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Abstract

Although diversity approaches attempt to foster inclusion, one size may not fit all. In five studies, African Americans ($N = 1,316$), who varied in strength of racial identification, contemplated interviewing at a company with a multicultural or colorblind approach. Participants in the multicultural condition anticipated pressure to be prototypical group members relative to colorblind and control conditions. Only weakly identified participants reacted to this pressure, experiencing more anxiety and inauthenticity in the multicultural relative to colorblind (not control) company. Strongly identified participants experienced less anxiety and inauthenticity in the multicultural relative to colorblind and control companies. Inauthenticity among weakly identified participants was apparent in self-descriptions and linked with worse hiring outcomes in multicultural relative to colorblind and control contexts. Despite predictions, there were no self-stereotyping effects. Diversity approaches that make some group members more comfortable may prove simultaneously constraining for others, highlighting the complexity in how diversity approaches affect individuals.
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Despite longstanding efforts to reduce employment discrimination in the U.S., racial minorities continue to be underrepresented and report feeling unwelcome in many workplaces (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019; Sinclair & Kunda, 1999; Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). To create a more welcoming climate, many companies implement diversity initiatives or statements affirming the importance of group differences (Dobbin, 2009), also known as a multicultural approach. For example, Bank of America (2014) notes, “At Bank of America, we realize the power of our people and value our differences — in thought, style, sexual orientation, gender identity, culture, ethnicity and experience — recognizing that our diversity makes us a stronger company.” Although this approach to diversity may create a welcoming climate, highlighting group differences could prove problematic for some racial minorities. For instance, Erica Baker Joy (2014), a former Google employee, documented her experience navigating workplace expectations in a blog post: “I am constantly making micro-evaluations about whether or not my actions will be attributed to my being ‘different’… I have to navigate the expectation of stereotypical behavior and disappointment when it doesn't happen (e.g. my not being the ‘sassy black woman’).”

Indeed, when a group is underrepresented in a particular context, members of that group often grapple with the expectation that they will serve as a representative or prototype of their group (Bell & Nkomo, 2003; Kanter, 1977; Sekaquaptewa, Waldman, & Thompson, 2007). This is particularly the case in work contexts, where there are strong impression management demands. Because cues in the environment can send messages about expected behavior (Sinclair, Lowery, Hardin, & Colangelo, 2005), we suggest that diversity approaches, such as
multiculturalism and colorblindness, may also send cues about how racial minorities in particular should present themselves. The current research explores how the fit between organizational diversity approaches and individual differences in racial identification interact to predict authenticity and related outcomes among racial minorities. As environmental fit is central to motivation and the self (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017), understanding the implications of organizational approaches to diversity for different individuals can provide significant insights into the experiences of underrepresented groups.

**Diversity Approaches**

Diversity approaches (or philosophies, ideologies, or strategies) are sets of ideas about how people from different backgrounds should interact, relate, and accommodate each other (Plaut, 2002). These approaches come in many forms, but two of the most prominent and well-understood approaches are multiculturalism and colorblindness (Gündemir, Martin, & Homan, 2019; Plaut, 2002). Multiculturalism highlights racial and ethnic differences, arguing that these differences enrich society and should be celebrated (Hahn, Banchefsky, Park, & Judd, 2015; Plaut, 2002). Colorblindness instead deemphasizes differences, focusing on individual traits or similarities across people, considering this commonality a source of strength.

---

1 Colorblindness has been defined in a variety of ways, including a focus on individual differences or uniqueness (Gündemir, Dovidio, Homan, & Dreu, 2016; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010b) or on equality (Apfelbaum, Stephens, & Reagans, 2016), but we will focus on downplaying as opposed to accentuating differences.

2 Some scholars have defined multiculturalism as an approach that values diverse backgrounds (e.g., Berry, 2001) and colorblindness as one that devalues diversity, perhaps even ignoring race and ethnicity as a category altogether (e.g., Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006). However, this definition can create a valence or prejudice confound (Hahn et al., 2015). It is important to distinguish between the goal of valuing diverse identities as opposed to the approach prescribed for navigating difference (Hahn et al., 2015), and the latter is our focus. For example, a society or organization can express a commitment to diversity,
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The dominant social psychological narrative contends that multiculturalism imparts important psychological benefits to minorities relative to colorblindness (e.g., Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). Not only do minorities prefer multiculturalism over colorblindness (Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007), but organizational multicultural approaches also facilitate engagement and trust among minority employees (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008; but see Wilton et al., 2020). For example, African Americans contemplating employment at a racially homogeneous company experience fewer identity-related concerns and higher trust when the company has a multicultural as opposed to a colorblind recruitment brochure (Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008). Similarly, the more White employees at companies endorse multiculturalism, the more minorities in those companies are psychologically engaged in their work (Plaut et al., 2009), and the reverse is true for colorblindness. Because minorities have chronic and well-justified concerns about belonging in domains where they have been historically devalued, instilling a sense of belonging in these environments can help overcome these barriers (Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002).

The Impact of Diversity Approaches on State Authenticity

While still advocating a colorblind approach that downplays intergroup difference for the sake of harmony. Indeed, a large majority of organizations in the US express a commitment to diversity (Dobbin, 2009; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006), but downplaying difference is nonetheless a common approach (Plaut, 2002), suggesting that these ideas can exist alongside each other. Indeed, the prescription to emphasize versus downplay group differences is one of the essential components distinguishing multiculturalism versus colorblindness in a great deal of research (Gündemir et al., 2019) and is the approach we will take in the present research.
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The benefits of multiculturalism dovetail with a broader research literature in the social identity threat tradition showing that many cues in an environment, such as representation of members of one’s group, can signal belonging and fit (Kirby, Tabak, Ilac, & Cheryan, 2020; Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007; Steele et al., 2002; Walton & Cohen, 2007), as well as reduce concerns about discrimination (Brady, Kaiser, Major, & Kirby, 2015; Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2014; Kaiser et al., 2013; Kirby, Kaiser, & Major, 2015). Although the importance of belonging has received a great deal of attention (see Baumeister & Leary, 1995), state authenticity has rarely been examined as a component in facilitating inclusive workplaces, despite being theorized as distinct from belonging and related outcomes (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017). State authenticity is “the sense or feeling that one is currently in alignment with one’s true or genuine self; that one is being their real self” (Sedikides, Slabu, Lenton, & Thomaes, 2017). People who feel authentic at work experience increased well-being, work engagement, job satisfaction, and performance (Ménard & Brunet, 2011; Metin, Taris, Peeters, van Beek, & Van den Bosch, 2016). To achieve state authenticity, one’s sense of “fit,” or the matching of characteristics of the environment with internal characteristics of the self, may be crucial (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017).

Because racial minorities experience less fit in majority White environments (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017), one might expect minorities to feel more authentic in a multicultural than colorblind context. However, authenticity depends in large part upon the fit between organizational and personal values or norms (i.e., “goal fit”). Because multiculturalism and colorblindness prescribe different models for navigating diversity, the appeal of these approaches may depend on a particular person’s values.
In particular, individuals’ level of group identification may be critical in understanding the experience of authenticity in multicultural and colorblind contexts. Although group identification consists of several dimensions (Leach et al., 2008), we focus on centrality, or the extent to which a particular group membership is chronically central to one’s sense of self (Leach et al., 2008), because it is relatively stable rather than responsive to situational context (Major, Quinton, & Mccoy, 2002). In line with social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), the self can involve a range of identities including both the individual (or personal) self and group (or collective) identities. Whereas strongly identified group members tend to prioritize their group identity, those weakly identified are less comfortable prioritizing the group and are more likely to embrace the individual self. This latter point is particularly true if their group is underrepresented or low status (Barreto & Ellemers, 2000; Ellemers et al., 2002; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997).

For instance, when women’s devalued group identity is made salient, those who are weakly identified with their gender group display pro-male biases (Brady et al., 2015; Derks, van Laar, Ellemers, & de Groot, 2011), a reaction that might suggest discomfort with the focus on their identity. Additionally, people report reduced comfort, well-being, and authenticity, as well as increased identity-based anxiety, when imagining or being in environments that are incompatible with their group identity (Knight & Haslam, 2010; Ng, Morton, & Kirby, 2020; Schmader & Sedikides, 2017). Accordingly, international students who are weakly identified

---

3 We will henceforth use the term “identity” to refer to group-based identities, as group identification is the focus of this research. Although the individual self is also an aspect of identity, we will only use the term “individual self” in referring to this construct in order to draw a clear distinction.
with their home culture report less comfort and a weaker sense of belonging with their surroundings when completing a test in a space designated specifically for international students (Ng et al., 2020). Conversely, international students who are strongly identified with their home culture report more comfort and belonging when completing a test in an international student space.

These findings suggest that environments that make group identity salient (or focus on group differences, as in the case of multiculturalism) may not be a good fit for those who are weakly identified with the group, thus reducing authenticity. Weakly identified group members might instead feel more authentic in environments with a colorblind approach, as this approach downplays group identity. In contrast, those strongly identified with their group may find multiculturalism compatible with their sense of self, increasing authenticity at work, but may find colorblindness to be less compatible. Additionally, this lack of fit may translate to increased state anxiety (i.e., “a transitory emotion characterized by physiological arousal and consciously perceived feelings of apprehension, dread, and tension”; Endler & Kocovski, 2001; Spielberger, 1966), as trait inauthenticity is associated with negative well-being outcomes (Kernis & Goldman, 2004; Sheldon, Ryan, Rawstorne, & Ilardi, 1997; Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, & Joseph, 2008).

The Role of Group Identification on Impression Management Behaviors

Diversity approaches that are incompatible with one’s sense of self (an individual or a group identity focus) may further lead to pressure to present oneself inauthentically. In the workplace, underrepresented minorities are often seen as representatives of their group by others and expected to behave in ways that may feel inauthentic, in order to confirm others’
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stereotypical beliefs about their group (Athanassiades, 1974; Kanter, 1977). Faced with this pressure, minorities do sometimes behave inauthentically in order to achieve relevant goals or comply with situational norms (Kirby, Rego, & Kaiser, 2020; Pickett, Bonner, & Coleman, 2002; Sinclair & Huntsinger, 2006; Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977); also see Baumeister, 1982; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Schlenker, 1980), through strategies such as self-stereotyping, or applying perceivers’ cultural stereotypes to themselves (Hogg & Turner, 1987; Sinclair & Huntsinger, 2006).

These authenticity pressures may disproportionately impact those weakly identified with their group because they are especially likely to engage in identity management strategies to comply with contextual expectations (e.g., emphasizing or downplaying group identity; Barreto & Ellemers, 2000; Ellemers et al., 2002; Pickett et al., 2002; Spears et al., 1997). This is particularly true when their behavior is accountable (Ellemers, Barreto, & Spears, 1999), like in a workplace, and when neither group identity nor the individual self are under threat. Under these circumstances, they feel free to strategically assert group identity or the individual self, depending on what is contextually appropriate. For example, when learning that their group is perceived positively, weakly identified members assert their group identity through increased self-stereotyping (Spears et al., 1997). Strongly identified group members, on the other hand, are relatively stable, behaving authentically and asserting their identity regardless of whether the group is perceived negatively or positively. Thus, multicultural and colorblind approaches may send messages about identity-based expectations for minorities, and weakly identified minorities may be most likely to alter their behavior to comply.

Present Research
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We present five experiments with online community samples of African Americans to examine how multicultural and colorblind approaches to organizational diversity shape our three key measures for strongly and weakly racially identified African Americans in a hiring context: Prototypicality pressure, authenticity, and anxiety. We also examine their impact on two secondary measures exploring downstream implications: Self-stereotyping and hiring desirability. Although some research has examined affective reactions to different diversity approaches (e.g., Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008), this is the first to examine fit between diversity approaches and individual characteristics and its impact on authenticity in particular.

Hypothesis 1. A company that advocates managing diversity through multiculturalism will elicit greater prototypicality pressure relative to a company advocating colorblindness or no particular strategy (control condition), regardless of participants’ level of racial identification (Experiment 1). We expect similarities across the colorblind and control company contexts because colorblindness has historically been the default approach in American institutions (Plaut, 2002; Schofield, 1986; Shweder, 1991).

Hypothesis 2. Among weakly racially identified minorities, a multicultural company will lead to greater anxiety and less authenticity relative to a colorblind or neutral control company (Experiments 1, 3, 4 and 5). Conversely, among strongly racially identified minorities, a multicultural company will lead to less anxiety and more authenticity relative to a colorblind or neutral control company (see Figure 1 for a visualization of predicted authenticity results).

Hypothesis 3. We also examine potential consequences of reduced feelings of workplace authenticity. With respect to strategic self-stereotyping, we predict that among weakly racially
identified minorities, a multicultural company will increase strategic self-stereotyping relative to a colorblind company or a control group because weakly identified minorities are more likely to engage in identity management strategies (Experiments 2-5). Because racial minorities tend to reduce self-stereotyping in the workplace by default (i.e., code switching; Debose, 1992), it is not clear if they will further reduce self-stereotyping in the colorblind relative to control condition. We also predicted that strongly identified minorities would not adjust their levels of self-stereotyping in response to the diversity approaches because they tend to express their group identity regardless of strategic concerns (see Figure 2 for a visualization of predicted self-stereotyping results).

**Hypothesis 4.** Finally, we predicted that reduced feelings of authenticity and increased anxiety would leak out in professional contexts, leading those participants to make worse impressions and experience worse hiring outcomes (Experiment 5). In other words, at a multicultural company, weakly racially identified minorities would be judged as less desirable applicants relative to those in the colorblind or control company. Conversely, those strongly identified would be judged as more desirable applicants at a multicultural relative to a colorblind or control company. Table 1 shows an overview of our predictions for all measures.

