaction between Participant Race and Race Identification](image)

**Trust in the Government**

There was not an three-way interaction predicting trust in the government, $F(1, 87) = 0.02, p = .878, \eta^2_p = .000$. All two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .112$, and simple effects, all $ps \geq .145$, were non-significant.
Desire for the Truth

There was not a three-way interaction predicting the desire for the truth, $F(1, 84) = 0.08$, $p = .778$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .402$. Those in the inoculation condition wanted to know the truth about the mistreatment of the Mapuche more than ($M = 6.10$, $SD = 1.02$) those in the no inoculation condition ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 1.30$), $F(1, 88) = 5.15$, $p = .026$, $\eta_p^2 = .055$. There was a simple effect of race identification, $F(1, 88) = 4.45$, $p = .038$, $\eta_p^2 = .048$, such that as identification increased so did the desire to know the truth about the injustices committed against the Mapuche, $b = 0.20$, $SE = 0.11$. There was not a difference between the Mapuche and non-indigenous participants in the desire for truth, $F(1, 88) = 0.00$, $p = .965$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$.

Summary

For the message distal outcomes about the government, there was moderation of race by identification. As participants became more identified with their group, Mapuche participants reported less favorability toward the government while the non-indigenous participants reported more favorability. The more identified non-indigenous participants were, the less they supported policies that help the Mapuche. In addition to moderation of the group effects, there was a simple effect of the inoculation. Regardless of group membership, those in the inoculation condition wanted to know the truth about past abuses. Similarly, regardless of group membership, those who were more highly identified with their group wanted to know the truth more.
Analyses of the Non-Indigenous Data

The analyses were run again dropping the Mapuche participants (and thus participant race as a variable). With the exception of the results that follow, all other two-way interactions were not significant, all $ps \geq .089$. There were no other effects of the inoculation, all $ps \geq .144$, or of race identification, all $ps \geq .067$.

Favorability of the Government and Security Forces

Overall there was a positive association, $b = 6.04$, $SE = 1.69$, between race identification and favorability of the government and security forces, $F(1, 81) = 11.18$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .121$, meaning that as non-indigenous participants were more identified with their group they favored the government and security forces more.

Support for Policies that Help the Mapuche

Non-indigenous participants in the inoculation condition were more in support of the policies that advocate for Mapuche rights ($M = 5.51$, $SD = 1.01$) than in the no inoculation condition ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.53$), $F(1, 80) = 9.30$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2_p = .104$. 
Desire for the Truth

Non-indigenous participants in the inoculation condition wanted to know the truth more \((M = 6.10, SD = 1.03)\) than in the no inoculation condition \((M = 5.65, SD = 1.25)\), \(F(1, 78) = 4.26, p = .042, \eta_p^2 = .052\).10 11

Summary

The analyses of the non-indigenous data only produced a few significant results. Favorability with the government and security force and race identification were positively associated. Non-indigenous participants in the inoculation condition were more supportive of policies that help the Mapuche and wanted to know the truth more than those in the no inoculation condition.

10 When biological sex was added as a predictor, the simple effect of the inoculation on the desire to know the truth was no longer significant, \(F(1, 71) = 3.12, p = .082, \eta_p^2 = .042\). Race identification moderated the effect of biological sex, \(F(1, 71) = 6.39, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .083\), such that non-indigenous female participants who were low in race identification were less concerned about knowing the truth than females high in race identification or non-indigenous male participants at any level of race identification. Non-indigenous male participants \((M = 6.13, SD = 0.94)\) wanted to know the truth more than non-indigenous female participants \((M = 5.71, SD = 1.32)\), \(F(1, 71) = 5.14, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .068\). There was also a simple effect of race identification, \(F(1, 71) = 4.89, p = .030, \eta_p^2 = .064\), such that the more identified participants were, the more they wanted to know the truth.

11 There was also a two-way interaction between biological sex and race identification predicting word count, \(F(1, 72) = 5.08, p = .027, \eta_p^2 = .066\), for the non-indigenous participants. When party identification was low, female and male participants did not differ in the number of words they wrote, \(b = 49.76, SE = 42.08, p = .241, \eta_p^2 = .018\), but when party identification was high male participants wrote marginally more words than female participants, \(b = -73.34, SE = 38.27, p = .059, \eta_p^2 = .047\). The association between word count and party identification was not significant for female participants, \(b = -32.51, SE = 18.59, p = .085, \eta_p^2 = .039\), or for male participants, \(b = 22.21, SE = 17.07, p = .197, \eta_p^2 = .022\).
Qualitative Data Summary

Mapuche Participants’ Responses

The Mapuche participants provided their opinions on the Chilean government’s efforts to address the conflict between the Mapuche and those developing traditional Mapuche land. They counter argued the government’s efforts by highlighting the inadequacies in what the government has done so far. For example, the government has not legitimated what the Mapuche are demanding because they have failed to address many of these demands in any way. But perhaps more important, the government has not included the Mapuche in their efforts to improve intergroup relations. Not only are Mapuche left out of important decision making, they often are not given equal opportunities for wellbeing and prosperity. The Mapuche participants also highlighted a number of ways in which the government’s efforts were misguided. For example, the government sent mixed messages about its efforts to provide concessions when it also used violence and its position of power against them (e.g., applying the anti-terrorism law to Mapuche activists). Likewise, the government has not taken responsibility for its efforts to support the timber companies, which are ultimately harming the Mapuche people and traditional Mapuche land. Efforts such as the promotion of the Mapuche language in schools largely exist in name only and are not implemented, making the government appear insincere. In addition to criticism, participants highlighted the challenges to repair efforts. The diversity of people and culture among the Mapuche people is not well known, and thus, efforts often lack sensitivity to that diversity. Assumptions by the dominant culture within Chile that assimilation is best and the media’s misrepresentation of the Mapuche as violent, further undermine efforts for reconciliation.
Non-Indigenous Participants’ Responses

The non-indigenous participants reported a diversity of views about the government’s role in addressing injustices committed against the Mapuche. Most were sympathetic of the Mapuche people and critical of the government’s efforts. For example, many said that the government has tried to fix some aspects of relations with the Mapuche, but has not addressed the roots of the problem. Suggestions they offered to the government included having respect for and an understanding of Mapuche culture. Some said the government was responsible to educate the public; others took the responsibility on themselves highlighting the ethnically and racially mixed nature of Chile. Other participants demonstrated a misunderstanding of Mapuche culture and expressed a desire to learn the language or traditional dances.

Another major theme was the discussion of land. Many not only acknowledged that Mapuche land is being stolen, but that the government is playing the role of a biased mediator between private entrepreneurs (developers) and the Mapuche people. Non-indigenous participants claimed that the State is not doing what it should, that the police launch armed attacks against the Mapuche, even children, and that this never gets covered in the news. The government has had ties with wealthy families that have a lot at stake in Chilean land for a long time, and this limits the government’s motivation to actually address Mapuche demands.

Some non-indigenous participants also expressed negative bias toward the Mapuche. One claimed that since the government does not take Mapuche demands seriously, conflict will bubble up and Mapuche activists will initiate terrorist attacks in Santiago. Another said that while they believe in respecting the Mapuche identity that they also support assimilation of
cultures. One person actually said that the State had gone too far in helping the Mapuche to the point of discriminating against the majority of Chileans, and that the Mapuche were just being greedy, pushing for more royalties.

**Discussion**

Study 2 addressed the ongoing conflict between the Mapuche, an indigenous group in Chile, and a number of parties, namely developers, non-indigenous farmers, and the government. All of the participants, regardless of race, counter argued the government’s efforts to address injustices against the Mapuche more than they wrote positive statements. The sample may have tilted more on the liberal side, but these results might also speak to a more widespread acknowledgement that the current treatment of the Mapuche is problematic in Chile. Due to the small sample size of Mapuche participants, the results were largely about group differences. The non-indigenous participants saw the government and security forces as more favorable than the Mapuche participants, and this difference was accentuated as group identification strengthened. In contrast, the non-indigenous participants were less supportive of public policies that would help the Mapuche, and this lack of support increased as race identification increased.

Some results were predicted and others were not. Unexpectedly, the Mapuche participants liked non-indigenous more as race identification increased. On the other hand, when the inoculation was present, the non-indigenous participants reported more out-group empathy than the Mapuche participants, which is the expected intergroup dynamic considering that the Mapuche participants felt more in-group victimization. Across both groups, identification was positively associated with wanting to know the truth about mistreatment of the Mapuche. In addition, the desire for truth was higher in the inoculation condition compared
to the no inoculation condition. The results about truth seeking may signal promise for future intergroup relations in Chile if people on all side become more aware of existing injustice.