**Meta-analytic approach.** To simplify the presentation and determine the overall, cumulative pattern of results, we conducted a meta-analysis across all five studies. Although concerns about replicability and statistical power in social psychology and other fields (Fraley & Vazire, 2014) can make it more difficult to study racial minority and other underrepresented groups while ensuring adequate statistical power (see Cortland et al., 2017 for a discussion of this issue), a meta-analytic approach can increase the confidence in findings. This is especially important when studying complex individual differences in minority populations, which are so
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critical to understanding the identity concerns experienced by minorities (e.g., Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Consistent with recommendations (Goh, Hall, & Rosenthal, 2016; Lakens & Etz, 2017), we included all studies we conducted testing the research questions.

Overview of Method

Because the study procedures were almost identical across experiments, we describe the method in full only for Experiment 1 (but see online supplement for full details - we have disclosed all measures, manipulations, and exclusion criteria for all studies). For each subsequent experiment, we give a brief overview of its goals and describe any substantive changes that were made to the procedure (e.g., the addition of any key dependent variables). Table 2 contains a summary of this information, including sample characteristics and information about which dependent variables were included in each experiment.

Experiment 1

In the first experiment, we examined how multicultural and colorblind approaches to organizational diversity shape prototypicality pressure, authenticity, anxiety, and how that might differ among strongly and weakly racially identified minorities. African Americans imagined interviewing at a company that advocated managing diversity either through multiculturalism or colorblindness or one that gave no information about the diversity approach (control condition) and then responded about prototypicality pressure in that context, as well as anticipated anxiety and authenticity. We predicted that weakly and strongly identified minorities would be equally likely to perceive multiculturalism (compared to colorblindness) as producing prototypicality pressure but that weakly identified minorities would be more likely to have a negative reaction to these concerns, feeling increased anxiety and inauthenticity in a multicultural context. We expected the reverse for those strongly identified with their group, that they would have a
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positive reaction to multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, consistent with past findings (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).

Participants. 408 African American visitors to the Project Implicit website (https://implicit.harvard.edu), who volunteered to participate in implicit social cognition research, were randomly assigned to complete the present study from a pool of available studies. Five were excluded because 10% or more of their IAT trials were faster than 300 milliseconds. Of the remaining 403 participants, 256 reached the end and completed the main independent and dependent measures (177 women, 79 men; mean age = 34.49, SD = 13.75; 95% had completed some college or a higher level of education). This is consistent with Project Implicit completion rates that typically range from 50 to 70 percent. To maximize statistical power, we retained partial data for those not fully completing the study, resulting in varying degrees of freedom in analyses (as in subsequent studies as well). Accounting for attrition, sensitivity analyses showed that we had adequate power (π = .80) to detect a slope difference by condition (i.e., an interaction between racial identification and condition) of β = 0.38 for authenticity. Full details of all sensitivity analyses are included in Table S1 of the online supplement.

Procedure. Participants first read a recruitment brochure from a consulting company called CCG Business Consulting (modeled after brochures from Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008, but adhering to the operationalizations used by Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011; see online supplement) and were instructed to consider working for CCG. The diversity approaches were manipulated via the content of the brochure. In the colorblind condition, the brochure emphasized that the company’s ethnically diverse workforce should embrace their similarities and that their race, ethnicity, and culture are immaterial. In the multicultural condition, the brochure instead encouraged participants to
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embrace their differences and emphasized that their race, ethnicity and culture are an asset. We modified the original manipulations from Purdie-Vaughns and colleagues (2008) to make the colorblind and multicultural statements as parallel as possible\(^4\) – only 7% of the words differed across the multicultural and colorblind conditions. In the control brochure, no information was given about the company’s diversity approach, but all other information about CCG was identical.

Participants next imagined that they were interviewing at CCG and responded to 6 items assessing prototypicality pressure (adapted from Sekaquaptewa et al, 2007; e.g., “CCG would be more likely to hire me if I conformed to their expectations about my racial/ethnic group”; \(\alpha = .82\); see online supplement for full scale items), 4 items on state authenticity developed specifically for this study (e.g., “I would be my true self at the CCG interview”; \(\alpha = .84\)), and 3 items about state anxiety in the interview scenario developed specifically for this study (e.g., “I would feel anxious at the CCG interview”; \(\alpha = .77\); see online supplement for results of the factor analysis). Scale endpoints were 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree), and the measures were scored so that higher values indicated greater anxiety, greater authenticity, and

\(^4\) The multicultural condition used by Purdie-Vaughns and colleagues (2008) read, “we believe that embracing our diversity enriches our culture,” but we adjusted the manipulation to, “we train our ethnically diverse workforce to embrace their differences.” This adjustment made it more parallel to the colorblind condition (“we train our ethnically diverse workforce to embrace their similarities”), which reflected the present study’s focus on group differences as opposed to similarities. We also focused exclusively on racial, ethnic, and cultural differences in the manipulation, rather than diversity more broadly, to avoid a possible conceptual overlap with diversity approaches that celebrate individual differences and uniqueness (Gündemir et al., 2016).
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greater prototypicality pressure. They also completed an Implicit Association Test because Project Implicit volunteers visit the website to learn about their implicit attitudes. Because the measure was not central to hypotheses in Experiment 1 and for the sake of brevity, it is only discussed in the online supplement – there was no effect of diversity condition for this measure in any studies.

Next, to examine whether participants’ level of racial identification would moderate how they responded to diversity condition, they completed the four items of the centrality subscale of the collective self-esteem scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale; α = .77. Although some research has clustered together several identification dimensions (see Leach et al., 2008 for a discussion) rather than focusing on the particular subcomponent of interest (Kaiser & Spalding, 2015; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997), we focused exclusively on centrality. This was important for two reasons: (a) To ensure that our moderator variable was distinct from one of our primary dependent measures, self-stereotyping, which is sometimes considered a component of identification (Leach et al., 2008; see Derks et al., 2011; Derks, van Laar, Ellemers, & Raghoe, 2015; Russell Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997), (2) Unlike other components of identification, the centrality dimension is theorized to be stable across situations (Major et al., 2002; Sellers et al., 1998), so is particularly appropriate as an individual difference measure.

5 An exploratory factor analysis using varimax rotation with maximum likelihood estimation showed that anxiety, authenticity, and prototypicality pressure loaded onto three separate factors. Full statistical analyses are available in Table S2 of the online supplement.
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We measured identification at the end of the study and after the manipulation to facilitate our cover story around the hiring scenario and avoid making our hypotheses transparent. In line with theorizing (Sellers et al., 1998), diversity condition did not affect participants’ level of racial identification in this study, $F(2,256) = 0.19, p = .830$, or any other studies.

Finally, to determine whether participants interpreted the manipulation as intended, they responded to the following item: “To what extent does CCG focus on the differences between different racial and ethnic groups?” (1 = Focuses not at all, 2 = Focuses slightly, 3 = Focuses moderately, 4 = Focuses a great deal).

Experiment 2

In Study 2, we examined the potential consequences of reduced feelings of workplace authenticity. Specifically, we expected that weakly identified African Americans’ concerns about being authentic in multicultural organizations may reflect perceived pressure to behave in line with stereotypes of their group. Thus, Experiment 2 examined whether diversity approaches would lead participants, particularly those who are weakly identified, to adjust their self-stereotyping in workplace contexts (Hypothesis 3). Specifically, we predicted that among weakly racially identified minorities, a multicultural company would increase strategic self-stereotyping relative to a colorblind company or a control group because weakly identified minorities are more likely to engage in identity management strategies.

Explained another way, under neutral circumstances, the stronger a person identifies with their group, the more likely they are to assert that identity through strategies such as self-stereotyping; however, this pattern can change when impression management concerns are salient. Because those who are weakly identified are particularly likely to respond to impression management concerns (Ellemers et al., 2002; Pickett et al., 2002; Spears et al., 1997) they might
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self-stereotype at similar levels as those strongly identified in the multicultural relative to colorblind context.

We also included a White American sample in this study to examine whether diversity approaches create identity-related pressure exclusively for racial minorities. Because Whites typically feel excluded from diversity structures (Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2014; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011), we did not expect that they would interpret multicultural and colorblind approaches as a model for how they should behave. These results are only presented in the online supplement.

We did not measure authenticity, anxiety, or prototypicality pressure in this experiment to keep the study length manageable for our volunteer participants. We also did not include a control condition in this study. Aspects of the methodology not described in the previous experiment are described below.

Participants. 1,487 White and 136 African American visitors to the Project Implicit website participated in this experiment. Further details about participants and results for White participants are described in the online supplement.

Additional Measures

Activity self-stereotyping. After reading the CCG brochure, participants imagined that they were interviewing at CCG and had been asked to complete a set of questionnaires for the organization. The questions ostensibly assessed their personality and interests, but were actually measuring self-stereotyping. They first responded to questions such as “How much do you enjoy the following activities?” on a 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely) scale about 35 activities and interests (Steele & Aronson, 1995), 9 of which were considered stereotypical of African Americans (α = .75; rap/hip-hop, football, sports, basketball, talking, gospel music, physical
education, athletics, track; see online supplement for information about pilot testing of items) and 26 of which served as filler items.

**Trait self-stereotyping.** A second self-stereotyping measure was embedded with stereotypically African American traits used in previous research (Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, & Kraus, 1995; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000), as well as filler items. Participants responded about the extent to which 32 positive and negative traits described them, of which five were positive stereotypes of African Americans (streetwise, humorous, athletic, musical, emotionally expressive; $\alpha = .56$; see online supplement for information about pilot testing of items). Scale endpoints were 1 (*Not at all descriptive of me*) to 7 (*Very descriptive of me*).

**Experiment 3**

In an effort to replicate the findings from the first two experiments and to demonstrate these effects within a single study, Experiment 3 used a new sample to test effects on anxiety, authenticity, and self-stereotyping. We added a supplement to our previous measures of self-stereotyping, which is described below.

**Participants.** We recruited 352 African American Amazon Mechanical Turk workers through Turkprime, an online crowdsourcing platform that allows for recruitment of participants with specified demographic criteria (see Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2017, for more information), in exchange for US $2.05. Further details are included in the online supplement.

**Additional Measures**

**Interest in Black CCG Network.** As a supplement to our previous measures of self-stereotyping, participants responded to “How interested would you be in the following CCG organizations?” on a 1 (*Not at all interested*) to 5 (*Extremely interested*) scale. Although we were only interested in their response to “the Black CCG Network,” potential organizations included
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Experiment 4

Due to unexpected findings in Experiment 3 with a sample from Mechanical Turk, we returned to a Project Implicit Sample in Experiment 4 to examine whether we would replicate the effects of Experiments 1 and 2 with participants recruited the same way as the original samples. The methodology was otherwise identical to Experiment 3 and included 368 African American participants. Further details are included in the online supplement.

Experiment 5

Experiment 5 examined another potential consequence of the mismatch between multicultural contexts and those weakly identified with their racial group (and colorblind contexts and those strongly identified): Negative hiring outcomes. Participants again considered employment at a multicultural relative to a colorblind or control company, but instead wrote an open-ended essay describing themselves. We then coded essays for evidence of authenticity and anxiety and asked an independent sample of participant raters to read the essays and indicate their willingness to hire each applicant. We describe any new methodological information below.

Method

Participants. 204 African American visitors to the Project Implicit website participated in this experiment. Further details are included in the online supplement.

Procedure. After reading a CCG recruitment brochure, participants were told that CCG would like to know more about them and that their responses could inform the types of events organized by Human Resources in the future. They responded to an essay prompt about their
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favorite activities and interests, as well as their personality characteristics, which we later coded for authenticity and anxiety.

**Authenticity essay coding.** Four research assistants (1 African American, 1 Asian American, 1 White, 1 White/Asian biracial) coded the essays for authenticity on a 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely) scale: “This person is being authentic”; “This person is being genuine.” Coder responses had moderate to good interrater reliability (ICC = .75; Koo & Li, 2016) and were averaged to create a measure of authenticity for each essay. Coders were blind to all hypotheses and the experimental condition of the essay writer, but, because racial identity is generally visible when forming impressions of others, we informed them that all essays were written by African American participants.

**Anxiety essay coding.** Two research assistants (1 Asian American, 1 White) coded the essays for anxiety on a 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely) scale: “This person seems anxious”; “This person seems nervous”; “This person seems comfortable” (reverse coded). Coder responses for each essay had poor to moderate interrater reliability (ICC = .46; see Koo & Li, 2016, for guidelines) and were averaged to create a measure of anxiety for each essay. Coders were blind to all hypotheses and the experimental condition of the essay writer, but, because racial identity is generally visible when forming impressions of others, we informed them that all essays were written by African American participants.

**Hiring outcome ratings.** We recruited a separate sample of 125 University of Washington undergraduate students (54 White, 32 Asian, 20 Multiracial, 6 Latino, 4 Black, 2 American Indian, 2 Other, and 5 unspecified; 72 female, 50 male, 3 unspecified) to read the essays and rate the extent to which they saw the essay writer as a desirable job applicant. Participants received extra course credit in their psychology courses in exchange for
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participation. The raters were told to imagine that they were a hiring manager and to read several short paragraphs in which people described themselves. Because racial identity is generally visible in hiring interviews, we made this information available to raters in order to increase ecological validity. They learned that the essays were divided into demographic subgroups and the candidates they had been assigned to evaluate were African Americans between the age of 18 and 40 of any gender.

Each rater was randomly assigned to read a subset of 40 different essays, and they were blind to all hypotheses and condition of the essay writer. Randomization was constrained so that each essay would be rated an approximately equal number of times. Due to missing data, each essay was rated between 6 and 10 times ($M = 8.89$). Raters responded to the following questions on a 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely) scale: How likely would you be to invite this person for an interview?; How likely would you be to hire this person?; How well would this person fit at the company?

The rater responses for each essay were averaged to create a measure of hiring desirability ($\alpha = .99$) for each essay. We could not run interrater reliabilities because all 125 participants rated a different subset of essays (in line with Kaiser & Miller., 2001), resulting in substantial missing data for every rater. However, the relatively large number of raters for each essay (approximately nine) helps promote reliability and more certainty in the overall impressions reported.

Results

We present meta-analyzed results when possible, but some key dependent measures could not be meta-analyzed because they were only measured once: Prototypicality pressure and hiring desirability. In these cases, we present the original moderated regression analyses. After
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discussing manipulation checks and our analytic strategy, we first present analyses for (1) Key measures analyzed individually (prototypicality pressure), (2) Key measures aggregated meta-analytically (authenticity and anxiety), (3) Secondary measures that explored downstream implications of the key findings: Self-stereotyping (aggregated meta-analytically) and hiring desirability (analyzed individually). All individual study results are fully described in tables, figures, and in the online supplement, and all data sets are available at https://osf.io/8nh2b/?view_only=b058e48b9ecc4fb791c148d7c118f8f2.

Manipulation Checks

Across all studies, participants perceived a significantly greater focus on group differences in the multicultural than in the colorblind condition, $p_s < .001$, and in the control condition, $p_s \leq .001$, when it was included (Studies 1, 3, 4, and 5). However, participants did not perceive a difference in how much the control and colorblind companies focused on group differences, $p_s > .092$.

Analytic Strategy

Moderated regression. To test the main hypotheses for individual studies, two dummy coded variables for diversity condition were entered into the first step of a hierarchical linear regression model in which multiculturalism, the reference group, was always coded as 0. Thus, one variable compared the multiculturalism condition to the control condition (coded as 1), if included in the study, and the other variable compared the multiculturalism to the colorblind condition (coded as 1). Centered racial identification scores were also entered into the first step of the model. All two-way interactions were entered into the second step. If the $R$-squared change ($\Delta R^2$) corresponded to $p < .05$ for a step of the regression model, we followed up with simple effects analyses for the highest order significant interactions using the PROCESS macro
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(Hayes, 2013). Thus, for any interactions that were significant ($p < .05$), we first broke down interactions for the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison. Next, we broke down interactions for the multicultural relative to control comparison. We also conducted a parallel regression analysis with the control condition as the reference group (to test the comparison between the colorblind and control group). For the sake of simplicity, we only discuss this comparison when it is statistically significant.

To conduct the simple effects analyses reported in Table 4, we used the Johnson-Neyman technique (Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006). Rather than setting pre-defined values to represent “strong” and “weak” levels of racial identification (Aiken & West, 1991), the Johnson-Neyman technique determines the values of the moderator (racial identification) at which a significant difference across conditions emerges ($p = .05$), if at all. A benefit of this approach is that it provides a more complete description of the divergence of the slopes (i.e., simple effects), both above and below mean levels of the moderator variable, rather than restricting the description to probing at single data points (e.g., +/- 1 $SD$ of the mean). We also conducted the simple effects analyses described below as part of the internal meta-analysis.

**Meta-Analytic Strategy.** In the internal meta-analysis, we examined state anxiety, authenticity, and self-stereotyping. We first ran a meta-analysis that compared the aggregate slopes (Pearson's $r$ converted to Fisher's $Zr$; see Lipsey & Wilson, 2001) for the multicultural, colorblind, and control conditions to determine whether there was an overall interaction effect on anxiety, authenticity, and self-stereotyping. Next, we conducted simple effects meta-analyses separately for those weakly and strongly identified with their racial group for the dependent variables showing a significant interaction.
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To calculate effect sizes for the simple effects meta-analyses, we defined “strong” and “weak” racial identification, respectively, as those who moderately agreed (6 on a 7 point scale) and moderately disagreed (2 on a 7 point scale) that their racial identity was important to them. Although it is customary to define these values as +/- 1 standard deviation of the moderator mean, this would have led to slightly different definitions of “strong” and “weak” identification across the studies. We instead chose static values that were a reasonable conceptual reflection of weak and strong identification, as recommended by Aiken and West (1991). Importantly, participant data points extended even beyond these chosen values when examining predicted slopes (see Figure 3).

We converted the unstandardized regression coefficients from these simple effects to Cohen’s $d$ using Lipsey & Wilson’s (2001) meta-analysis effect size calculator, which also requires the standard deviation of the dependent measure and the $n$ for each condition as an input. When there were multiple measures for an experiment (e.g., both a trait and an activity self-stereotyping measure), we combined those into one effect size, in line with recommendations by Borenstein and colleagues (2009), to ensure that each effect size represented an independent sample. All meta-analyses were conducted with the MeanES.sps and MetaF.sps SPSS macros (Wilson, 2005) using method of moments. Because the methods were identical across studies and we only sought to describe the effect size of the present studies (see Goh et al., 2016), we used fixed effects models.

---

$^6$ To ensure the coefficients are comparable, this approach requires using the same independent variables across all regressions. Because one study did not have a control group, we first ran regressions to obtain coefficients for the multiculturalism vs colorblind comparison, leaving out the control groups for all experiments. Next, we ran the usual regression models for comparisons to the control group in Experiments 1, 3, 4, and 5.
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**Does Multiculturalism Create Prototypicality Pressure?**

In Experiment 1, we anticipated that participants would perceive more race prototypicality pressure in the multicultural company context compared to colorblind and control companies, with no moderation by racial identification. This would show that participants interpret the approaches in similar ways. In a hierarchical moderated regression analysis, a main effect emerged between the multiculturalism condition relative to colorblindness and control. Specifically, participants perceived more prototypicality pressure in the multicultural company context ($M = 3.93$) compared to colorblind ($M = 3.13$ and control companies ($M = 3.13$). These effects were not moderated by racial identification (see Table 3), which suggests that the multicultural approach to diversity management heightened prototypicality pressure among participants irrespective of racial identification.

**How Do Multiculturalism and Colorblindness Impact Anxiety and Authenticity?**

We next examined the anxiety and authenticity dependent measures in an internal meta-analysis. We predicted that for weakly racially identified minorities, a multicultural company would lead to greater anxiety and less authenticity relative to a colorblind and control company. Conversely, we anticipated that strongly racially identified minorities would feel less anxious and more authentic at a multicultural company relative to a colorblind and control company. As shown in Table 4, our interaction hypotheses were confirmed for anxiety and authenticity in 3 out of 4 studies (Studies 1, 4, and 5, but not Study 3).

The meta-analytic results bore out these predictions as well, showing that the relationship between racial identification and authenticity, $Q(2)_{B} = 13.90$, $p = .001$, and anxiety, $Q(2)_{B} = 21.00$, $p < .001$, differed by condition (see Table 5 for pairwise breakdowns). The simple effects confirmed predictions (see Tables 6 and 7), with the exception of the pattern of the control condition contrasts. Specifically, strongly and weakly identified African Americans had
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opposing reactions to diversity approaches, with those weakly identified feeling more authenticity and less anxiety in a colorblind context relative to control and multicultural context. However, those strongly identified felt more authenticity and less anxiety in a multicultural relative to control and colorblind context. Figure 3 shows the typical pattern of the authenticity and anxiety results, using the data from Experiment 1.

Taking all results together so far, participants in the multicultural condition detected more pressure to be prototypical group members relative to those in the colorblind and control condition, regardless of levels of racial identification. However, only weakly identified African Americans responded to this pressure, showing more comfort in the colorblind than multicultural and control contexts. Strongly identified participants were instead unaffected by prototypicality pressure, experiencing more comfort in the multicultural relative to colorblind and control conditions.

What Are the Downstream Implications of Increased Authenticity and Anxiety?

Self-stereotyping. We next examined the self-stereotyping measures meta-analytically, as one potential outcome of increased authenticity and anxiety. We predicted that among weakly (but not strongly) racially identified minorities, a multicultural company would increase strategic self-stereotyping relative to a colorblind company because weakly identified minorities are susceptible to engaging in identity management strategies. As shown in Table 4, our hypotheses were only confirmed for self-stereotyping in 2 out of 4 studies (Studies 2 and 5, but not Studies 3 and 4), and the predictions did not ultimately bear out in the internal meta-analysis (see Tables 5-7). Specifically, the relationship between racial identification and self-stereotyping did not significantly differ by condition, $Q(2) = 1.61$, $p = .446$, so we did not further probe the simple effects.
**Hiring desirability (Experiment 5).** Experiment 5 examined another potential consequence of lack of fit between diversity approaches and racial identification: Negative hiring outcomes. We expected that in the multicultural condition, weakly identified participants would be seen as less desirable applicants than those in the colorblind and control conditions. This would happen because their anxiety and inauthenticity would leak out in their self-descriptions. Our regression analysis showed that this hypothesis was confirmed for both the multicultural relative to colorblind, $b = 0.66$, $SE = 0.27$, $p = .015$, and control comparisons, $b = 0.78$, $SE = 0.30$, $t(183) = 2.26$, $p = .010$ (see Table 3 for overall interaction statistics)\(^7\). The interaction for the colorblind versus control comparison was not statistically significant, $\beta = 0.03$, $t(169) = 0.29$, $p = .771$.

For strongly identified participants in the multicultural condition, we hypothesized that they would instead be judged as more desirable applicants than those in the colorblind and control conditions. Although this was again the observed pattern, this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $p_s > .146$. Overall, this pattern of results shows that weakly identified participants experience worse hiring outcomes in the multicultural relative to colorblind and control condition, which somewhat matches the findings for authenticity and

---

\(^7\) Two research assistants also independently coded the stereotypicality (ICC = .80) of each essay to use as a covariate in analyses. There were no effects of condition or interaction between condition and racial identification on stereotypicality of essays, $p_s > .125$. Additionally, when controlling for stereotypicality in analyses of hiring desirability, authenticity, and anxiety, all previously significant $p$-values remained statistically significant, suggesting that judgments of authenticity and anxiety were not merely capturing stereotypicality.
anxiety. However, the findings should be interpreted cautiously because hiring outcomes were only examined in a single study.

**General Discussion**

Diversity initiatives have proliferated in recent years. The multicultural approach, which values and encourages the expression of group differences, has received considerable attention because it offers significant benefits to racial minorities relative to colorblindness. However, the present research tested the hypothesis that some of its benefits (and that of colorblindness) would depend on minorities’ levels of racial identification. We tested this hypothesis with a large sample ($N = 1,316$) of African American participants, who are underrepresented in the psychology literature and in many workplaces (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Indeed, multiculturalism increased prototypicality pressure in one study (relative to colorblind and control company contexts), irrespective of participants’ racial identification (Experiment 1), but participant reactions to this pressure did depend on racial identification (Experiments 1-3). Whereas strongly identified minorities felt more authentic and less anxious in the multicultural relative to the colorblind and control conditions, weakly identified minorities felt more authentic and less anxious in the *colorblind* relative to multicultural and control conditions in an internal meta-analysis. Thus, feelings of authenticity when considering an organizational context depend on fit between racial identification and the diversity approach, consistent with theorizing about goal fit as a route to authenticity (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017).

Although our hypotheses focused on multiculturalism as causing differential reactions among weakly and strongly identified minorities, comparisons to the control condition told a slightly different story. Rather than weakly identified minorities feeling uncomfortable with multiculturalism, they received an authenticity boost from colorblindness. Similarly, rather than
strongly identified minorities feeling uncomfortable with colorblindness, they received an authenticity boost from multiculturalism (but see Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008, which suggests this may depend on representation).

Furthermore, these feelings of authenticity and anxiety were apparent in professional self-descriptions, tentatively leading to less hiring desirability among weakly identified participants in a multicultural context. This latter finding was only examined in a single study (as was prototypicality pressure) and only partially matched the pattern of differences for authenticity and anxiety. Thus, it should be interpreted cautiously unless replicated in future research.

Self-Stereotyping

We also hypothesized that multicultural approaches would promote self-stereotyping, but only among those weakly identified with their racial group. Specifically, strategic self-stereotyping and stereotype distancing would only occur among weakly racially identified minorities because, compared to strongly identified minorities, they are more likely to engage in identity-related impression management strategies to obtain desired outcomes (Ellemers et al., 2002). Although there was evidence supporting this hypothesis in Experiments 2 and 5, the effects did not hold in Experiment 3 or 4, and the overall meta-analytic effect was not statistically significant in either direction.

Caveats and Limitations

We used the same multicultural and colorblind manipulations across all experiments. Although this facilitated direct replication, it is important to understand whether these results generalize to different ways of framing multiculturalism and colorblindness, particularly ones that focus less narrowly on racial and ethnic differences (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).
Despite adapting the manipulations, supplemental measures included in the study and reported in the online supplement showed evidence for replication of previous effects in the literature. For example, participants believed that they would be stereotyped less and had fewer concerns about being a good representative of their group at the multicultural relative to colorblind or control company, which is consistent with the finding that African Americans trust multicultural organizations more (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). These findings are especially interesting given the (seemingly conflicting) findings for prototypicality pressure, showing that multiculturalism increases prototypicality pressure relative to colorblindness. This inconsistency may reflect the neutral phrasing of prototypicality pressure. In other words, participants may believe that they will be treated more fairly at a multicultural company, while also acknowledging that it will be more desirable to present themselves prototypically at that same organization. However, for weakly identified participants, the perception that they will be treated fairly does not translate into feelings of state authenticity and reduced anxiety at the organization, which is consistent with arguments that authenticity is distinct from constructs like belonging and anticipated organizational treatment (Schmader & Sedikides, 2017).

A limitation of the present research is that all participants—with the exception of those in Experiment 3—were from the Project Implicit website, which attracts relatively highly educated participants. Future research should examine how diversity approaches affect a more nationally representative sample of racial minorities, as well as minority groups other than African Americans.

Nonetheless, Project Implicit sampling has benefits. The site has more representative samples than the university student samples typically used in social psychology research. Additionally, Project Implicit may have tapped into a wider range of racial identification levels
than do other recruitment tools. Our Project Implicit samples reported a mean racial identification of 4.58 on a 1-7 agreement scale (4.44 to 4.87; $SD = 1.50$), whereas the Mechanical Turk sample in Experiment 3 had a mean racial identification of 4.84. Similarly, Shelton and Sellers (2000), who examined racial identification stability in a sample of undergraduate African Americans, reported a higher mean racial identification ranging from 4.9 to 5.1 ($SD = 0.9$), using a similar 1-7 agreement scale as ours. Given that the present samples may be somewhat less identified with their racial group and show more dispersion than some university student samples, the psychological research literature may be neglecting individuals who are weakly identified with their racial or ethnic group. This is one potential explanation for the fact that the pattern of moderation observed in most of the present studies did not replicate in the Mechanical Turk sample.