News coverage of the conflict with the Mapuche portray it similarly to race relations in the U.S. Thus, prior to collecting data I expected the polarization between the Mapuche and non-indigenous to be similar to that between Blacks and Whites in the U.S. That appeared not to be the case at least in this sample. This is not to say that some Mapuche individuals do not think the majority is complicit in their mistreatment, but at least in this sample, negativity of Mapuche individuals was directed towards the government and security not non-indigenous people. The open ended data point towards the development companies and the wealthy families who own them as the perceived perpetrators continuing to take and develop traditional Mapuche land. Surprisingly many non-indigenous participants noted the land issues, but they had varying degrees of understanding about acknowledgement, cultural identity, and rights to practice and preserve culture (versus assimilation). This primarily thoughtful perspective of the non-indigenous participants may also contribute to the Mapuche participants’ perceptions of them.
CHAPTER 4

STUDY 3

Study 3 was designed around the context of Left-Right relations in Chile to examine reactions to messages about efforts at intergroup reconciliation. Chile experienced a period of political violence from the late 1960s through the era of Augusto Pinochet’s dictatorship (from 1973 to 1990). Political polarization and conflict came in many forms including the disappearance, torture, and execution of people on the political Left who were viewed as subversive by the dictatorship. When Chile returned to a democracy, the state looked at ways to address the past intergroup conflict. Two truth commissions (i.e., the Rettig Commission and the Valech Commission) were established to address the abuses that were committed during this time (Manzi & González, 2007). The government implemented some of the recommendations of the commissions including providing reparations to victims and their families, but in many cases concrete government action has taken years (United States Institute of Peace, 2013). A political dialogue (1999-2000) was also facilitated by the state, bringing together key stakeholders on both the Left and the Right. These sessions ended with a joint statement about reconciliation in Chile (Manzi & González, 2007).

Although this intergroup conflict occurred in the past, memories of the conflict are still alive for many in Chile. With the recent 40th anniversary of the military coup (September 11, 1973) more attention is being given to political conflict and reconciliation at a national level. Likewise, the presidential election of November 2013 that occurred shortly before data collection began also brought Chile’s history of Left-Right conflict under the public eye. The two candidates for President were both daughters of former generals involved on opposite sides of the coup. The father of the candidate on the Right was a member of the Pinochet regime and
the father of the candidate on the Left was imprisoned and tortured by the regime. Political
discussions and commentary about Chile’s history frequently bring up conflicting perspectives
from different members of society (Franklin, 2012; Long, 2013).

Study 3, in contrast to Studies 1 and 2, was focused on a different type of intergroup
conflict, one in which members of both sides were deeply affected. Study 3, although set in the
context of a disproportional conflict, added to what was learned about reconciliation from the
cases of interracial relational between a minority group and the dominant group discussed in
Studies 2 and 3. Unlike the specific apology message participants responded to in Study 1 or the
social services and reparations efforts participants responded to in Study 2, Study 3 examined
participants’ responses to efforts for reconciliation that are perhaps the most abstract (e.g.,
truth seeking) and the most symbolic of reconciliation as a whole (e.g., intergroup dialogue). In
addition, the groups that were involved in the conflict in Study 3 were not racial or ethnic but
rather political and ideological. Ideological differences are another important aspect of conflict
and thus responses to reconciliation efforts following this kind of conflict are important to
understand.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants were students at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile who were
recruited from psychology classes. Interested students provided their email addresses and were
emailed a link to the study. They were entered into a lottery for prizes as compensation. Of
those who participated, 106 identified with the political Left and 77 identified with the political
Right. Participation was nearly equal for biological sex: 92 females, 76 males, and 15
unreported. Effects of biological sex were footnoted in the results. The mean age was 19.84 (SD
The study was a 2 (Left vs. Right) by 2 (inoculation vs. no inoculation) factorial design with a continuous moderator of party identification.

**Procedure**

Participants began the study by first indicating their political orientation as either toward the political Left or the political Right (as a forced choice). They then completed a measure of political party identification (Roccas et al., 2008). All participants then read a brief summary of the political unrest in the 1960s and 1970s and of the rule of past dictator Augusto Pinochet. They read about the two truth commissions (i.e., the Rettig Commission and the Valech Commission) that followed the end of the dictatorship and the reported statistics on death and torture (see Appendix C). Those randomly assigned to the inoculation condition also read about the shortcomings of the truth commissions to fully address the human rights abuses that had been committed and to address those who had been disappeared. All participants then read the same information about additional government efforts to work toward national reconciliation between sympathizers of the Pinochet dictatorship (primarily on the political Right) and the victims of the dictatorship (primarily of the political Left). Finally, all participants were asked opened ended questions about the effectiveness of the government’s efforts to foster reconciliation. “The information provided on the previous page presents the history of serious human rights violations that occurred in Chile during the military regime. The efforts made by the State to repair the damage to the victims and their families were also discussed. We would like you now to write in the space below your opinion about these issues, answering the following questions: How do you evaluate the repair efforts made by Chilean State to victims of human rights violations and their families? How do you evaluate the role the Chilean State played in this conflict? What does the subject of human rights mean to you personally? Please
be as specific as possible in your answer.” After the open ended response, participants completed the close ended questions.

**Measures**

**Message Processing Variables**

The number of words participants wrote in response to the summary of the government’s repair efforts was considered one measure of engagement. In addition, the amount of time (in minutes) that the participants spent reading about the repair efforts and responding to the open ended question was also recorded. Word count and response time were correlated, $r = 0.51, p < .001$ (for correlations by group see Table 4).
Table 4 Study 3 Correlations between the Message Processing Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Word count</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time (in minutes)</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative statements</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive statements</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.18†</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The correlations for participants on the political Left were on the bottom left and the correlations for the participants on the Right were on the top right.
† p < .100, ** p ≤ .010, *** p ≤ .001

The open ended responses the participants provided were divided into statements and coded using the same method as in Studies 1 and 2 (Petty & Cacioppo, 1977). Three Spanish speaking research assistants conducted the dividing and coding. All responses were divided by one researcher assistant and checked by a second to ensure a consistent method was used. They settled any disagreements through discussion. Statements were largely divided based on sentence structure, but each research assistant separately reported that the responses were wordy and did not always use proper punctuation. The statement was coded as positive if the participant praised the repair efforts of the government. If the statement was critical of the repair efforts, it was coded as negative, and if it was unrelated, it was coded as neutral (i.e., +1, -1, and 0). The interrater reliability between the three coders was good, α = .76. The coding was unanimous 53.20% of the time. Statements were coded based on the agreement of at least two of the three coders. When two coders agreed and the third coder contradicted them (e.g., -1, +1, +1), the statement was coded based on the majority; this occurred for 3.61% of the statements. When all three coders gave the statement a different code (e.g., -1, 0, +1), it
became a neutral code, and thus was not analyzed; this occurred 2.09% of the time. Positive and negative statements were negatively correlated, $r = -0.16, p = .033$.

Word count, one measure of engagement, was positively correlated with both negative statements, $r = 0.29, p < .001$, and with positive statements, $r = 0.30, p < .001$. However, the other measure of engagement (time) was not associated with either negative statements, $r = 0.09, p = .255$, or positive statements, $r = 0.06, p = .452$. This may indicate that word count is a better measure of engagement.

**Message Proximal Outcome Variables**

All items were measures on a scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*) unless otherwise specified. Items were created to measure perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts in the context of the political conflict in Chile. An exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation (per the recommendation of Costello & Osborne, 2005) and direct oblimin rotation was conducted with the eight items that were drafted for the Chilean political context and the six previously used items from Study 1, but it failed to find a four factor solution after 100 iterations. When a three-factor solution was forced, the rotation converged after 13 iterations, but three of the items cross-loaded above .30, the acceptable cut-off (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The cross-loadings were with items that used reversed language for similar concept. Thus, a 2-factor solution was forced, and the rotation converged after 5 iterations.

The first factor included two items about the two truth commissions fulfilling their mandates, and the factor loadings were both .93; cross loadings were low at or below .21. The beliefs that each of the truth commissions (i.e., the Rettig Commission and the Valech Commission) fulfilled their mandates were correlated, $r = 0.90, p < .001$. The second factor
about adequacy of the government’s efforts at repairing the past harm included nine items: four of the items tailored for the Chilean political context and five previously used items from Study 1. The factor loadings ranged from .89 - .46, and all cross loadings were low, at or below .13. The reliability of the perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts was excellent, \( \alpha = .88 \). Three items were dropped completely because all of their factor loadings were at .23 or below (acceptable loading should be .40 or higher according to Velicer & Fava, 1998).

The belief that the government had ulterior motives was measured with five items used in Studies 1 and 2, and the reliability was good, \( \alpha = .73 \).

**Message Distal Outcome Variables**

Perceived in-group victimization was measured with the same two-items from Study 2, \( r = 0.57, p < .001 \) (Manzi & González, 2007): “Indicate to what degree you consider yourself—or your immediate family and close friends—directly victimized by the Left / Right during the ‘70s and ‘80s” and “Indicate to what degree people you know but who are not close to you consider themselves to be victims of the Left / Right during the ‘70s and ‘80s.”

Participants reported whether they perceived discrimination based on party affiliation in their: place of employment or education, during their daily routine, by authorities such as the police, and where they live. The reliability for these four items was excellent, \( \alpha = .84 \).

Favorability of different target groups was measured on a scale from 0 (*extremely unfavorable*) to 100 (*extremely favorable*). Favorability of the Right included: leaders of the political Right, people on the Right, and the Right in general, \( \alpha = .93 \). Favorability of the Left included: leaders on the political Left, people on the political Left, and the Left in general, \( \alpha = .88 \).
Desire for outgroup remorse was measured with five items, $\alpha = .90$ (Manzi & González, 2007) e.g., “People on the Left / Right should condemn their wrongdoings during the ‘70s and ‘80s.” Empathy towards the out-group was measured with a six-item scale, (Manzi & González, 2007), and the reliability was excellent, $\alpha = .91$. Forgiveness of the out-group was measured with a 12-item sub-set of the full 30-item scale used in Study 1 (Philpot & Hornsey, 2008), $\alpha = .87$.

Favorability of the state and security forces was measured with rating items from 0 to 100 about the armed forces, the national police, and the Chilean state, $\alpha = .81$. Trust in the government was measured using the same six items from Study 1, $\alpha = .73$. Desire for truth was measured with the same two-item scale from Study 2, $r = 0.48, p < .001$ Manzi & González, 2007). The items included, “Finding out what actually happened to the victims on the Left /Right is important to me” and “It is necessary to clarify what happened to all the victims of human rights violations regardless of their political positions.”

**Moderator**

Strength of identification with political party was measured using a 16-item scale (Roccas et al., 2008). An example item was: “People on the political Left / Right are better than other political groups in all respects.” The reliability was excellent for participants on the Left, $\alpha = .92$, and for participants on the Right, $\alpha = .92$.

**Results**

The three predictor variables analyzed were party affiliation (Left or Right), the inoculation manipulation (inoculation or no inoculation), and the strength of political party identification (continuous), thus all analyses were conducted using multiple moderated regression. First, the highest order interaction was tested: a three-way interaction between
party affiliation, the inoculation, and party identification. All simple effects and two-way interaction terms were included per the method outlined by Cohen et al. (2013). When the three-way term was not significant, it was removed, and the analysis was run again with the two-way terms and the simple effects. If none of the two-way interactions were significant, the analyses was run a third time only including the simple effects. Lower order effects were interpreted in the context of higher order effects.

**Message Processing Variables**

**Word Count**

There was not a three-way interaction between political party, the inoculation, and party identification predicting word count, $F(1, 171) = 1.67, p = .199, \eta_p^2 = .010$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .193$. There were no simple effects predicting word count, all $ps \geq .351$.

When biological sex was added to the analyses as an additional independent variable, there was a two-way interaction between biological sex and party identification predicting word count, $F(1, 153) = 21.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .123$. When party identification was low, male participants wrote more than female participants, $b = 50.02, SE = 18.69, p = .008, \eta_p^2 = .043$, but when party identification was high female participants wrote more than male participants, $b = -70.89, SE = 18.77, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .082$. For female participants the association between word count and party identification was positive, $b = 30.58, SE = 8.77, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$, but for male participants the association was negative, $b = -26.99, SE = 8.83, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .055$.  

---

12 When biological sex was added to the analyses as an additional independent variable, there was a two-way interaction between biological sex and party identification predicting word count, $F(1, 153) = 21.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .123$. When party identification was low, male participants wrote more than female participants, $b = 50.02, SE = 18.69, p = .008, \eta_p^2 = .043$, but when party identification was high female participants wrote more than male participants, $b = -70.89, SE = 18.77, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .082$. For female participants the association between word count and party identification was positive, $b = 30.58, SE = 8.77, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$, but for male participants the association was negative, $b = -26.99, SE = 8.83, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .055$.  

100
Time

There was not a three-way interaction predicting time spend reading about the repair and responding, $F(1, 172) = 0.44, p = .508, \eta_p^2 = .003$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .196$. There were no simple effects predicting time, all $ps \geq .864$.  

Negative Statements

There was not a three-way interaction predicting negative statements, $F(1, 167) = 0.16, p = .688, \eta_p^2 = .001$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .280$. Participants on the Left wrote significantly more negative statements about the government’s efforts at repair ($M = 2.84, SD = 1.81$) than those on the Right ($M = 1.59, SD = 1.39$), $F(1, 171) = 24.15, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .124$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .291$.  

Positive Statements

There was not a three-way interaction predicting positive statements, $F(1, 167) = 2.38, p = .125, \eta_p^2 = .014$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .445$. Participants on the Right wrote significantly more positive statements about the government’s efforts ($M = 1.25, SD = 1.15$) than people on the Left ($M = 0.75, SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 167) = 2.38, p = .125, \eta_p^2 = .014$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .854$.  

13 There was a two-way interaction between biological sex and party identification predicting time, $F(1, 154) = 9.67, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .059$. When party identification was low, female and male participants spent the same amount of time in minutes responding to the repair efforts, $b = 2.06, SE = 2.30, p = .372, \eta_p^2 = .005$, but when party identification was high female participants spent more time than male participants, $b = -8.21, SE = 2.34, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .071$. For female participants the correlation between time and party identification was positive, $b = 2.32, SE = 1.10, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .027$, but for male participants it was negative, $b = -2.57, SE = 1.10, p = .020, \eta_p^2 = .033$.  

13
Repeated Measures Analysis of Statements Type

A mixed-method analysis was run with political party as a between-subjects factor and type of statement (negative vs. positive) as a repeated-subjects factor. The party affiliation by statement type interaction was significant, $F(1, 173) = 31.37, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .153$. Participants on the Right wrote the same number of negative statements, $M = 1.59, SE = 0.19, 95\% CI [1.21, 1.96]$, and positive statements, $M = 1.25, SE = 0.13, 95\% CI [1.00, 1.51]$. However, those on the Left wrote more negative statements, $M = 2.84, SE = 0.16, 95\% CI [2.52, 3.17]$, than positive statements, $M = 0.74, SE = 0.11, 95\% CI [0.52, 0.96]$ (see Figure 19).

![Figure 19 Interaction between Political Party and Type of Statement](image)

Summary

In summary, there were no differences in engagement as measured by word count or time. Participants on the Left wrote more negative statements than those on the Right and less positive statements than participants on the Right. In addition to the differences between the Left and the Right, participants on the Left wrote significantly more negative statements
compared to positive statements, meaning that they counter argued against the government’s repair efforts more than those of the Right.

**Message Proximal Outcomes Variables**

**Perceived Adequacy of the Government’s Efforts**

There was not a three-way interaction between political party, the inoculation, and party identification predicting perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, \( F(1, 168) = 2.23, p = .137, \eta_p^2 = .013 \). There were no two-way interactions, all \( ps \geq .143 \). Those on the Right perceived the government’s efforts as more adequate \((M = 4.26, SD = 0.99)\) than those on the Left \((M = 3.24, SD = 1.00), F(1, 172) = 45.47, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .209 (see Figure 20)\). There were no other simple effects, all \( ps \geq .141 \).
Belief that the Truth Commissions Fulfilled their Mandates

There was not a three-way interaction predicting the belief that the truth commissions fulfilled their mandates, $F(1, 163) = 0.15, p = .699, \eta^2_p = .001$. There was a marginal two-way interaction between political party and party identification predicting the belief that the truth commissions fulfilled their mandates, $F(1, 164) = 3.70, p = .056, \eta^2_p = .022$. The other two-way interactions were non-significant, all $p \geq .454$. There were no simple effects, all $p \geq .141$.

Political Party and Party Identification

The marginal interaction between political party and party identification was such that for those on the Right who were highly identified were more likely to believe that the truth commissions had fulfilled their mandate, $b = 0.25, SE = 0.10, p = .019, \eta^2_p = .033$, but those on the Left there was no association between party identification and the belief that the truth commissions had fulfilled their mandate, $b = -0.05, SE = 0.12, p = .691, \eta^2_p = .001$ (see Figure 21). Participants on the Left and the Right did not differ at high levels of identification, $b = 0.32, SE = 0.23, p = .165, \eta^2_p = .012$, or at low levels of identification, $b = -0.30, SE = 0.24, p = .214, \eta^2_p = .009$. 