A final limitation is that the primary effects of interest on authenticity and anxiety accounted for a relatively small proportion of the variance explained (2% to 5%). However, seemingly small effect sizes can have a meaningful impact in the real world (Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982). In a simulation study, gender bias that initially accounted for only 1% of the variance in performance scores led to substantial promotion inequality, where women comprised only 35% of top-level positions (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996).

**Implications and Future Directions**

These findings could have important downstream consequences for some minority groups. People desire to be seen in ways that are consistent with their own self-views (Swann & Read, 1981) and have lowered self-esteem and positive affect when they behave inauthentically (Harter, 2002). Minorities also experience negative affect in intergroup interactions when they behave inauthentically (Newheiser & Barreto, 2014). Thus, inauthentic behavior or discomfort in
workplace contexts may lead to both negative psychological experiences and harm employee relations. Furthermore, workplace stress and anxiety can lead to lowered efficiency, job satisfaction and retention, performance, and well-being (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; Linden & Muschalla, 2007).

The present research has important implications for organizational and institutional best practices. Although we have demonstrated that multiculturalism does not have the same benefits for weakly identified minorities as it does for those strongly identified, it also did not have clear negative implications and could potentially be adjusted to be more beneficial. One possibility is to combine multiculturalism with other strategies that acknowledge the individual self. Identity safety is a diversity model that also values group differences but considers within group differences to be of equal importance, thus ensuring that the individual is valued as well (Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011; Steele et al., 2002; also see Gündemir, Homan, Usova, & Galinsky, 2017).

Conclusion

As the world becomes increasingly diverse, efforts to harness the potential benefits of this diversity are essential. Although diversity efforts have become institutionalized in many companies and institutions, relatively limited research has examined the nuances of how to best manage diversity (Dobbin, 2009; Paluck, 2006), in a way that accounts for important individual differences in responses. A better understanding of both multicultural and colorblind practices will prevent unexpected consequences for underrepresented groups and help promote inclusion in the workplace.
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Table 1

*Predictions for All Dependent Variables in the Multicultural Relative to Colorblind Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderation by Racial ID</th>
<th>Weakly Identified</th>
<th>Strongly Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality pressure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Desirability</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The moderation by racial identification column indicates if moderation is predicted (with a √). The weakly and strongly identified columns indicate predictions for simple effects of diversity condition. ↑ indicates that we expect the multicultural condition to increase scores on the dependent measure relative to the colorblind condition. For example, we expect increased feelings of anxiety among weakly identified participants in the multicultural condition. ↓ indicates that we expect the multicultural condition to decrease scores on the dependent measure. 0 indicates that we expect no difference across conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics and Dependent Measure Overview Across Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study</strong> and <strong>Meta-Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N African Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Authenticity/Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Desirability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait self-stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity self-stereotyping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Note. The sample characteristics section gives information about how participants were recruited (PI = Project Implicit), the sample size for each group, and how we determined the sample size for each study (stopping rules). Stopping rules were determined before data analysis with the exception of Study 2, where we conducted a preliminary analysis and then collected approximately 40 additional participants to increase statistical power. In some cases, our final sample was lower than our stopping rule because of unanticipated exclusions (participants not meeting the prescreening criteria specified). The final section includes information about which dependent variables were included in each experiment.
Table 3
Hierarchical Regression on Measures Analyzed Individually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Prototypicality Pressure (Exp 1)</th>
<th>Hiring Desirability (Exp 5)</th>
<th>Positive Self-Presentation (Exp 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ $p$</td>
<td>$\beta$ $p$</td>
<td>$\beta$ $p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .10, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .06, p = .011$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .01, p = .537$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial identification</td>
<td>-0.05 .453</td>
<td>0.25 .001</td>
<td>0.09 .245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.29 &lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04 .603</td>
<td>0.03 .747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.31 &lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04 .628</td>
<td>-0.04 .689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .001, p = .844$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .05, p = .015$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = .01, p = .391$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.04 .573</td>
<td>-0.27 .009</td>
<td>-0.11 .321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.01 .907</td>
<td>-0.26 .016</td>
<td>-0.15 .188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.
Table 4

*Individual Study Results for Dependent Measures Comprising Meta-Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Activity Self-Stereotyping</th>
<th>Trait Self-Stereotyping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low ID</td>
<td>High ID</td>
<td>Low ID</td>
<td>High ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diversity x Id β (p)</td>
<td>-0.26 (.003)</td>
<td>0.23 (.007)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Effect d (p)</td>
<td>0.84 (.008)</td>
<td>-0.37 (.069)</td>
<td>-0.81 (.001)</td>
<td>0.27 (.182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-N cutpoint</td>
<td>3.46 (24%)</td>
<td>6.19 (14%)</td>
<td>3.61 (28%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diversity x Id β (p)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.27 (.021)</td>
<td>0.25 (.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Effect d (p)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.65 (.031)</td>
<td>0.11 (.604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-N cutpoint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.51 (27%)</td>
<td>1.96 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diversity x Id β (p)</td>
<td>0.04 (.613)</td>
<td>0.12 (.112)</td>
<td>-0.09 (.249)</td>
<td>-0.07 (.387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Effect d (p)</td>
<td>-0.57 (.049)</td>
<td>-0.38 (.018)</td>
<td>-0.13 (.641)</td>
<td>0.40 (.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-N cutpoint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diversity x Id β (p)</td>
<td>-0.18 (.022)</td>
<td>0.23 (.002)</td>
<td>-0.05 (.529)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Effect d (p)</td>
<td>0.61 (.022)</td>
<td>-0.20 (.214)</td>
<td>-0.84 (.003)</td>
<td>0.21 (.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-N cutpoint</td>
<td>3.24 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.04 (35%)</td>
<td>6.69 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diversity x Id β (p)</td>
<td>-0.24 (.033)</td>
<td>0.21 (.061)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Effect d (p)</td>
<td>0.50 (.163)</td>
<td>-0.64 (.030)</td>
<td>-0.61 (.10)</td>
<td>0.33 (.245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-N cutpoint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.43 (31%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The studies are presented in this order for narrative purposes, but the original order of studies was 2, 5, 1, 3, and 4. Study 2 results are reported when excluding White participants in order to make the effect sizes comparable for meta-analytic purposes. Diversity corresponds to the comparison of the multicultural (0) relative to the colorblind (1) diversity conditions, but statistics for the control comparison are presented in the meta-analysis and online supplement. Simple effects compare the multicultural to colorblind conditions when probed at racial identification values of 2 (moderately disagree) and 6 (moderately agree), to be consistent across experiments. The J-N (Johnson-Neyman) cutpoint designates the value of racial identification at which the effect of diversity condition became statistically different at p < .05 and what percentage of participants fell below (for low identification) or above (for high identification) that value. If no value is listed, there was no point at which the difference between conditions became statistically significant within the observed range of racial identification or the interaction was not significant. The simple effects statistics presented are from analyses that did not include the control groups, as this was necessary in order to run
the Johnson-Neyman technique in PROCESS and it also ensured comparable coefficients for aggregation in the meta-analysis. Statistically significant ($p < .05$) effects are in bold, including simple effects that were significant using the J-N technique, even if not significant at “low” and “high” identification.
Table 5
Meta-Analysis of Racial Identification Slope Differences by Diversity Condition (Interaction Effects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$Q(1)_B$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (1) vs Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (1) vs Control (0)</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1) vs Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* These analyses examine whether the relationship between racial identification and the dependent variables (Pearson’s $r$) differed in the multicultural, colorblind, and control conditions, to determine whether there was an overall interaction effect.
Table 6
Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Racial Identification and Dependent Measures by Diversity Condition (Simple Slope Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean $r$ (simple slope)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06 to .25</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.26 to -.07</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06 to .13</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20 to .004</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06 to .26</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02 to .23</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01 to .22</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13 to .08</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-stereotyping</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03 to .20</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Diversity Condition for African Americans Low and High in Racial Identification (Simple Effects Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Experiments contributing data</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Mean d</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weakly Identified African Americans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (1) vs Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.44</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural (0) vs Control (0)</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.72 to -0.44</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1) vs Authenticity</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.32 to -0.04</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.23 to 0.06</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Identified African Americans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (1) vs Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.50 to -0.22</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural (0) vs Control (0)</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.16 to 0.44</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1) vs Authenticity</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.20 to 0.09</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1) vs Multicultural (0)</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.44 to -0.16</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The direction of effect sizes reflects the original coding in the studies. For example, multiculturalism was coded as 0 and colorblindness as 1 in the primary analyses, so a negative effect size for that comparison on authenticity reflects increased authenticity in the multicultural relative to colorblind condition.

*#* Indicates that the direction of the effect is opposite of hypotheses.
Figure 1. Predicted results for the authenticity dependent measure.
Figure 2. Predicted results for the self-stereotyping dependent measure.
Figure 3. Authenticity and anxiety among African American participants varying in racial identification in Experiment 1.
Figure 4. Hiring desirability of African American participants varying in racial identification in Experiment 5. Independent raters judged participants’ essay responses.
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### Sensitivity Analyses

Table S1. Information for sensitivity calculations across all studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N$s per condition (MC, CB)</td>
<td>95, 88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122, 109</td>
<td>126, 130</td>
<td>66, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD\ IV$ (MC, CB)</td>
<td>1.54, 1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.49, 1.59</td>
<td>1.51, 1.66</td>
<td>1.39, 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity $SD\ E_{ij}$</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety $SD\ E_{ij}$</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity Sensitivity $\beta$</td>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Sensitivity $\beta$</td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The sensitivity analysis section gives the information to calculate the minimum effect ($\beta$) needed to detect a difference in the multicultural (MC) and colorblind (CB) slopes (i.e., an interaction between racial identification and condition). This information is presented for the two key variables, authenticity and anxiety, with 80% power at $\alpha = .05$. The sensitivity analysis requires entering the standard deviation of the error term ($SD\ E_{ij}$) and moderator variable ($SD\ IV$: racial identification), as well as $n$ per condition, all included in the table above.
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Colorblind brochure

Who We Are

CCG is a major provider of consultancy services, with a reputation for excellence. With annual turnover of $300 million, the company places a strong emphasis on business growth and the contribution of its staff.

Our Staff

While other consulting firms mistakenly focus on their staff’s differences, we train our ethnically diverse workforce to embrace their similarities.

Focusing on our similarities creates a more exciting and collaborative work environment. Such an inclusive and accepting environment helps not only us, but also our clients.

At CCG, your race, ethnicity, and culture are immaterial—you’ll recognize this as soon as you walk through our doors.

Our Mission

We aim to ensure that working with CCG is a smooth and effective process for our clients through:

- Excellence and expertise in quality of services
- Customer-focused culture
- Continual process improvement
- Success in implementing pioneering activities and technology
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Our Staff

While other consulting firms mistakenly focus on their staff’s similarities, we train our ethnically diverse workforce to embrace their differences.

Focusing on our differences creates a more exciting and collaborative work environment. Such an inclusive and accepting environment helps not only us but also our clients.

At CCG, your race, ethnicity, and culture are fundamental assets—you’ll recognize this as soon as you walk through our doors.

Our Mission

We aim to ensure that working with CCG is a smooth and effective process for our clients through:

- Excellence and expertise in quality of services
- Customer-focused culture
- Continual process improvement
- Success in implementing pioneering activities and technology

Contact Us

CCG
45 West 51st Street, 28th Floor
New York, NY 11020
T (212) 566-9000
CCG_Inquiries@ccg.com
Our Staff

At CCG, we seek to foster an environment that focuses on our staff—this creates a more exciting work environment.

This environment helps not only us, but our clients as well. At CCG, our staff has unlimited access to success.

Our Mission

We aim to ensure that working with CCG is a smooth and effective process for our clients through:

- Excellence and expertise in quality of services
- Customer-focused culture
- Continual process improvement
- Success in implementing pioneering activities and technology

Contact Us

CCG
45 West 51st Street, 28th Floor.
New York, NY 11020
T (212) 566 9000
CCG_Inquiries@ccg.com
Measures

**Racial Identification (All experiments)**

My race/ethnicity is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am. (reverse scored)
The racial/ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
In general, belonging to my race/ethnicity is an important part of my self image.
Overall, my race/ethnicity has very little to do with how I feel about myself. (reverse scored)

1 = *Strongly disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Disagree somewhat*, 4 = *Neutral*, 5 = *Agree somewhat*, 6 = *Agree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*

**Prototypicality Pressure (Experiment 1)**

CCG would be more likely to hire me if I asserted my racial/ethnic identity.
My interview at CCG would go better if I asserted my racial/ethnic identity.
If I asserted my racial/ethnic identity, CCG would think I was a better fit at their company.
CCG would be more likely to hire me if I conformed to their expectations about my racial/ethnic group.
My interview at CCG would go better if I behaved like a representative of my racial group.
If I seemed like others of my racial group, CCG would think I was a better fit at their company.

1 = *Strongly disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Moderately disagree*, 4 = *Neutral*, 5 = *Moderately agree*, 6 = *Agree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*

**Authenticity (Experiments 1,3,4,5)**

I would be myself at the CCG interview.
I would be my true self at the CCG interview.
I would feel comfortable being myself at the CCG interview.
I would feel comfortable at the CCG interview.