Figure 20 Simple Effects of Party Affiliation
There was not a three-way interaction predicting ulterior motives, $F(1, 165) = 0.31$, $p = .576$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .454$. Those on the Left were more likely to say that the government had ulterior motives ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 0.88$) than those on the Right ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 1.03$), $F(1, 169) = 3.92$, $p = .049$, $\eta_p^2 = .023$ (see Figure 20). There was a marginal effect of party identification, $F(1, 169) = 3.42$, $p = .066$, $\eta_p^2 = .020$, such that as identification increased so did the belief that the government had ulterior motives, $b = 0.13$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = .066$, $\eta_p^2 = .020$. There was not a simple effect of the inoculation manipulation, $F(1, 169) = 1.01$, $p = .310$, $\eta_p^2 = .006$.

**Summary**

The results of the message proximal outcomes revealed group differences demonstrating the Left’s suspicion and the Right’s acceptance of government action. Those on
the Right perceived the government’s efforts as more adequate than those on the Left. Those on the Left were more likely to think that the government had ulterior motives compared to those on the Right. For those on the Right, the more they identify with their party the more they believed the truth commissions fulfilled their mandates.

Message Distal Outcome Variables

In-Group Victimization

There was not a three-way interaction between political party, the inoculation, and party identification predicting the perception of in-group victimization, $F(1, 161) = 0.90, p = .345, \eta^2_p = .006$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .171$. Those on the Left were more likely to see themselves as victims because of their party identification ($M = 4.34, SD = 1.45$) than those on the Right ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.49$), $F(1, 165) = 28.74, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .148$ (see Figure 20). There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .293$.

Perceived Discrimination

There was not a three-way interaction predicting perceived discrimination, $F(1, 159) = 0.08, p = .785, \eta^2_p = .000$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .151$. There was an effect of party identification on perceived discrimination, $F(1, 163) = 21.87, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .118$, such that as people became more identified with their party they perceived more discrimination, $b = 0.43, SE = 0.09$. There were no other main effects, all $ps \geq .393$.

In-Group Favorability

There was not a three-way interaction predicting in-group favorability, $F(1, 164) = 0.03, p = .857, \eta^2_p = .000$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .381$. Participants on the Right were more likely to feel favorable towards their own group ($M = 61.90, SD = 18.88$) compared to
those on the Left ($M = 54.95$, $SD = 18.17$), $F(1, 168) = 16.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .091$ (see Figure 22).

There was an effect of party identification, $F(1, 168) = 106.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .387$, such that the more identified people were with their party the more favorably they rated their party, $b = 10.85$, $SE = 1.05$. There was not an effect of the inoculation manipulation, $F(1, 168) = 0.62$, $p = .431$, $\eta^2_p = .004$.

![Simple Effects of Party Affiliation](image)

**Figure 22 Simple Effects of Party Affiliation**

**Out-Group Favorability**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting out-group favorability, $F(1, 161) = 0.83$, $p = .365$, $\eta^2_p = .005$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .286$. Participants on the Right were more likely to feel favorable towards the out-group ($M = 32.66$, $SD = 18.39$) compared to those on the Left ($M = 25.67$, $SD = 16.63$), $F(1, 165) = 5.05$, $p = .026$, $\eta^2_p = .030$ (see
Figure 22). There was an effect of party identification, $F(1, 165) = 10.70, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .061$, such that the more identified people were with their party the less favorable they felt toward the other party, $b = -4.16, SE = 1.27$. There was not a simple effect of the inoculation manipulation, $F(1, 165) = 0.02, p = .889, \eta_p^2 = .000$.

**Desire for Out-Group Remorse**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting the desire for out-group remorse, $F(1, 161) = 0.006, p = .804, \eta_p^2 = .000$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .611$. Participants on the Left wanted an expression of remorse from the Right ($M = 6.03, SD = 1.11$) more than participants on the Right wanted this from the Left ($M = 5.01, SD = 1.40$), $F(1, 165) = 27.56, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .143$ (see Figure 20). There was an effect of party identification, $F(1, 165) = 32.24, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .163$, such that the more identified people were with their party the more they wanted an expression of remorse from the out-group, $b = 0.47, SE = 0.08$. There was not an effect of the inoculation manipulation, $F(1, 165) = 1.06, p = .305, \eta_p^2 = .006$.

**Empathy for the Out-Group**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting out-group empathy, $F(1, 159) = 1.05, p = .308, \eta_p^2 = .007$. There were no two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .320$. Participants on the Right expressed more empathy for the out-group ($M = 5.27, SD = 0.90$) than those on the Left ($M = 4.55, SD = 1.42$), $F(1, 163) = 11.84, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .068$ (see Figure 20). As party identification increased, empathy for the out-group decreased, $b = -0.22, SE = 0.09, F(1, 163) = 6.04, p = .015,$
\[ \eta_p^2 = .036. \] The inoculation manipulation did not have an effect, \( F(1, 163) = 2.55, p = .112, \eta_p^2 = .015. \)

**Forgiveness of the Out-Group**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting out-group forgiveness, \( F(1, 161) = 2.00, p = .159, \eta_p^2 = .012. \) There was a significant two-way interaction between the inoculation and party identification predicting out-group forgiveness, \( F(1, 162) = 4.70, p = .032, \eta_p^2 = .028. \) There was a marginal two-way interaction between political party and the inoculation, \( F(1, 162) = 2.85, p = .093, \eta_p^2 = .017. \) There was not a two-way interaction between political party and party identification, \( F(1, 162) = 0.10, p = .750, \eta_p^2 = .001. \) Participants on the Right reported more out-group forgiveness compared to those on the Left, \( F(1, 162) = 10.05, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .058. \) There was also an effect of party identification, \( F(1, 162) = 44.27, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .215, \) such that the more identified people were the less they forgave, \( b = -0.30, SE = 0.11. \) There was not an effect of the inoculation manipulation, \( F(1, 162) = 0.02, p = .881, \eta_p^2 = .000. \)

**Inoculation and Party Identification**

The two-way interaction between the inoculation and party identification was such that in the no inoculation condition out-group forgiveness decreased as party identification increased, \( b = -0.57, SE = 0.09, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .214, \) while this same pattern was found in the

\[ \text{14} \] There was a two-way interaction between biological sex and party identification predicting out-group empathy, \( F(1, 156) = 9.13, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .055. \) For female participants, out-group empathy was negatively associated with party identification, \( b = -0.53, SE = 0.13, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .098, \) but for male participants out-group empathy and party identification were not associated, \( b = 0.05, SE = 0.13, p = .686, \eta_p^2 = .001. \) When party identification was low, female participants reported more out-group empathy than male participants, \( b = 0.64, SE = 0.27, p = .017, \eta_p^2 = .034, \) but when party identification was high, female participants reported less out-group empathy than male participants, \( b = -0.57, SE = 0.27, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .027. \)
inoculation condition, it was weaker, $b = -0.28, SE = 0.09, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .055$ (see Figure 23). At high levels of identification those in the inoculation condition reported more out-group forgiveness than those in the no inoculation condition, $b = 0.40, SE = 0.19, p = .033, \eta_p^2 = .027$, but there was no difference at low identification, $b = -0.22, SE = 0.19, p = .234, \eta_p^2 = .009$.

![Figure 23 Interaction between Inoculation and Party Identification](image)

**Party Affiliation and Inoculation**

The marginal interaction between political party and the inoculation was such that in the no inoculation conditions participants on the Right ($M = 4.64, SD = 1.03$) reported more out-group forgiveness than those on the Left ($M = 3.83, SD = 0.92$), $t(83) = 3.72, p < .001, d = 0.83$, but there was not a difference in out-group forgiveness in the inoculation condition between those on the Left ($M = 4.08, SD = 0.99$) and on the Right ($M = 4.30, SD = 0.85$), $t(82) = 1.06, p = .291, d = 0.23$. Forgiveness did not differ among participants on the Right between the inoculation and the no inoculation conditions, $t(67) = 1.49, p = .141, d = 0.36$, or among those on
the Left between the inoculation condition and the no inoculation condition, $t(98) = 1.30, p = .198, d = 0.26$.

Summary

Overall, for the message distal outcomes there were very large group differences in the predicted direction based on the history and context of the Left-Right conflict (see Figures 20 and 22). For some of these variables, there were also effects of identification. Participants on the Right were more lenient toward people on the Left than visa versa. In other words, people on the Left held harsher views of the Right. Those on the Left saw themselves more as victims during the 1970s and 1980s than participants on the Right. The more identified members of both parties were, the more their perceived discrimination because of their party affiliation. Those on the Right favored their own group more; for both groups, party identification and in-group favorability were positive associated. Participants on the Right also favored the out-group more than participants on the Left; regardless of party affiliation, as party identification increased favorability of the out-group decreased. Participants on the Left wanted an expression of out-group remorse more than those on the Right; as identification increased so did the desire for out-group remorse. Those on the Right expressed more out-group empathy than participants on the Left; overall out-group empathy decreased as identification increased. There was an inoculation by party identification interaction predicting forgiveness; in both conditions forgiveness and identification were negatively correlated, but the slope was steeper in the no inoculation condition. Participants on the Right forgave the out-group more than those on the Left, especially in the no inoculation condition.
**Favorability of the Security Forces**

There was not a three-way interaction predicting favorability of the security forces, $F(1, 163) = 0.00, p = .986, \eta^2_p = .000$. There was a significant two-way interaction between political party and party identification predicting favorability of the security forces, $F(1, 164) = 12.55, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .071$. There were no other two-way interactions, all $ps \geq .419$. Participants on the Right were more favorable of the security forces ($M = 70.23, SD = 17.92$) compared to those on the Left ($M = 39.81, SD = 20.59$), $F(1, 164) = 108.30, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .398$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .115$. The difference between participants on the Right and the Left must be interpreted in the context of the two-way interaction between political party and party identification.