**Anxiety (Experiment 1,3,4,5)**

I would feel anxious at the CCG interview.
I would feel nervous at the CCG interview.
I would feel uncomfortable at the CCG interview. [This item also loaded onto the authenticity scale, but is included only in the anxiety scale because it loaded slightly more strongly and boosted the reliability of this scale]

1 = *Strongly disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Moderately disagree*, 4 = *Neutral*, 5 = *Moderately agree*, 6 = *Agree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*
Workplace Citizenship (Experiments 3-4)

In past jobs, how often have you helped other colleagues?
In past jobs, how often have you volunteered to help with company activities?
In past jobs, how often have you worked extra hours?
In past jobs, how often have you gone above and beyond what a task required?

1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = All the time
Experiment 5 Essay Prompt

Section 1/5

Please imagine that you are interviewing at CCG, and they would like to know more about you as a person.

CCG offers a number of benefits to its employees such as museum and gym memberships, discounted concerts, sporting events, theater tickets, and many other activities. It also organizes events for employees and friends/family. Your responses to these questions may inform the type of benefits that Human Resources offers in the future or the types of events it organizes. Please keep this in mind when responding to the next question.

[Instructions Page 2]

CCG Questionnaire

Please spend a couple minutes answering the following question. Please be detailed and write as much as you want (although it is not required, normal responses are at least five lines). All of the questions that follow this one are multiple choice.

If you had to describe yourself to someone at CCG, how would you describe yourself? For example, what are some of your favorite activities, hobbies, and interests? What are your favorite academic subjects or other educational pursuits? Who do you enjoy spending time with, and where? How would you describe your personality? Please be as specific as possible (for example, if you enjoy music, what type of music?).
Full Details of Experiment 1

Below, we describe individual study results that were not reported in the main text due to space constraints or that were only reported in aggregate in the main text (e.g., simple effects for interactions).

Method

Participants did not complete explicit self-stereotyping measures in this study due to limitations on study length and because understanding self-stereotyping was not a central aim in this study; however, they completed an implicit self-stereotyping measure because Project Implicit volunteers visit the website to learn about their implicit attitudes. The implicit measure allowed us to ascertain whether authenticity concerns would lead participants to adjust their self-stereotyping and whether it reflected an automatic or a more deliberate process (see Cvencek, Greenwald, Brown, Gray, & Snowden, 2010; also Gawronski, LeBel, & Peters, 2007).

The implicit measure was adapted from Amodio and Devine's (2006) Brief Implicit Association Test (BIAT) assessing stereotypes of African Americans as more athletic (physical) and less intelligent (mental) relative to European Americans (Devine & Elliot, 1995). In six blocks (alternating two different block types), participants classified “mental” words (e.g., math, brainy), “physical” words (e.g., athletic, dancing), “self” words (e.g., me, self), and “other” (e.g., other, they) words using two response keys. In one block type, they pressed the right key for mental and self words (and the left key for all other words); in the second block type, they pressed the right key for physical and self words. Which block type participants completed first was counter-balanced. Participants classifying physical and self words together more quickly than mental and self words indicated a stronger automatic association of themselves with physical than mental activities. The BIAT was scored using
the IAT $D$ measure (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003) so that positive values corresponded to greater implicit self-association with physical activities.

**Results**

**Manipulation and attrition checks.** Perceptions of how much the company focused on group differences differed by condition, $F(2, 242) = 37.17, p < .001$. Specifically, Bonferroni multiple comparison tests revealed that participants perceived greater focus on group differences in the multiculturalism condition ($M = 3.27, SD = 0.98$) than in the colorblind condition ($M = 2.05, SD = 1.12$), $p < .001$, and the control condition ($M = 2.16, SD = 0.99$), $p < .001$. However, participants did not perceive a difference in how much the control and colorblind companies focused on group differences, $p = .775$. Attrition from the study did not differ by gender, $\chi^2(1, n = 403) = 1.14, p = .286$, but did differ by diversity condition, $\chi^2(2, n = 403) = 11.57, p = .003$. Participants assigned to the control condition completed the study at lower rates (53%) than those assigned to the multicultural (73%) or colorblind (66%) conditions.

**Preliminary analyses.** To confirm that the prototypicality pressure, authenticity, and anxiety items loaded onto the anticipated measures, we conducted a factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation requesting three factors. See Table S2 for results and Table S3 for correlations between aggregated measures.
Table S2

*Factor Analysis on Dependent Variable Items in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Prototypicality</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCG would be more likely to hire me if I conformed to their expectations about my racial ethnic group</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG would be more likely to hire me if I asserted my racial ethnic identity</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I asserted my racial ethnic identity, CCG would think I was a better fit at their company</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interview at CCG would go better if I asserted my racial ethnic identity</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I seemed like others of my racial group, CCG would think I was a better fit at their company</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interview at CCG would go better if I behaved like a representative of my racial group</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel nervous at the CCG interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel uncomfortable at the CCG interview</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel anxious at the CCG interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be myself at the CCG interview (reverse)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable being myself at the CCG interview (reverse)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable at the CCG interview (reverse)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be my true self at the CCG interview (reverse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Loadings below .30 are suppressed for clarity of presentation. For items that loaded onto more than one factor, we included them in the scale where they had the strongest loading.
Table S3

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Primary Experiment 1 Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racial Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prototypicality Pressure</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authenticity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxiety</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean (SD)  4.59 (1.50)  3.43 (1.24)  5.26 (1.32)  3.81 (1.48)

*Note. N = 256. Numbers in parentheses next to means correspond to standard deviations. Scales range from 1-7 for all measures. p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001*
Main analyses. As described in the main text, we probed the highest order significant interactions with simple effects and then with simple slope analyses using the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013). We defined “strong” and “weak” racial identification, respectively, as those who moderately agreed (6 on a 7 point scale) and moderately disagreed (2 on a 7 point scale).

Authenticity. The predicted two-way interaction ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p = .010$) emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification, $\beta = -0.26, t(250) = -3.05, p = .003$, but not for the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = -0.08, t(250) = -1.01, p = .315^8$. Next, we examined simple effects for the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel less comfortable being authentic when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = 1.06, SE = 0.38, p = .006$. African Americans with strong racial identification reported that they would feel more comfortable being authentic when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = -0.50, SE = 0.27, p = .060$, but it did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance at the value designated for high racial identification.

Simple slope analyses showed the predicted interaction pattern as well. As participants in the colorblind condition were more strongly racially identified, they felt less

---

8 We also re-ran the regression model with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was no interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = -0.17, t(250) = -1.79, p = .075$. 
comfortable being authentic, $b = -0.20$, $SE = 0.09$, $p = .035$. In the multiculturalism condition, as participants were more strongly racially identified, they instead felt more comfortable being authentic, $b = 0.19$, $SE = 0.09$, $p = .028$. Finally, the relationship between racial identification and authenticity was not statistically significant in the control condition, $b = 0.05$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = .606$.

**Anxiety.** The predicted two-way interaction ($\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p = .012$) emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification, $\beta = 0.23$, $t(250) = 2.73$, $p = .007$, and the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = 0.19$, $t(250) = 2.32$, $p = .021$. Next, we examined simple effects for both the multicultural relative to colorblind and the multicultural relative to control comparisons.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel more anxious when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = -1.15$, $SE = 0.43$, $p = .008$, but not relative to the control condition, $b = -0.62$, $SE = 0.46$, $p = .149$. African Americans with strong racial identification showed the opposite pattern, but this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance for the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison, $b = 0.41$, $SE = 0.30$, $p = .168$, although it did for the multicultural relative to control comparison, $b = 0.81$, $SE = 0.31$, $p = .010$.

Simple slope analyses partially confirmed predictions in terms of the slope patterns, but some of the slopes did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. In the

---


9 We also re-ran the regression model with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was no interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = .020$, $t(250) = 0.21$, $p = .832$. 
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multiculturalism condition, as participants were stronger in racial identification, they were less anxious, $b = -0.22$, $SE = .10$, $p = .028$. The relationship was the reverse (but non-significant) in the control condition, $b = 0.14$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .239$, and the colorblind condition $b = 0.17$, $SE = .10$, $p = .098$.

**Prototypicality pressure mediating authenticity and anxiety.** We tested moderated mediation models with 10,000 bootstrap resamples using the PROCESS macro (Model 15; Hayes, 2013) to determine whether prototypicality pressure statistically mediated the effect of multiculturalism (relative to colorblindness) on (1) authenticity and (2) anxiety among weakly racially identified participants (but not strongly identified). In the full model for authenticity (1), the index of moderated mediation was significant for both the multiculturalism compared to colorblind, $b = -0.09$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI[-0.18, -0.01], and control comparisons, $b = -0.09$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI[-0.18, -0.01]. When examining mediation by prototypicality pressure at different levels of the racial identification moderator, indeed, there was a significant indirect effect on authenticity among those weakly identified for the colorblind (v multiculturalism) comparison, $b = 0.29$, $SE = 0.10$, 95% CI[0.11, 0.49], and for the control (v multiculturalism) comparison, $b = 0.29$, $SE = 0.10$, 95% CI[0.11, 0.50]. There was not a significant indirect effect among those strongly identified for the colorblind (v multiculturalism) comparison, $b = 0.03$, $SE = 0.09$, 95% CI[-0.15, 0.20] or for the control (v multiculturalism) comparison, $b = 0.03$, $SE = 0.09$, 95% CI[-0.15, 0.20].

In the full model for anxiety (2), however, the index of moderated mediation was not significant for either the multiculturalism compared to colorblind, $b = 0.04$, $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI[-0.04, 0.14], or control comparisons, $b = 0.04$, $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI[-0.04, 0.14]

**Implicit self-stereotyping.** As shown in Table S4, there were no effects of diversity condition on implicit self-stereotyping.
Table S4

**Hierarchical Regression on Implicit Self-Stereotyping in Experiment 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1**

\[ \Delta R^2 = .01, \ p = .614 \]

**Step 2**

\[ \Delta R^2 < .001, \ p = .968 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.
Full Details of Experiment 2

Method

Participants. 2,537 White and 337 African American visitors to the Project Implicit website (https://implicit.harvard.edu), who volunteered to participate in implicit social cognition research, were randomly assigned to complete the present study from a pool of available studies (previous participants were not permitted to participate). Sixty-six participants were excluded because they indicated in an open-ended item that they did not read the brochure containing the manipulation, and another 135 were excluded because 10% or more of their BIAT trials were faster than 300 milliseconds (as recommended by Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003) or for nonsensical questionnaire responses (e.g., reporting the same response for all items, including reverse-scored ones). Of the remaining 1,623 participants, 1,487 White (1,109 women, 377 men) and 136 African Americans (95 women, 41 men) reached the end of the study and completed the key independent and dependent measures (mean age = 33.38, SD = 11.29; 98% had completed some college or a higher level of education). To maximize statistical power, we retained partial data for those not fully completing the study, resulting in varying degrees of freedom in analyses (as in all subsequent studies). For African Americans, accounting for attrition, this left us with adequate power ($\pi = .80$) to detect a slope difference by condition (i.e., an interaction between racial identification and condition) of $\beta = 0.49$ for self-stereotyping. Our goal sample size was 70 per condition.

Additional Information about Measures

10 Results were the same when analyzing without exclusions.
**African American negative trait stereotypes.** In addition to the positive trait measure described in the main text\(^\text{11}\), participants responded about the extent to which eight negative stereotypes of African Americans described them (poor, lazy, reckless, dishonest, dangerous, complaining, violent, ignorant; \(\alpha = .73\); Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, & Kraus, 1995; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). Scale endpoints were 1 (*Not at all descriptive of me*) to 7 (*Very descriptive of me*).

**White trait stereotypes.** Participants also responded about the extent to which six positive stereotypes (wealthy, responsible, successful, educated, intelligent, ambitious; \(\alpha = .74\); Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, & Kraus, 1995; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000) and seven negative stereotypes (boring, materialistic, greedy, conventional, uptight, stuffy, boastful; \(\alpha = .68\)) of Whites described them. Scale endpoints were 1 (*Not at all descriptive of me*) to 7 (*Very descriptive of me*). The inclusion of White traits allowed us to determine whether diversity philosophies also affected Whites’ self-stereotyping and whether diversity philosophies affected African Americans’ self-descriptions only on measures relevant to stereotypes of their group (i.e., African American stereotypes) or on all types of traits, irrespective of the association of the traits with African Americans (i.e., White American stereotypes).

---

\(^{11}\) A preliminary study revealed an unexpected gender moderation on self-stereotyping (with predicted effects demonstrated among men, but not women). However, we realized in retrospect that the traits and activities used in the preliminary study were stereotypically masculine ones and may not have captured stereotypes of African American women. Indeed, African American women are often overlooked in stereotype measurement because men are the prototype of their group (see Ghavami & Peplau, 2012; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Sesko & Biernat, 2010). Accordingly, in this study, we ensured that measures also included female African American stereotypes (i.e., emotionally expressive, talking, gospel music; see the final section of the online supplement for more information about piloting).
**Racial identification.** Participants responded to the same racial identification scale as in Experiment 1 ($\alpha = .76$). African American participants ($M = 4.44, SD = 1.47$) reported stronger racial identification than White participants ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.31$), $F(1,1621) = 9.94$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.85$. Due to racial differences in identification, we mean centered racial identification by race before including it in the main regression analyses.

The centrality dimension of racial identification is theorized to be stable across situations (Sellers et al., 1998), and participants’ level of racial identification did not differ across conditions, $F(1,1619) = 1.22, p = .271$, nor was the effect of condition moderated by race, $F(1,1619) = .001, p = .979$.

**Manipulation check.** To determine whether participants interpreted the manipulation as intended, they responded to the following item: “To what extent does CCG value group differences?” on a 1 (*Undervalue a great deal*) to 7 (*Value a great deal*) scale.
Table S5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Primary Experiment 2 Variables Split by Participant Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racial Identification</td>
<td>.04 (1487)</td>
<td>.003 (1487)</td>
<td>.01 (1486)</td>
<td>.003 (1487)</td>
<td>.05 (1486)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black Activity Stereotypes</td>
<td>.03 (136)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.37 (1487)**</td>
<td>-.003 (1486)</td>
<td>.21 (1487)**</td>
<td>&lt;.001 (1486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive Black Trait Stereotypes</td>
<td>-.01 (136)</td>
<td>.54 (136)**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04 (1486)</td>
<td>.45 (1487)**</td>
<td>-.13 (1486)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negative Black Trait Stereotypes</td>
<td>.01 (136)</td>
<td>-.001 (136)</td>
<td>.23 (136)**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.27 (1486)**</td>
<td>.53 (1486)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positive White Trait Stereotypes</td>
<td>-.01 (136)</td>
<td>.25 (136)**</td>
<td>.32 (136)**</td>
<td>-.28 (136)**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.07 (1486)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negative White Trait Stereotypes</td>
<td>.07 (136)</td>
<td>.02 (136)</td>
<td>.19 (136)*</td>
<td>.67 (136)**</td>
<td>-.02 (136)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) for African Americans</td>
<td>4.44 (1.47)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.25)</td>
<td>4.07 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.72 (0.73)</td>
<td>5.22 (0.95)</td>
<td>2.39 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD) for Whites</td>
<td>3.27 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.80 (1.01)</td>
<td>1.95 (0.68)</td>
<td>4.89 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.66 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations for African Americans are below the diagonal, and correlations for Whites are above the diagonal. Ns (in parentheses next to correlations) do not necessarily correspond to the degrees of freedom in regression analyses, as we used pairwise deletion for all analyses. Numbers in parentheses next to means correspond to standard deviations. Scales range from 1-7 for all measures.

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Supplementary dependent measures. The primary purpose of the research was to understand how diversity approaches shape self-views in the organizational context. However, we included two additional measures described below that assessed participants’ perceptions of how they would be treated and fit at the company.

Company stereotyping. This exploratory dependent variable consisted of two items (“People at this company would stereotype your racial group”; “People at CCG would treat you differently based on your racial group membership”; $\rho = .88$) on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale. We used the Spearman-Brown formula, recommended by Eisinga, Grotenhuis, and Pelzer (2013) to calculate reliability with two-item measures.

Change to fit in. This variable was measured with a single item (“I would have to change to fit in at this company”) on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale.

Results

Manipulation and attrition checks. Participants reported that the company valued group differences more in the multiculturalism condition ($M = 6.46$, $SD = 1.10$) than in the colorblind condition ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 2.31$), $F(1, 1451) = 216.81$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.94$. This effect was more pronounced among White participants (multicultural $M = 6.51$; colorblind $M = 3.13$), $F(1, 1451) = 1206.15$, $p < .001$, than among African American participants (multicultural $M = 5.94$; colorblind $M = 4.22$), $F(1, 1451) = 26.94$, $p < .001$; interaction: $F(1,1451) = 22.67$, $p < .001$.

Attrition from the study did not differ by diversity condition, $\chi^2(1, n = 2674) = 1.56$, $p = .212$, or gender, $\chi^2(1,n = 2669) = 1.34$, $p = .248$. However, White participants (62%) completed the study at higher rates than African Americans (47%), $\chi^2(1, n = 2674) = 25.26$, $p < .001$, but this effect did not interact with condition, $\chi^2(1, n = 2674) = 0.60$, $p = .438$. 
**Analytic strategy.** To test the main hypotheses, diversity condition (0 = multiculturalism, 1 = colorblindness,), race (0 = African American, 1 = White), and racial identification (mean-centered by race) were entered into the first step of a hierarchical linear regression model. All two-way interactions were entered into the second step, and the single three-way interaction was entered into the third step. We followed up with simple slope and simple effects analyses for the highest order significant interactions (defined as \( p < .05 \) throughout all studies) using the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013). We conducted simple effects analyses as described in Experiment 1.

**Main self-stereotyping analyses.** Unless otherwise specified, we hypothesized an interaction between diversity condition, race, and racial identification such that African Americans, but not Whites, would show a two-way interaction between racial identification and diversity condition.

**African American activity stereotypes.** The predicted three-way interaction between diversity condition, racial identification, and race emerged, \( \beta = -0.26, t(1615) = -2.37, p = .018 \). We first broke down the three-way interaction by participant race. Consistent with hypotheses, the two-way interaction between condition and racial identification emerged among African American participants, \( b = 0.27, p = .021 \), but not White participants, \( b = -0.02, SE = 0.04, p = .561 \), so we did not examine Whites further.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African American participants with weak racial identification reported more interest in stereotypically African American activities when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness \( b = -0.91, SE = 0.33, p = .006 \). Strongly racially identified African American participants showed the opposite pattern, but this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, \( b = 0.16, SE = 0.25, p = .515 \).
Simple slope analyses confirmed the predicted interaction pattern as well. As African Americans in the colorblind condition had stronger racial identification, they self-stereotyped more on the activity measure, $b = 0.17, SE = 0.09, p = .040$. In the multiculturalism condition, this relationship was attenuated, and there was no relationship between racial identification and self-stereotyping, $b = -0.09, SE = 0.08, p = .237$.

**African American positive trait stereotypes.** The predicted three-way interaction between diversity condition, racial identification, and race once again emerged, $\beta = -0.24, t(1615) = -2.12, p = .034$. We first broke down the interaction by participant race. Consistent with hypotheses, a two-way interaction between condition and racial identification emerged among African American participants, $b = 0.25, p = .035$, but not White participants, $b = -0.02, p = .708$, so we did not examine Whites further.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification self-stereotyped more on positive traits when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = -0.83, SE = 0.35, p = .017$. Strongly racially identified African American participants showed the opposite pattern, but this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $b = 0.19, SE = 0.26, p = .454$.

Simple slope analyses showed the predicted interaction pattern, but the slopes were not statistically significant for either condition. We nonetheless describe the pattern of these results to facilitate understanding of the significant interaction terms. As African Americans in the colorblind condition had stronger racial identification, there was a non-significant pattern of increased self-stereotyping, $b = 0.13, SE = 0.09, p = .141$. In the multiculturalism condition, this relationship was attenuated, and the pattern was in the opposite direction, $b = -0.12, SE = 0.08, p = .129$. 


**African American negative trait stereotypes.** Because people tend to embrace positive, but not negative, stereotypes about their group (i.e., selective self-stereotyping; Biernat, Vescio, & Green, 1996), and may be particularly unwilling to express negative stereotypes in the context of job outcomes, we did not expect diversity condition to affect levels of negative self-stereotyping. Indeed, participants were relatively unwilling to express negative stereotypes about themselves, resulting in a positive skew on this variable (skewness $= 0.89, SE = .06; M = 1.94, SD = 0.69$). Due to the low variability and because transformations of the variable did not reduce the skewness, it is difficult to interpret the results for negative stereotypically African American traits and we do not describe these results in detail (however, no main effects or interactions emerged for any variables of theoretical interest, $p_s > .176$).

**Implicit stereotypes.** Consistent with Study 1, there were no main effects or interactions with diversity condition, $p_s > .354$.

**Analyses of White trait stereotypes.** We hypothesized that neither African Americans nor Whites would show an effect of diversity condition or an interaction between diversity condition and racial identification on measures reflecting stereotypes of Whites. If an effect emerged, however, this would suggest that diversity condition affects self-descriptions more broadly and not just traits and activities relevant to participants’ group membership. As hypothesized, there were no main effects or interactions with diversity condition on positive traits, $p_s > .281$, or negative traits, $p_s > .155$, indicating that diversity condition only affected descriptions with stereotype-relevant traits among African Americans.

**Supplementary dependent measures.** The results presented in Table S6 conceptually replicated findings by Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, and Crosby (2008) suggesting that racial minorities trust multicultural more than colorblind companies.
Specifically, African Americans believed that people at the colorblind company would stereotype them more than those at the multicultural company, although the reverse was true for Whites. Additionally, both Whites and African Americans believed they would have to change to fit in more at the colorblind than multicultural company. This was magnified for those strongly identified with their racial group.
Table S6

*Hierarchical Regression on Supplemental Dependent Variables in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Company Stereotyping</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Change to Fit In</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = 0.03, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = 0.04, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Condition</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = 0.01, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = 0.01, p = .010$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity x Centrality</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity x Race</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Centrality</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 &lt; 0.001, p = .655$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2 = 0.001, p = .242$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity x Race x Centrality</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. For diversity condition, 0 = Multiculturalism, 1 = Colorblindness. For Race, 0 = African American, 1 = White.
Full Details of Experiment 3

This experiment was pre-registered at https://osf.io/2j4aw.

Method

Participants. We recruited Amazon Mechanical Turk workers through Turkprime, an online crowdsourcing platform that allows for recruitment of participants with specified demographic criteria (see Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2017, for more information). In Wave 1, 604 African American participants completed racial identification measures and demographic information in exchange for US$0.30. Of these, 358 participated in Wave 2 (59%) for US $1.75, but 6 were excluded for nonsensical questionnaire responses (e.g., reporting the same response for all items) and failing an attention check. Of the remaining 352 participants (mean age = 35.86, SD = 11.29; 88% had completed some college or a higher level of education), 239 were women, 111 were men, 1 identified as another gender, and 1 gave no information. Everyone who started Wave 2 completed the study, and attrition between Wave 1 and Wave 2 of the study did not differ by gender, $\chi^2(2, n = 597) = 0.81, p = .667$, or racial identification, $F(1, 596) = 0.01, p = .921$.

We used G*power 3.1.5 to estimate the goal sample size in a linear bivariate regression (two groups, differences between slopes) with 80% power, an alpha level of 0.05, and an estimated slope difference of $\beta = .394$ between the multiculturalism and colorblind condition. Based on this, we aimed to collect at least 291 participants (97 per condition), but allowed as many participants as opted to participate in Wave 2.

Procedure. In Wave 1, participants completed the same four-item measure of racial identification described in previous studies, as well as demographic information. After an average of 26 days ($SD = 18.24$), participants were invited to participate in an ostensibly unrelated study (Wave 2). They were randomly assigned to read the same multiculturalism or colorblind philosophy in a CCG recruitment brochure from previous Experiments (see
Appendix B for new filler information and design) or a control statement that described CCG’s staff philosophy without any reference to diversity. They next imagined that they were interviewing at CCG and completed the activity and positive trait self-stereotyping measures from Experiment 2 (in a random order), but with additional items (italicized) to boost reliability. Participants indicated the extent to which positive stereotypes of African Americans (streetwise, athletic, humorous, musical, emotionally expressive, religious, rhythmic, spiritual, sporty; $\alpha = .78$) were self-descriptive and how interested they were in several activities (rap music, gospel music, talking/socializing, sports/fitness, athletics, track, physical education, basketball, attending religious services, singing; $\alpha = .73$).

Next, participants responded to measures assessing workplace citizenship, interest in a race-relevant sub-organization, anticipated authenticity ($\alpha = .89$) and anxiety ($\alpha = .81$) in the interview, race concerns, state self-esteem, and racial identification, in that order. Finally, participants completed the same manipulation check item as in Experiment 2. Measures not already described in previous experiments are outlined below.

**Additional information about measures**

**Workplace citizenship.** We measured participants’ reports of their past workplace citizenship in order to address an alternative explanation for self-stereotyping. Although we hypothesized that weakly identified participants would self-stereotype more in the multicultural than colorblind condition, self-stereotyping might have picked up more generally on positive self-views or self-presentation. If weakly identified minorities described their workplace citizenship histories more positively in the multicultural company, this would be consistent with the positive self-presentation alternative explanation (and inconsistent with hypotheses). Specifically, participants responded to four items (see Appendix C; e.g., “In past jobs, how often have you helped other colleagues?”; “In past jobs, how often have you worked extra hours”) on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale; $\alpha = .82$. 

82
**Race concerns.** Participants responded to two items (“I would be worried about whether I conform to CCG’s expectations for my racial/ethnic group” and “I would be concerned about whether I am a good representative of my racial/ethnic group”) on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale; ρ = .80.

**State self-esteem.** To assess participants’ self-views, they responded to 10 items about how they would feel right now if they worked at CCG (e.g., “I take a positive attitude toward myself right now”) from the Rosenberg (1979) self-esteem scale on a 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) scale; α = .94. If weakly identified minorities reported higher self-esteem in the multicultural company, this would be consistent with the positive self-view alternative explanation (and inconsistent with the self-stereotyping hypothesis).

**Racial identification.** Participants responded to the same four items used in previous experiments in both Wave 1 (α = .83) and Wave 2 (α = .82), and they were strongly associated across waves, r(350) = .68, p < .001. Additionally, racial identification did not significantly change between Wave 1 (M = 4.84, SD = 1.57) and Wave 2 (M = 4.75, SD = 1.61), t(351) = 1.32, p = .187, d = 0.07. Importantly, participants’ level of racial identification did not differ across conditions in Wave 1, F(2, 349) = 1.07, p = .344, suggesting successful random assignment, or in Wave 2, F(2, 349) = 1.03, p = .359. For the main analyses, we used the Wave 1 measure of racial identification.
Table S7

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Primary Experiment 3 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black Activity</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive Black</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest in</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Authenticity</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anxiety</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Race Concerns</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workplace</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean (SD)

|          | 4.84 (1.57) | 4.02 (1.06) | 4.31 (1.15) | 3.88 (1.24) | 5.73 (1.21) | 3.67 (1.65) | 3.19 (1.78) | 3.70 (0.86) | 5.70 (1.34) |
Note. Ns range from 350 to 352. Numbers in parentheses next to means correspond to standard deviations. Scales range from 1-7 for all measures except Interest in Black Network, which ranges from 1-5.

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$
Results

**Manipulation checks.** Perceptions of how much the company focused on group differences differed by condition, $F(2,346) = 53.95, p < .001$. Specifically, Bonferroni multiple comparison tests revealed that participants perceived greater focus on group differences in the multiculturalism condition ($M = 6.35, SD = 1.02$) than in the colorblind condition ($M = 4.27, SD = 2.24$), $p < .001$, and the control condition ($M = 4.73, SD = 1.39$), $p < .001$. However, participants did not perceive a difference in how much the control and colorblind companies focused on group differences, $p = .092$.