**Party Affiliation and Party Identification**

The nature of the two-way interaction between party affiliation and party identification was such that for participants on the Right they became more favorable as party identification increased, $b = 7.09, SE = 2.09, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .065$. For those on the Left, there was no association between favorability of the security forces and party identification, $b = -2.67, SE = 1.81, p = .143, \eta^2_p = .013$ (see Figure 24). Participants on the Left were less favorable than those on the Right at both high, $b = -41.27, SE = 4.21, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .366$, and low identification, $b = -20.78, SE = 4.01, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .134$. 
There was not a three-way interaction predicting trust in the government, $F(1, 162) = 0.75, p = .389, \eta^2_p = .005$. There were no two-way interactions predicting trust in the government, all $p$s $\geq .258$. Participants on the Right reported more trust in the government ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 1.00$) compared to those on the Left ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.92$), $F(1, 166) = 48.00, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .224$ (see Figure 20). There was a marginal simple effect of party identification, $F(1, 166) = 2.90, p = .091, \eta^2_p = .017$, such that as party identification increased so did trust in the government, $b = 0.12, SE = 0.07$.

**Desire for the Truth**

There was not a three-way interaction for truth, $F(1, 160) = 1.03, p = .312, \eta^2_p = .006$. There was a significant two-way interaction between political party and party identification, $F(1, 161) = 11.71, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .068$. There were no other two-way interactions, all $p$s $\geq .132$. 

![Figure 24 Interaction between Party Affiliation and Party Identification](image-url)
Participants on the Left ($M = 6.66, SD = 0.69$) desired to know the truth about past injustices more than those on the Right ($M = 6.18, SD = 1.04$), $F(1, 161) = 13.35, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .077$. There were no other simple effects, all $ps \geq .495$. The difference between participants on the Left and the Right must be interpreted in the context of the party affiliation by identification interaction.

**Party Affiliation and Party Identification**

The interaction between political party and party identification was such that for participants on the Right, their desire to know the truth decreased as party identification increased, $b = -0.17, SE = 0.09, p = .066, \eta^2_p = .021$. However, for those on the Left, their desire to know the truth increased as party identification increased, $b = 0.25, SE = 0.08, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .055$ (see Figure 25). When identification was high, participants on the Left reported a greater desire to know the truth than those on the Right, $b = 0.91, SE = 0.18, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .129$, but when identification was low there was no difference, $b = 0.04, SE = 0.18, p = .846, \eta^2_p = .000$. 
Figure 25 Interaction between Party Affiliation and Party Identification

Summary

Overall, participants on the Right vs. the Left were more favorable of the security forces, and as they became more identified favorability ratings increased. Likewise, participants on the Right trusted the government more than those on the Left. In contrast, those on the Left wanted to know the truth about the past more, and the gap between participants on the Left and the Right increased as group members became more identified.

Discussion

The majority of the findings for Study 3 were group differences between participants on the political Left and Right. Because the Left was more victimized by the Pinochet regime, they reported more negative statements about the government’s efforts at repair than the Right and less positive statements. The Left perceived more ulterior motives of the government, they had a greater desire for out-group remorse, were more likely to see themselves as victims of the
regime, and wanted to know the truth about the past abuses more than the Right. Participants on the Right, on the other hand, perceived the government’s efforts as more adequate, expressed more favorability and more empathy of the Left than the Left did of the Right, favored the security forces more, and trusted the government more. In general, group identification decreased favorability, empathy, and out-group forgiveness (specifically in the inoculation condition), and increased the gap in desire to know the truth between the Left and the Right.

Although some Chileans on the Right claimed that political dissidents on the Left contributed to political instability in Chile in the period prior to the Pinochet dictatorship, most people acknowledge that those who were harmed by Pinochet and the security forces during his rule were mostly people on the Left. Since the two-way political conflict had disproportionate victims on the Left, it is not surprising why participants on the Left were more wary of the government and less favorable of people on the political Right than the reverse.
CHAPTER 5

MESSAGE PROCESSING VARIABLES AS INDICES OF PARTICIPANT REACTIONS

Results across All Studies

In order to better understand the connections between message processing and intergroup outcomes, correlations were examined across the three studies between the message processing variables (word count, time, negative statements, and positive statements) and the outcome variables that were included in all three studies. Correlations were presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Participants</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Negative Statements</th>
<th>Positive Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the government</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the government and Whites</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.20†</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and Whites</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19†</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Participants</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Negative Statements</th>
<th>Positive Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the government</td>
<td>-.15†</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the government and Whites</td>
<td>-.16†</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and Whites</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16†</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The measure of empathy in Study 1 was about the government; in Studies 2 and 3 it was about the racial and political out-groups, respectively. The measures of forgiveness and favorability combine targets groups including the government and the White majority group in Study 1, but in Studies 2 and 3, they items asked about out-groups.

† p < .100, * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .010, *** p ≤ .001

Table 5 Study 1 Correlation with the Message Processing Variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Negative Statements</th>
<th>Positive Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mapuche participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.56†</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the out-group</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the out-group</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and the security forces</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.63†</td>
<td>.61†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Indigenous participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.22†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the out-group</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the out-group</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and the security forces</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The measure of empathy in Study 1 was about the government; in Studies 2 and 3 it was about the racial and political out-groups, respectively. The measures of forgiveness and favorability combine targets groups including the government and the White majority group in Study 1, but in Studies 2 and 3, they items asked about out-groups.

† p < .100, * p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .010, *** p ≤ .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Negative Statements</th>
<th>Positive Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants on the Left</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the out-group</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the out-group</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and the security forces</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.19†</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>.19†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants on the Right</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived adequacy</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior motives</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy with the out-group</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of the out-group</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability of the government and the security forces</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the government</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The measure of empathy in Study 1 was about the government; in Studies 2 and 3 it was about the racial and political out-groups, respectively. The measures of forgiveness and favorability combine targets groups including the government and the White majority group in Study 1, but in Studies 2 and 3, they items asked about out-groups.
† $p < .100$, * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .010$, *** $p \leq .001$

Table 7 Study 3 Correlations with the Message Processing Variables

The goal of the material presented in this section is to better understand the extent to which the message processing variables coded from participants’ open ended responses are in
fact predictive of participants’ close-ended responses. One of the major ideas motivating this dissertation was that examining how people in victim and perpetrator groups actually process reconciliation messages may prove useful in understanding what leads to acceptance of these messages and to more distal, long-term, outcomes such as intergroup forgiveness. Thus, if I find evidence of robust correlations between the message processing variables and the close-ended outcome measures, this indicates both that participants’ responses to the message are psychologically meaningful and also that my approach to dividing and coding participants’ responses was effective in capturing that meaning. Conversely, if the coding of participants’ responses are not related to how they then responded to the close-ended questions this would indicate either that the coding was flawed or that the open-ended responses themselves are not meaningful (at least by the metric of the questions used in this and much prior research). As I will discuss in more detail in this section, there was a fairly robust relationship between the coded message processing variables and at least some of the close-ended responses.

**Engagement**

The first two measures of message processing (overall word count in participants’ response to the message and the time they spent writing) were used to assess overall engagement with processing the message. High levels of engagement might, of course, result from either counter-arguing (negative responses to the message) or argument bolstering (positive responses to the message). Thus, these first measures themselves do not directly capture the valence of people’s responses.

In Study 1, for Black participants, writing time and the belief that the President Clinton had ulterior motives for apologizing were positively correlated, $r = 0.38$, $p = .016$ (see Table 5). Time was not associated with other outcomes and word count was not associated with the
outcomes. For White participants, time spent writing was negatively correlated with: empathy with the government, $r = -0.22, p = .011$, forgiveness of the government and Whites, $r = -0.20, p = .017$, and favorability of the government and Whites, $r = -0.19, p = .030$. Similarly, for White participants, word count was negatively associated with these same outcomes, but the associations were not significant. For White participants, there were no other associations with word count or time.