**Main analyses**

*Authenticity.* Contrary to Experiment 1, there was no interaction between racial identification and diversity condition, $ps > .40$ (see Table S8). However, a main effect showed that participants would feel more comfortable being authentic when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism ($M = 6.05$) relative to colorblindness ($M = 5.54$) and the control company ($M = 5.58$).

*Anxiety.* Contrary to Experiment 1, there was no interaction between racial identification and diversity condition, $ps > .112$ (see Table S8), although the pattern of interaction results was consistent with Experiment 1. A main effect showed that participants would feel less anxious when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, but the $\Delta R^2$ for Step 1 was not statistically significant.

*Race concerns.* Contrary to hypotheses, there was no interaction between racial identification and diversity condition, $ps > .560$ (see Table S8).
Table S8

Hierarchical Regression on Authenticity, Anxiety, and Race Concerns in Experiment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th></th>
<th>Race Concerns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.06, p &lt; .001</td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.01, p = .265</td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.03, p = .009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.002, p = .701</td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.01, p = .273</td>
<td>ΔR² = 0.001, p = .842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.
Self-stereotyping. Our analytic strategy and hypotheses were identical to Experiments 1 and 2, but used the measure of racial identification from Wave 1. Contrary to Experiment 2, there were no main effects or interactions with diversity condition on any of the three self-stereotyping measures (statistics reported in the main text). Because interest in the CCG Network was left-skewed (42% of people selected the highest option, “Extremely interested”), we also examined this variable as a binary outcome (1 = “Extremely interested”, 0 = All options below “Extremely interested”) in a logistic regression. However, there were still no main effects or interactions, \( p > .385 \).

Workplace citizenship. To assess whether participants self-presented more positively in general (not just on stereotype-relevant traits), we assessed reports of their past work histories. If weakly identified minorities described their work histories more positively in the multicultural company, this would be consistent with the positive self-presentation alternative explanation (and inconsistent with hypotheses). This measure was less relevant given that we did not find an effect on self-stereotyping in this study, and indeed, there was no effect of condition or interaction with condition and racial identification, \( p > .452 \).

State self-esteem. We assessed trait self-esteem for similar reasons as workplace citizenship, but there was no effect of condition or interaction with condition and racial identification, \( p > .147 \).

Full Details of Experiment 4

This experiment was pre-registered at https://osf.io/sahtb.

Method

Participants. Of 615 African American Project Implicit participants (previous participants were not permitted to participate), 14 were excluded because 10% or more of their IAT trials were faster than 300 milliseconds. Of the remaining 601, 368 reached the end (246 women, 121 men, 1 unspecified; mean age = 34.13, \( SD = 12.88 \); 85% had completed
some college or a higher level of education). We used G*power 3.1.5 to estimate the goal sample size needed to detect an $R^2$ change of .023 (effect size estimated from Study 2) when adding an interaction into a linear bivariate regression with 80% power, an alpha level of 0.05. Based on this, we anticipated needing 336 participants – to account for potential exclusions, we collected data until we reached 375 participants (see pre-registration details at https://osf.io/5nvwc/).

**Procedure.** Participants were randomly assigned to read the same multiculturalism or colorblind philosophy in a CCG recruitment brochure from previous experiments or a control statement that described CCG’s staff philosophy without any reference to diversity. They next imagined that they were interviewing at CCG and completed the activity self-stereotyping measure (rap music, gospel music, talking/socializing, sports/fitness, athletics, track, physical education, basketball, attending religious services, singing, activities related to music; $\alpha = .72$).

Next, participants responded to measures assessing workplace citizenship ($\alpha = .74$), interest in a race-relevant sub-organization, anticipated authenticity ($\alpha = .85$) and anxiety ($\alpha = .79$) in the interview, race concerns ($\rho = .76$), and racial identification ($\alpha = .75$), in that order. Participants’ level of racial identification did not differ across conditions, $F(2, 365) = 1.02, p = .363$. Finally, participants completed the same manipulation check item as in Experiment 2 and an IAT.
Table S9

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Primary Experiment 4 Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black Activity</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interest in Black</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Authenticity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anxiety</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Race Concerns</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workplace</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean (SD)        | 4.87    | 4.60    | 5.90    | 5.57    | 3.82    | 3.50    | 4.30    |
|                  | (1.57)  | (0.98)  | (1.42)  | (1.31)  | (1.51)  | (1.83)  | (0.90)  |

*Note.* Ns for correlations range from 364 to 370. Numbers in parentheses next to means correspond to standard deviations. Scales range from 1-7 for all measures except Interest in Black Network, which ranges from 1-5.

\[ p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001 \]
Results

**Manipulation and attrition checks.** Perceptions of how much the company focused on group differences differed by condition, $F(2, 336) = 15.36, p < .001$. Specifically, Bonferroni multiple comparison tests revealed that participants perceived greater focus on group differences in the multiculturalism condition ($M = 5.37, SD = 1.97$) than in the colorblind condition ($M = 3.94, SD = 2.30, p < .001$, and the control condition ($M = 4.32, SD = 1.83, p = .001$). However, participants did not perceive a difference in how much the control and colorblind companies focused on group differences, $p = .363$. Attrition from the study did not differ by condition, $\chi^2(2, n = 601) = 2.93, p = .231$, or gender, $\chi^2(1, n = 599) = 0.24, p = .621$.

**Analytic strategy.** Our analytic strategy and hypotheses were the same as in previous experiments.

**Authenticity.** The predicted two-way interaction emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification (see Table S10 for statistics), but not between the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification.\(^{12}\) Next, we examined simple effects for both the multicultural relative to colorblind and the multicultural relative to control comparisons.

\[^{12}\text{We also re-ran the regression model with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was a significant interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, } \beta = -0.20, t(362) = -2.55, p = .011. \text{ African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel less comfortable being authentic when exposed to a control company than to one that valued colorblindness, } b = 1.11, SE = 0.35, p = .002. \text{ This was not the case for participants stronger in racial identification, } b = 0.03, SE = 0.20, p = .869.\]
In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel less comfortable being authentic when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = 0.71$, $SE = 0.33$, $p = .032$. African Americans with strong racial identification showed the opposite pattern, but this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $b = -0.24$, $SE = 0.20$, $p = .247$.

Simple slope analyses partially confirmed the predicted interaction pattern as well. As participants in the colorblind condition were more strongly racially identified, they felt less comfortable being authentic, $b = -0.18$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = .009$. Although we predicted a positive relationship between racial identification and authenticity in the multicultural condition, it was not statistically significant for either the multicultural or control conditions, $b = 0.06$, $SE = 0.08$, $p = .464$, $b = 0.09$, $SE = 0.08$, $p = .275$, respectively.

**Anxiety.** The predicted two-way interaction emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification, but not between the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification.\textsuperscript{13} Next, we examined simple effects for both the multicultural relative to colorblind and the multicultural relative to control comparisons.

\textsuperscript{13} We also re-ran the regression model with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was a significant interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = 0.31$, $t(362) = 3.94$, $p < .001$. African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel more anxious when exposed to a control company than to one that valued colorblindness, $b = -1.88$, $SE = 0.40$, $p < .001$. This was not the case for participants stronger in racial identification, $b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.23$, $p = .971$. 
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In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification reported that they would feel more anxious when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = -1.12, SE = 0.37, p = .003$. However, African Americans with strong racial identification reported that they would feel less anxious when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = 0.31, SE = 0.23, p = .187$ (although it was only significant when using the Johnson-Neyman technique, presented in Table 4).

Simple slope analyses partially confirmed the predicted interaction pattern. As participants in the colorblind condition were more strongly racially identified, they felt more anxious, $b = 0.19, SE = 0.08, p = .014$. In the multiculturalism condition, this relationship was attenuated, and in the negative direction but it did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $b = -0.16, SE = 0.09, p = .063$. Although we predicted a null relationship between racial identification and anxiety in the control condition, the relationship was significantly negative, $b = -0.27, SE = 0.09, p = .002$, showing that as participants were more strongly racially identified, they felt less anxious in a neutral workplace environment. Taken together, our predictions were confirmed for the colorblind and multicultural conditions, but not for the control condition.

**Race concerns.** Contrary to hypotheses, there was no interaction between racial identification and diversity condition. However, there was an unexpected main effect such that participants in the multicultural condition ($M = 3.24$) reported fewer race concerns than those in the control condition ($M = 3.78$), but not relative to the colorblind condition ($M = 3.51$). Although originally unexpected, these results partially conceptually replicate findings by Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, and Crosby (2008) suggesting that racial minorities are more likely to trust multicultural companies.
Table S10

Hierarchical Regression on Authenticity, Anxiety, and Race Concerns in Experiment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Race Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR² = 0.01, ΔR² = 0.02, ΔR² = 0.04,</td>
<td>p = .016</td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR² = 0.02, ΔR² = 0.05, ΔR² = 0.003,</td>
<td>p = .017</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.*
Secondary analyses

**African American activity stereotypes.** Contrary to hypotheses, there were no interactions with diversity condition, \( ps > .523, \Delta R^2 = .001, p = .767 \). However, there was an unexpected main effect such that participants in the colorblind condition \( (M = 4.78) \) described themselves as more stereotypical than those in the multicultural condition \( (M = 4.53), \beta = 0.12, t(364) = 2.09, p = .037 \). This pattern of results did not match hypotheses or the findings in any previous experiments, so may not be reliable.

**Interest in Black CCG Network.** Contrary to hypotheses, there were no interactions with diversity condition, \( ps > .081, \Delta R^2 = .01, p = .218 \). However, there was an unexpected main effect such that participants in the colorblind condition \( (M = 6.08) \) reported more interest in the Black CCG Network than those in the multicultural condition \( (M = 5.68), \beta = 0.12, t(358) = 2.03, p = .043 \). Because interest in the CCG Network was left-skewed, we also examined this variable as a binary outcome \( (1 = “Extremely interested”, 0 = All options below “Extremely interested”\) in a logistic regression. In this analysis, there were no main effects of condition or interactions, \( ps > .378 \). This pattern of results did not match hypotheses or the findings from any previous experiments.

**Workplace citizenship.** To assess whether participants self-presented more positively in general (not just on stereotype-relevant traits), we assessed reports of their past workplace citizenship. If weakly identified minorities described their work histories more positively in the multicultural company, this would be consistent with the positive self-presentation alternative explanation (and inconsistent with hypotheses).

This measure was less relevant given that we did not find an effect on self-stereotyping; however, a two-way interaction \( (\Delta R^2 = .02, p = .036) \) emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification, \( \beta = -0.17, t(361) = -2.20, p = .028 \), but not for the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and
racial identification, $\beta = 0.002$, $t(361) = 0.03$, $p = .976$. Next, we examined simple effects for the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison.

In simple effects analyses, inconsistent with the alternative explanation, African Americans with weak racial identification presented themselves less positively when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = 0.52$, $SE = 0.23$, $p = .023$. This finding may be another manifestation of the increased anxiety reported by weakly identified participants considering the multicultural context. African Americans with strong racial identification did not show a significant difference by condition, $b = -0.10$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = .461$.

**Implicit self-stereotyping.** There were no effects of diversity condition on implicit self-stereotyping, $ps > .106$.

**Full Details of Experiment 5**

**Method**

**Participants.** Of 386 African American Project Implicit participants (previous participants were not permitted to participate), eleven were excluded because 10% or more of their BIAT trials were faster than 300 milliseconds, and one was excluded for not taking the essay task seriously (as determined by four coders). Of the remaining 374, 204 reached the end of the study (146 women, 56 men, 2 unknown; mean age = 34.98, $SD = 13.85$; 95% had completed some college or a higher level of education). Accounting for attrition, this left adequate power ($\pi = .80$) to detect a slope difference by condition (i.e., an interaction between racial identification and condition) of $\beta = 0.21$ for authenticity. Our goal sample size was 70 per condition.

**Additional information about primary measures.** Participants imagined that they were interviewing at CCG and completed the positive trait measures from Experiment 2, with the trait religious added to the African American stereotypes to boost reliability. Participants
indicated the extent to which positive stereotypes of African Americans (streetwise, humorous, athletic, musical, emotionally expressive, and religious; $\alpha = .54$) were self-descriptive. Participants did not self-report about negative traits or activity interests in this study. As in previous experiments, participants’ level of racial identification ($\alpha = .69$) did not differ across conditions, $F(2, 204) = 2.22, p = .111$. 
Table S11

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Primary Experiment 5 Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Racial Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive Trait Stereotypes (self-report)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authenticity (essay)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxiety (essay)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.51***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hiring Desirability</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean (SD) 4.42 (1.47) 4.34 (1.11) 4.71 (0.61) 1.75 (0.54) 3.71 (0.80)

*Note.* Ns range from 175 to 204. Numbers in parentheses next to means correspond to standard deviations. Scales range from 1-7 for all measures.

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Supplementary dependent measures

Positive self-presentation essay coding. If there were differences in hiring outcomes across diversity conditions, we hypothesized that this would be because different levels of anxiety and inauthenticity were evident in their self-descriptions. Specifically, we expected that in the multicultural condition, weakly identified participants would be seen as less desirable applicants because their anxiety and inauthenticity would be more evident in their self-descriptions than those in the colorblind condition (and the reverse for strongly identified participants).

However, an alternative possibility was that in the multicultural condition, weakly identified participants would be seen as less desirable applicants because they were less interested in working at the organization than those in the colorblind condition – this might lead them to present themselves less positively in reaction (and the reverse for strongly identified participants).

To address positive self-presentation as an alternative explanation for differences in hiring outcomes, we asked three research assistants to code the essays for positive self-presentation on a 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely) scale: “How competent does this person seem?” and “Does this person convey a positive impression?” Coders were blind to all hypotheses and experimental condition of the essay writer, and their responses, which had moderate interrater reliability ($ICC = .63$), were averaged to create a measure of positive self-presentation for each essay.