In Study 2, there were no significant associations between the measures of engagement—word count and time—for either Mapuche or non-indigenous participants. However, the largest correlations in magnitude were between word count and out-group empathy for the Mapuche participants, $n = 10, r = 0.46, p = .183$, and between word count and favorability of the government and security forces, $n = 12, r = -0.44, p = .152$ (see Table 6), meaning that the more Mapuche participants wrote the more they empathized with non-indigenous individuals, but the less they liked the government and security forces.

In Study 3, for participants on the Left there were no associations between word count and the outcome variables. Time was marginally negatively associated with favorability of the government and security forces, $r = -0.19, p = .059$ (see Table 7). For participants on the Right, word count was positively associated with perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $r = 0.36, p = .002$, and word count was negatively associated with perceived discrimination, $r = -0.29, p = .018$, meaning that the more people wrote the more they thought the government’s efforts were adequate, and the less they perceived the Right (their political in-group) as the target of discrimination. For those on the Right, time was positively correlated with perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $r = 0.27, p = .025$, and time was positively correlated with the belief that the government had ulterior motives, $r = 0.24, p = .045$. 
The measures of engagement (word count and time) were correlated with some outcomes in both Studies 1 and 3 but across all the studies, the associations between the engagement measures and outcome measures were more prevalent for the dominant group (i.e., White participants in Study 1 and the Right in Study 3). A closer examination of the association between engagement (specifically word count) and the valence of the statements may better illustrate the nature of participants’ engagement with the message. Across the three studies, word count was positive associated with negative statements: in Study 1, $r = 0.73, p < .001$; in Study 2, $r = 0.30, p = .004$; and in Study 3, $r = 0.29, p = .001$. The overall relationships between engagement and positive statements were not as strong: in Study 1, $r = 0.28, p < .001$; in Study 2, $r = -0.02, p = .824$; and in Study 3, $r = 0.30, p = .001$. Thus, the following correlational analyses that examined the valence of the open ended responses may make the influence of engagement clearer.

**Counter Arguing and Argument Bolstering**

The second set of measures more directly assess the valence of people’s engagement with the message. The open ended responses were divided into discrete statements, and each statement was coded as negative if it disagreed with the main message for reconciliation and positive if it agreed. Thus, negative responses to the message represented counter-arguing while positive responses represented bolstering of that message. I expected negative statements would be negatively associated with the pro-reconciliation outcomes and that positive statements would be positively correlated with these outcomes.

In Study 1, for Black participants negative statements were positively associated with the belief that President Clinton had ulterior motives, $r = 0.32, p = .003$, and negative statements were negatively associated with empathy toward the government, $r = -0.22, p = .010$, and with
trust in the government, $r = -0.22, p = .042$. Similarly, negative statements were negatively associated with forgiveness of the government and Whites, $r = -0.20, p = .066$, and favorability of the government and Whites, $r = -0.19, p = .078$, but these correlations did not reach significance. There were similar correlations for White participants. The more negative statements White participants wrote the more they believed Clinton had ulterior motives, $r = 0.26, p = .002$, while the more negative statements they wrote the less they perceived the apology as adequate, $r = -0.32, p < .001$. In addition, negative statements were negatively associated with: empathy with the government, $r = -0.20, p = .021$, forgiveness of the government and Whites, $r = -0.26, p = .002$, favorability of the government and Whites, $r = -0.24, p = .004$, and trust in the government, $r = -0.16, p = .054$.

For Black participants, positive statements were negatively associated with perceived discrimination, $r = -0.22, p = .040$, meaning the more positive things Black participants said in response to the apology the less they thought they were targets of discrimination because of their race. For White participants, positive statements were positively associated with perceived adequacy of Clinton’s apology, $r = 0.33, p < .001$, and positively associated with trust in the government, $r = 0.24, p = .005$. Positive statements were negatively associated with the belief that Clinton had ulterior motives, $r = -0.26, p = .002$. In addition, perceive discrimination was negatively correlated with positive statements, $r = -0.24, p = .005$.

In Study 2, for Mapuche participants negative statements were negatively associated with perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $n = 10, r = -0.56, p = .093$, and with favorability of the government and security forces, $n = 10, r = -0.63, p = .053$. For the non-indigenous participants, negative statements were also negatively correlated with perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $r = -0.49, p < .001$, and with favorability of the government and the security forces, $r = -0.45, p < .001$, meaning that for all participants, the
more they counter argued against the government’s efforts the less adequate they thought the efforts were and the less they like the government and the security forces.

For positive statement the reverse pattern was found for both groups. For Mapuche participants positive statements were positively associated with favorability of the government and the security forces, $n = 10, r = 0.61, p = .062$, and with perceived adequacy of the government’s efforts, $n = 10, r = 0.43, p = .221$, but these correlations did not reach significance. For the non-indigenous participants, positive statements were positively correlated with perceiving the government’s efforts as adequate, $r = 0.32, p = .004$, and with favoring the government and the security forces, $r = 0.39, p = .001$.

In Study 3, for participants on the political Left negative statements were negatively correlated with perceiving the government’s efforts and adequate, $r = -0.45, p < .001$, and with seeing the government and the security forces as favorable, $r = -.033, p = .001$. For participants on the Right there were no associations with negative statements.

Slightly different patterns were found for positive statements. For participants on the Left, positive statements were positively associated with thinking the government’s efforts were adequate, $r = 0.46, p < .001$, with out-group empathy, $r = 0.22, p = .032$, and with trust in the government $r = 0.27, p = .008$. For participants on the Right, positive statements were positively correlated with seeing the government’s efforts as adequate, $r = 0.32, p = .007$.

Across all of the studies and between the groups in each study, negative statements and positive statements generally were associated with the outcome variables as expected (in the opposite direction). Furthermore, there were significant correlations between the statement valence measures (positive and negative) and the outcome measures in all three studies and across all groups (see the third and fourth columns of Tables 5, 6, and 7) with the exception of negative statements for participants on the political Right in Study 3. In addition, there were
fairly consistent findings across studies and across groups for outcomes related to the
government, specifically the evaluation of the government’s efforts for reconciliation and the
evaluation of the government. These correlations point to the importance of the target of
people’s attitudes; responses about the primary perpetrator (the government) may be more
relevant than the out-group following exposure to message for reconciliation. The correlation
patterns also highlighted the relevance of the temporal nature of the outcome variables
(proximal vs. distal). There were more significant correlations between the message processing
variables and the proximal outcome variables than there were between the message processing
variables and the distal outcome variables. This speaks to the hypothesized idea that cognitively
processing a message for reconciliation will have a more immediate effect on some attitudes
and perhaps take much long to affect other important outcomes such as intergroup forgiveness.

Taken together, these correlation patterns speak to the importance of asking the right questions
at the right time to truly understand how and why reconciliation efforts affect long-term
intergroup relations. For example, if a government intended to offer an apology or make
reparations, it would be important to understand current perceptions of that effort by members
of all groups in advance of any action (e.g., reparations for slavery).

15 In Study 1, the measure of favorability also included the government and White
participants, the dominant group. In Studies 2 and 3, the measure of favorability included the
government and the security forces that may also be perceived as perpetrators of violence
against the victimized group.
CHAPTER 6

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The work presented in this dissertation was motivated by the inconsistencies in the research on the effectiveness of intergroup apologies to elicit intergroup forgiveness (Brown, Wohl, et al., 2008; Leonard, et al., 2011; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Philpot & Hornsey, 2011; Wohl et al., 2012). Governments and other groups increasingly use intergroup apologies (e.g., for internment of Japanese descendants in the U.S. and in Canada; for mistreatment of indigenous peoples in Canada and Australia; Blatz et al., 2009; Brooks, 1999; Lazare, 2004), compensation (for some examples see International Center for Transitional Justice, 2016; Roht-Arriaza, 2004), and other efforts to influence harmed groups and to improve intergroup relations (for lists of countries that have gone through official reconciliation processes see Barkan, 2002; Hayner, 2000; Minow, 2002; United States Institute of Peace, 2011). Thus, it is vital to understand when and why such efforts have positive impacts on people’s attitudes. I designed my dissertation research to consider not only the short and long term effects of efforts for intergroup reconciliation but also to examine how people actually responded to, or “process” reconciliation efforts. In developing this new approach to intergroup reconciliation, I relied on theory (Chaiken & Trope, 1999; Eagly & Chaiken, 1995; McGuire, 1964; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) and methods from attitude change research (Petty & Cacioppo, 1977) and conceived efforts for reconciliation as persuasive messages from perpetrator groups designed to influence people’s attitudes about the intergroup relationship and about past harms. These messages matter not only to the victim group members but to members of the perpetrator group as well.
According to persuasion research, when people are engaged in message processing they are likely to elaborate on the message more deeply (Ostrom & Brock, 1968; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Sherif & Hovland, 1961). This process of elaboration could lead individuals to bolster the argument if they already agreed with it, or it could lead to counter arguing the message, (i.e., poking holes in it) if do not agree with it (Banas & Rains, 2010; Hovland & Sherif, 1952; McGuire, 1964; Sherif & Hovland, 1953). In the context of messages for reconciliation, counter arguing will likely lead to a lack of willingness to reconcile (especially for victim group members), while argument bolstering will lead to a greater willingness to reconcile. The correlations between the message processing variables and the outcomes across the three studies provide initial evidence for this theoretical idea.

Overall, the participants’ open ended responses to the messages for reconciliation across the three studies related to how they responded to short-term attitudes about the governments’ efforts and long-term attitudes about the government and the respective out-groups. These findings in themselves may be the most important contribution of this dissertation and highlight the importance of conceptualizing efforts for reconciliation as persuasive messages. Specifically, the extent to which participants counter argued with the repair efforts was related to their perception of the government’s efforts and the government’s motives for attempting to repair intergroup relations. Generally the more people counter argued, regardless of group, the more they thought the government had ulterior motives and that the repair efforts were not adequate. Counter arguing was associated with distal outcomes such as out-group attitudes mostly in Study 1, but counter arguing was also negatively correlated with favorability of the government in Studies 2 and 3. Other findings across the three studies were less consistent, but the differences may well be due to contextual differences specific to each conflict and context.
The results found in Study 1 provide the most support for the idea of inoculation against a message of reconciliation. Study 1 showed some of the hypothesized inoculation effects especially for Black participants, the victimized group. The inoculation was manipulated by informing half of the participants that after the Tuskegee study conducted on Black men ended, over 25 years passed before the government made any kind of official statement about the injustice. In the results, for example, Black participants wrote most in the inoculation condition. There were similar effects of researcher race in the same pattern as the effects for inoculation. For example, a two-way interaction revealed that Black participants wrote more negative statements than White participants, but only when the research was a person of color. The presence of another person of color might have allowed the Black participants to write in a more candidate way about how they felt; it also might have made White participants censor their responses. Research conducted in field experiments highlights the relevance of having researchers who are similar to the participants (for examples of studies conducted in Rwanda, see Bilali & Vollhardt, 2013; Paluck, E. L., 2009). Even though the interaction between participant race and the inoculation did not reach significance, the pattern was the same; Black participants wrote more negative statements than White participants but only in the inoculation condition. The similarity between the effect of the inoculation and the effect of research race may mean that the presence of a person of color primed the inoculation messages that may already exist in the public consciousness (e.g., the government still does things that are racist). Generally Black participants in the inoculation condition with a researcher of color had the most negative reactions.

In contrast to Study 1, the inoculation manipulation did not have much effect in Study 2, which examined the conflict involving the Mapuche people in Chile. In Study 2, there were expected group effects; the non-indigenous participants favored the government and security
forces more while the Mapuche participants were more supportive of policies that would help their group. These findings parallel debates taking place in Chile presently. Mapuche activists are still portrayed as terrorists and treated as such by the security forces and legal system (Crow, 2003; Brown, González, et al., 2008). On the other hand, the Mapuche people have a lengthy list of demands that have not yet been addressed from the end of current forestry practices on their ancestral land (Rohter, 2004) to better representation in and protections by the government (Under Represented Nations and Peoples Organization, 2013).

Like Study 2, Study 3 was also conducted in the Chilean context, but examining political conflict between the Left and the Right in the aftermath of the Pinochet dictatorship instead of the conflict over Mapuche rights. Similar to Study 2, the primary results were group differences. There were particularly large group differences on out-group (i.e., Left-Right) directed outcomes, demonstrating the political polarization that still exists in Chile. As the group victimized by Pinochet, the participant on the Left were less accepting of the government’s efforts and less favorable of the political out-group. Chile is still divided along political line over Pinochet’s legacy; some believe he saved the country from political and economic collapse, while others see him as the orchestrator of unjustifiable detention, torture, and executions (Long, 2013; PanAm Post, 2015).

**Limitations**

In addition to the strengths of this research, there were some shortcomings as well. Power may have been an issue because of the small sample size of Black participants in Study 1 and of Mapuche participants in Study 2. This is particularly relevant for detecting moderation if it occurred. In addition to low power, these small samples may also have had subgroups with different perspectives and experiences. Specifically, the Black sample in Study 1 included
individuals from a variety of backgrounds; some were immigrants. However, the sample size was not large enough to examine potential differences between the sub-groups. Black participants who immigrated to the U.S. more recently may or may not have had the same experiences with prejudice that are common to African-Americans. As noted earlier, the sample of Mapuche participants was small. Since the participants were university students at PUC, they may only represent one perspective of the Mapuche people. Those who are being directly victimized by the security forces or legal systems and those whose land has been taken or polluted likely hold more negative evaluations of the government’s efforts to reconcile than the participants in Study 2 (Richards, 2013).

There were few effects of the inoculation manipulation in Studies 2 and 3. The lack of effects might be the result of differences in operationalization between the studies. In Studies 2 and 3, the inoculation may have been weaker because participants may already have had strong attitudes about the efforts for reconciliation before reading the inoculation; strong attitudes are more resistant to change. Conversely, the inoculation in Study 1 may have had the expected effect because the message was a quoted verbal message, and thus very concrete, and the participants may have been less aware of the timing of the Tuskegee study and Clinton’s apology even if they had some previous knowledge of both. The 25-year delay by the government to apologize was the ideal event to highlight in the inoculation manipulation. The way in which participants interpreted and evaluated the inoculations in Studies 2 and 3 could have to do with contextual factors in Chile’s history and current politics.

\[16\] Black participants with an immigrant background \((M = 4.49, SD = 1.56, 31)\) and those who did not \((M = 4.77, SD = 1.29, 54)\) reported the same amount of perceived discrimination based on their racial identity, \(t(83) = 0.91, p = .366, d = 0.21\).
The different effects of the inoculation across the studies raises the idea that in each study, more information would be helpful to interpret the results. For example, I could have asked participants about the extent of their knowledge about the reconciliation efforts. I expect that the more they know, the less likely the inoculation will be to have an effect. Another methodological oversight was the omission of political and national identification in Study 2. I discussed the importance of these measures with my collaborators, but failed to add them to the final Spanish survey online. Without knowing this information, the responses of both the Mapuche participants and the non-indigenous participants cannot be fully explained. The pro-Mapuche rights position tends to be more supported by those on the Left. Relatedly, I could have asked participants in all of the studies, what they see as the root causes of the conflict and who they feel is still fueling it presently. For example, someone who attributes more of the problem to institutions like the government might feel more understanding of their respective out-group than someone who believes members of the other group are complicit in the injustice (e.g., the role of White privilege in mistreatment of Blacks).

**Future Directions of this Research**

I will build on the research reported in this dissertation in two different ways. First, I will conduct further analyses and additional coding. Second, I will use the successes and the shortcomings of this work to inform future research. Further analysis, for example, will include conditional effects modeling to test the message processing variables as mediators of the outcome variables. Exploratory analyses were conducted using Hayes’ PROCESS model 7 (see Hayes, 2013), a moderated mediation model. Using the data from Study 1, participant race was tested as the independent variable. Negative statements were tested as the mediator predicting favorability of the government and of Whites. Researcher race was tested as a
moderator of the effect of participant race on negative statements. Negative statements explained the difference between Black and White participants’ attitudes toward the government and Whites, but only when the researcher was a person of color, $b = -3.00, SE = 1.19, 95\% CI [-5.58, -1.00]$, and not when the researcher was White, $b = 0.44, SE = 0.58, 95\% CI [-0.60, 1.69]$, meaning that as Black participants in the condition with research of color wrote more negative statements they favored the government and Whites less. Additional analyses such as this will be conducted.

The research conducted for this dissertation lays the groundwork for a conceptualization of reconciliation efforts as persuasive messages, but further research on how people process message for reconciliation using multiple methods is needed (e.g., qualitative, experimental, surveys, and measures of brain activation). Multiple methods can provide converging evidence to answer these questions. Additional consideration should go into how best to operationalize message inoculation in the context of post-conflict reconciliation. The use of minimal groups in a controlled lab study could help isolate the boundary conditions of the inoculation effect. Better understanding reconciliation processes, however, cannot be done void of context. Therefore, in addition to lab studies, more research should be conducted in the context of meaningful intergroup conflict. Longitudinal research may capture the downstream effects of efforts for reconciliation. Additionally, since the coding of the open-ended responses was correlated with outcome variables in a predictable way, more research can be done with open-ended responses to efforts for reconciliation in accessible places such as online forums.