Desire to work at company and hiring perceptions. The primary purpose of the research was to understand how diversity approaches shape self-views in the organizational context. However, we also directly assessed participants’ perception of the company because it might have been affected by anticipated feelings of authenticity and anxiety. Desire to work
at the company was measured with “How much would you want to work at CCG?” on a 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Very much so) scale, and perception that the company would hire participants was measured with “How likely would CCG be to hire you?” on a 1 (Not at all likely) to 7 (Very likely) scale. We did not include these measures in the main results for the sake of brevity, because it was only measured once, and because it contributed less to understanding the phenomenon at hand than did the measures included in the main text.

**African American similarity.** African American similarity consisted of three items (“I am similar to other African Americans in terms of my behaviors”; “I am similar to the average African American”; “I am similar to other African Americans in terms of my life goals”; $\alpha = .81$) on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale and was measured immediately before racial identification and after the CCG interview questions. We included this measure of ingroup similarity as another way of assessing whether diversity approaches affected how people viewed or presented themselves. We did not include this measure in the main results for the sake of brevity, because it was only measured once, and because it showed null results parallel to the self-stereotyping measure presented in the main text (i.e., it was redundant information).

**Private collective self-esteem.** Private collective self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) was measured with four items ($\alpha = .75$; e.g., “I feel good about the race/ethnicity I belong to”) using the same scale. We included this measure to understand whether diversity approaches affect how participants feel about their group identity. If weakly identified participants self-stereotyped more in the multicultural relative to colorblind condition (as originally hypothesized), one possibility would be that it made them feel more positive toward their own group and therefore more comfortable embracing stereotypical qualities.

**Results**
**Manipulation and attrition checks.** Perceptions of how much the company focused on group differences differed by condition, $F(2, 186) = 28.19, p < .001$. Specifically, Bonferroni multiple comparison tests revealed that participants perceived greater focus on group differences more in the multiculturalism condition ($M = 3.31, SD = 1.04$) than in the colorblind condition ($M = 1.94, SD = 1.27$), $p < .001$, and the control condition ($M = 2.19, SD = 1.06$), $p < .001$. However, participants did not perceive a difference in how much the control and colorblind companies focused on group differences, $p = .642$. Attrition from the study did not differ by condition, $\chi^2(2, n = 374) = 2.74, p = .255$, or gender, $\chi^2(1, n = 371) = 1.88, p = .170$.

**Primary dependent measures.** Our analytic strategy and hypotheses were similar to previous experiments.

**Authenticity.** The predicted two-way interaction emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification, but not for the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification (see Table S12). Next, we examined simple effects for the multicultural relative to colorblind comparisons.

In simple effects analyses, African Americans with weak racial identification seemed less authentic when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, but this difference was not statistically significant, $b = 0.29, SE = 0.21, p = .171$. African Americans with strong racial identification showed the opposite significant pattern, $b = -.36, SE = .17, p = .032$.

---

14 We also re-ran the regression model on authenticity with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was no interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = -0.04$, $t(169) = -0.33, p = .742$. 
Simple slope analyses partially confirmed the predicted interaction pattern. Although we predicted a negative relationship between racial identification and authenticity in the colorblind condition, this slope was not statistically significant, $b = -0.02$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = .761$. However, as predicted in the multiculturalism condition, as participants were more strongly racially identified, they seemed more authentic, $b = 0.15$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = .008$. Finally, as expected, the relationship between racial identification and authenticity was not statistically significant in the control condition, $b = 0.01$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .869$.

Anxiety. The predicted two-way interaction emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification (see Table S12), but was not statistically significant for multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $p = .061$. Nonetheless, we examined simple effects for both the multicultural relative to colorblind and the multicultural relative to control comparisons to understand the pattern of effects.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification showed more anxiety when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to control, $b = -0.51$, $SE = 0.21$, $p = .017$, and colorblindness, but it was not statistically significant for the latter comparison, $b = -0.33$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .084$. African Americans with strong racial identification showed the opposite pattern, but these differences were not statistically significant for the multicultural relative to control comparison, $b = 0.21$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = .135$, or the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison, $b = 0.19$, $SE = 0.15$, $p = .224$.

15 We also re-ran the regression model on anxiety with the control condition as the reference group to compare the control and colorblind conditions. There was no interaction between the colorblind condition (relative to control) and racial identification, $\beta = -.07$, $t(169) = -0.62$, $p = .534$. 
Simple slope analyses partially confirmed the predicted interaction pattern. Although we predicted a positive relationship between racial identification and anxiety in the colorblind condition, this slope was not statistically significant, $b = 0.03, SE = 0.05, p = .531$. However, as predicted in the multiculturalism condition, as participants were more strongly racially identified, they showed less anxiety, $b = -0.10, SE = 0.05, p = .046$. Finally, as expected, the relationship between racial identification and anxiety was not statistically significant in the control condition, $b = 0.08, SE = 0.05, p = .119$.

**Positive African American traits.** The predicted two-way interaction emerged between the multiculturalism condition (relative to colorblindness) and racial identification. However, the predicted two-way interaction between the multiculturalism condition (relative to control) and racial identification did not emerge. Because of this, we probed the multicultural relative to colorblind comparison, but not the multicultural relative to control comparison.

In simple effects analyses, consistent with predictions, African Americans with weak racial identification reported that stereotypically African American traits were more self-descriptive when exposed to a company that valued multiculturalism relative to colorblindness, $b = -1.09, SE = 0.35, p = .002$. African Americans with strong racial identification showed the opposite pattern, but this difference did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $b = 0.45, SE = 0.28, p = .112$.

Simple slope analyses confirmed the predicted interaction pattern as well. As participants in the colorblind condition were more strongly racially identified, they described themselves more stereotypically, $b = 0.27, SE = 0.09, p = .003$. Racial identification was unrelated to how stereotypically participants described themselves in the multiculturalism condition, $b = -0.11, SE = 0.09, p = .200$, and control condition, $b = 0.03, SE = 0.09, p = .757$. 
Table S12

Hierarchical Regression on Primary Dependent Measures in Experiment 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Positive African American Self-Stereotyping</th>
<th>Essay Authenticity</th>
<th>Essay Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.
**Positive self-presentation.** We expected that differences in hiring desirability across diversity conditions was due to raters detecting anxiety and inauthenticity in participants’ self-descriptions. However, another possibility was that diversity condition impacted interest in working at that company, and therefore efforts to present themselves positively. When examining positive self-presentation in essays as an alternative explanation for differences in hiring outcomes, there were no main effects or interactions between diversity condition and racial identification (see Table 3). This suggests that the interaction between diversity condition and racial identification on hiring desirability could not be attributed to participants changing their self-presentations due to more or less interest in a company context.

**Implicit self-stereotyping.** There were no effects of diversity condition on implicit self-stereotyping, \( p_s > .536 \).

**Authenticity and anxiety mediating hiring desirability.** We tested moderated mediation models with 10,000 bootstrap resamples using the PROCESS macro (Model 8; Hayes, 2013) to determine whether authenticity and anxiety statistically mediated the interaction effect of multiculturalism (relative to colorblindness) on hiring desirability. The index of moderated mediation was significant for authenticity, \( b = -0.07, SE = 0.04, 95\% CI [-0.18, -0.01] \), but not anxiety, \( b = -0.05, SE = 0.03, 95\% CI [-0.13, 0.003] \). When examining mediation by authenticity at different levels of the racial identification moderator, there was only a significant indirect effect among participants who were strongly identified, \( b = -0.15, SE = 0.10, 95\% CI [-0.38, -0.01] \). Taken together, this suggests that increased feelings of authenticity in the multicultural relative to colorblind condition mediated better hiring outcomes among those strongly identified.
**Authenticity and anxiety mediating self-stereotyping.** Using the same model as above, the index of moderated mediation was not significant for anxiety, $b = -0.05, SE = 0.04, 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.14, 0.006]$, or authenticity, $b = 0.02, SE = 0.04, 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.05, 0.11]$.

**Supplementary dependent measures**

There were no significant effects of diversity condition or interaction between diversity condition and racial identification on participants’ perception that they will be hired or their reported similarity to other African Americans (see Table S13).

**Private collective self-esteem.** As shown in Table S13, there was a significant interaction between colorblindness (v. multiculturalism) and racial identification on private collective self-esteem. However, it revealed that weakly racially identified participants had more positive feelings toward their racial group at the multicultural than the colorblind company, $b = -0.68, SE = 0.34, p = .045$. Strongly identified participants were unaffected, $b = 0.35, SE = 0.27, p = .188$. Although the finding among weakly identified participants should be interpreted cautiously without replication, it is intriguing – it suggests that multiculturalism might make weakly identified minorities have more positive attitudes toward their group identity, while simultaneously feeling uncomfortable with the focus on that group identity. This ambivalence may be specific to a work context in which they prefer a focus on the individual self rather than group identity.

**Desire to work at company.** A significant interaction between diversity condition and racial identification revealed that strongly racially identified participants wanted to work at
the multicultural more than the colorblind, $b = -1.56$, $SE = 0.54$, $p = .004$, or control companies, $b = -2.02$, $SE = 0.52$, $p < .001$. The opposite was true for weakly identified participants, but it did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, $ps > .083$. 
Table S13

Hierarchical Regression on Supplemental Dependent Variables in Experiment 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>African American Similarity</th>
<th>Private Collective Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Desire to Work at Company</th>
<th>Perceptions of Being Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta ) ( p )</td>
<td>( \beta ) ( p )</td>
<td>( \beta ) ( p )</td>
<td>( \beta ) ( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identification</td>
<td>( 0.38 ) (&lt; .001 )</td>
<td>( 0.30 ) (&lt; .001 )</td>
<td>(-0.09 ) (.388 )</td>
<td>(-0.06 ) (.424 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>( 0.02 ) (.839 )</td>
<td>( 0.07 ) (.320 )</td>
<td>(-0.24 ) (.003 )</td>
<td>(-0.15 ) (.068 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural)</td>
<td>(-0.05 ) (.528 )</td>
<td>(-0.04 ) (.599 )</td>
<td>(-0.11 ) (.177 )</td>
<td>(-0.04 ) (.629 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>(-0.004 ) (.962 )</td>
<td>(-0.02 ) (.860 )</td>
<td>(-0.25 ) (.011 )</td>
<td>(-0.20 ) (.044 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind (v. Multicultural) x Identification</td>
<td>(0.01 ) (.942 )</td>
<td>(0.20 ) (.034 )</td>
<td>(-0.28 ) (.006 )</td>
<td>(-0.08 ) (.455 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Regression coefficients are reported from the step on which each variable was first entered. The multicultural condition, the reference group in the regression, is always coded as 0, with control and colorblindness coded as 1.
**Stereotype Pilot Studies**

**Activity Stereotyping Pilot Study**

With an independent sample of 13 University of Washington students (9 White, 3 Asian, 2 Hispanic), we pre-tested the 35 activities, interests, and traits from Steele and Aronson's (1995) stereotype avoidance measure to assess the stereotypicality of each activity for our activity self-stereotyping measure. Pre-test participants circled activities that they considered consistent with the cultural stereotype of African Americans (circled = 1, not circled = 0), and an activity was considered stereotypical if it was chosen at a rate significantly above chance (0.50). On this basis, nine activities were selected as stereotypical of African Americans (rap/hip-hop, football, sports, basketball, talking, gospel music, physical education, athletics, track) – we omitted the traits included in this scale because a separate measure assessed trait stereotypes (see next section). Means, standard deviations, and \( p \)-values indicating each item’s difference from 0.50 are reported in Table S14.
Table S14

*Means and Standard Deviations of Activity Stereotypicality Pilot Ratings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics career*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aloof*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Educator as career*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>Foreign language courses</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap/Hip-hop*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>Professional career</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Chess</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel music*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education courses*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Country music</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Fuzzy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business career</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Math &amp; science courses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm &amp; Blues</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>New Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Rock music</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a lazy couch potato</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Techie</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal courses</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Traveling</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Responses were binary (selected as stereotypical or not). A one-sample t-test compared the mean response for each trait to chance (0.50).

* Items included in experiments
Trait Stereotype Testing

Although the trait self-stereotyping measure was comprised of validated scales used in past research (see Judd et al., 1995; Wolsko et al., 2000) and validated in more recent research (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2006; Ghavami & Peplau, 2012), we conducted our own pilot study to confirm the appropriateness of these traits and to ensure that they also accounted for stereotypes of African American women. With an independent sample of 122 University of Washington students (see Table S15 for racial breakdown), we pre-tested 23 positive African American traits from Wolsko, Park, Judd, and Wittenbrink's (2000) stereotyping measure.

Pre-test participants were asked to circle all of the traits (circled = 1, not circled = 0) that encompassed stereotypes of either (between-subjects) African Americans, African American men, or African American women. A trait was considered stereotypical of African Americans if it was significantly above chance (0.50) either for the group as a whole or specifically for African American men or women.
Table S15

*Racial Background of Participants Completing Trait Stereotypicality Pilot Ratings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Target Condition</th>
<th>Participant Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American men</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American women</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trait means, standard deviations, and $p$-values are in Table S16 below. Final scales in Experiment 1 included five traits that were positive stereotypes of African Americans (streetwise, humorous$^{16}$, athletic, musical, emotionally expressive). In Experiment 5, we added the item religious to the positive African American stereotype measure to boost reliability.

$^{16}$ Humorous was included because it was considered stereotypical in the first stereotype pilot we reported above, based on Steele and Aronson’s (1995) measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Overall ($N = 38$)</th>
<th>Men ($N = 44$)</th>
<th>Women ($N = 40$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetwise*</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious**</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical*</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally expressive*</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Responses were binary (selected as stereotypical or not). A one-sample t-test compared the mean response for each trait to chance (0.50).
* Items included in experiments
** Item added after Experiment 2
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