Many of these methods should also be used to tease apart the effectiveness of different forms of addressing intergroup reconciliation (e.g., apologies, truth commissions, reparations). Better understanding how people process these different methods and how that process affects intergroup attitudes is a critical part of informing reconciliation efforts in multiple contexts.
Likewise, understanding the specific historical and contextual factors that may influence victim group members’ or perpetrator group members’ attitudes about reconciliation cannot be underestimated.
From 1932 to 1972 the U.S. Public Health Service worked with the Tuskegee University in Macon county, Alabama to conduct a study on the sexually transmitted disease syphilis. The Tuskegee study involved 600 Black male participants, 399 who had syphilis and 201 who did not. The goal of the government was to study the progression of the disease until all the infected participants died.

The men were not given the opportunity to decide whether or not they wanted to participate in the study. The men were simply told that they were being treated for “bad blood”. Even after penicillin was found as a known cure for syphilis in 1947, treatment was withheld for the remaining 25 years of the study.

What was the goal of the study?

The study was stopped in 1972 only after public health workers leaked the story to the press. By this time many of the men had died, and many of their wives had been infected with syphilis.
In 1973, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filed a class-action lawsuit. The government gave the victims and families a 10-million dollar settlement outside of court and provided them with lifetime healthcare. Various groups felt that compensation was not enough and demanded that the government make a public statement about the study.

Why was the study stopped?

**Inoculation Condition:** After the settlement, the government did not respond publically to the harm or apologize, even though there were many demands to do so.

**No Inoculation Condition:** After the settlement, various books were published about what happened during the studies.

**Inoculation Condition:** Various books were published about the true motivations of the government officials and the lies they told while conducting the study that they did not admit.
The Tuskegee Syphilis Study Legacy Committee was established by advocacy groups to spell out what the government should do in response. For over 20 years the government did not respond to these injustices, the victims, or the legacy of this atrocity.

**No Inoculation Condition:** The Tuskegee Syphilis Study Legacy Committee was established by advocacy groups to document what had taken place.

**Repair Effort:** In 1997 the remaining survivors of and or family members of subjects in the Tuskegee study were invited to Washington, D.C. to attend a public statement by President Clinton.

Instructions: Please read the following excerpt of the statement by former President Clinton to the survivors of the Tuskegee syphilis study. Then we would like you to tell us what you think.

“Ladies and gentlemen, on Sunday, Mr. Shaw will celebrate his 95th birthday. I would like to recognize the other survivors [of the Tuskegee study] who are here today and their families: Mr. Charlie Pollard is here. Mr. Carter Howard. Mr. Fred Simmons. Mr. Simmons. And Mr. Frederick Moss, thank you, sir.”

“I also acknowledge the families, community leaders, teachers and students watching today by satellite from Tuskegee. We are glad to have all of you here today. The eight men who are survivors of the syphilis study at Tuskegee are a living link to a time not so very long ago that many Americans would prefer not to remember, but we dare not forget. Today America does remember the hundreds of men used in research without their knowledge and consent. We remember them and their family members. What was done cannot be undone. But we can end the silence. We can look at you in the eye and finally say on behalf of the American people, I am sorry.”
“To Macon County, to Tuskegee, to the doctor, to our African American citizens, I am sorry. It was an outrage to our commitment to integrity and equality for all our citizens. You did nothing wrong, but you were grievously wronged. Your federal government orchestrated a study so clearly racist. The United States government did something that was wrong -- deeply, profoundly, morally wrong.”

“To the survivors, to the wives and family members, the children and the grandchildren, I say what you know: No power on Earth can give you back the lives lost, the pain suffered, the years of internal torment and anguish. An apology is the first step, and we take it with a commitment to rebuild that broken trust. We can begin by making sure there is never again another episode like this one. Thank you, and God bless you.”

Instructions: Above is an excerpt of the statement by Former President Clinton to the survivors of the Tuskegee syphilis study. We are interested to hear how you evaluate this statement. How does this affect your views of the government generally and its actions in the Tuskegee study? Please elaborate on what it means to you personally and what it means broadly speaking about research practices in this country and the role of the government, past and present. Please be as specific as possible.
APPENDIX B

INFORMATION ABOUT TREATMENT OF THE MAPUCHE

In Chile, the Mapuche have suffered a long history of abuse and marginalization, which began with the Spanish conquest and has extended to today. During this period, the Mapuche lost much of their ancestral territory and have seen a sharp weakening of their culture, traditions, and social position.

In recent years, their demand for justice and restitution of lands has clashed with the interests of companies exploiting agricultural resources, forest, and water in the region of Araucanía. Most of the Mapuche live in poverty, with limited access to basic services such as housing, health, education, and employment. The accumulation of social needs has led several Mapuche activists to demand compensation and reparations by the Chilean State.

**Inoculation Manipulation:** The pressure exerted by the Mapuche communities to achieve formal recognition of their status as indigenous people and their efforts to make their demands for better conditions of life heard have been met with incomprehension, slow, or no response from the Chilean State. Land restitution has been a slow and frustrating process, which has not responded satisfactorily the demands of the Mapuche people. In this context, several Mapuche
leaders have argued that the Chilean State should offer apologies for abuses over the years and must make a greater effort to resolve clearly and definitively the problem of the Araucanía.

**Repair Efforts:** In response to Mapuche demands, the Chilean State has undertaken several initiatives to improve their living conditions and repair the damage experienced by the members of the Mapuche people. Among these initiatives is the establishment of a public agency dedicated to the situation of indigenous peoples (CONADI), creating Origins Program, with a goal to provide significant resources to implement remedial action in various fields (housing, health, land, etc.), and established forums for expression of their demands. The field of education has promoted intercultural bilingual education, and special scholarships have been created to support higher education of young Mapuche.

Instructions: On the page above information about the history of injustices suffered by the Mapuche people is provided. Also mentioned are the efforts made by the Chilean State to repair the harm. We would like now for you to write in the space below, your opinion about these issues, answering the following questions: How do you evaluate the repair efforts of the Chilean State to address the injustices suffered by the Mapuche people? How do you evaluate the role that the State has played in this conflict? What does the subject of human rights mean to you personally? Please be as specific as possible in your answer.
APPENDIX C
INFORMATION ABOUT THE POLITICAL VIOLENCE

The political crisis in Chile between late 60s and early 70s led to the military coup on September 11, 1973. From that time, the country was ruled for 17 years by a military regime, which committed serious human rights violations, including execution, disappearances, and torture of its opponents. The country only returned to democracy in 1990. Then President Patricio Aylwin established the Commission Rettig to determine the magnitude of the human rights violations. The final report of the Commission claimed that 3,428 people were killed (executed or disappeared) and blamed the National Intelligence Directorate (DINA) for many of those deaths.

Subsequently in 2003, the Valech Commission was established to study the cases of torture under the same regime. Their report concluded that torture and detention were widespread. They were used as tools of political control by the authorities. The report further argues that the occurrence of torture had the implicit support of the judiciary.

**Inoculation Manipulation:** The gravity of the human rights violations motivated many families to organize to petition the State of Chile to search for truth, the proper administration of justice,
and adequate payment of reparations. However, in many cases the answers were not sufficiently timely or effective. For example, the Rettig Commission focused on cases resulting in death, postponing the issue of victims of torture for 10 more years (until Valech Committee was formed). The calls for reparation for victims and their families have only been partially addressed in some cases because it has been very difficult to prove that a person is eligible for compensation (e.g., because it is very difficult to prove that someone was fired from a job for political reasons). In other cases, compensation is insufficient to address the physical, psychological, and material harms that victims experienced. The most frustrating thing has been the lack of progress in clarifying cases of those who were detained or disappeared, which is an issue that still persists today. Currently, there is a lack of information for over 1,000 cases despite persistent demands for truth from their families.

**Repair Efforts:** Since Chile's return to democracy, successive governments have made significant efforts to address the aftermath of pain and significant psychological and social damage that human rights violations have had on victims and their families. President Aylwin apologized to victims on behalf of the Chilean State at the time the Rettig Commission’s report was issued in 1991. Since that time, a number of laws regarding reparations were developed to compensate material and symbolical loses of the victims and their families. In the late 90s, a Roundtable brought together representatives of the armed forces and the families of the victims for the first time, leading to a joint statement that recognized the painful past and committed effort by all stakeholders to prevent such a violent break from political coexistence in Chile again. These efforts, combined with the actions of the judicial system have made important advances to pursue truth, justice, and reparation. In addition, previous joint action in an effort to symbolically recognize what happened built memorials and a museum of memory.
Instructions: The information provided on the previous page presents the history of serious human rights violations that occurred in Chile during the military regime. The efforts made by the State to repair the damage to the victims and their families were also discussed. We would like you now to write in the space below your opinion about these issues, answering the following questions: How do you evaluate the repair efforts made by Chilean State to victims of human rights violations and their families? How do you evaluate the role the Chilean State played in this conflict? What does the subject of human rights mean to you personally? Please be as specific as possible in your answer.
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