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This dissertation tests a new theoretical model that describes when low status group members will work with members of higher status groups for social change, known as intergroup political solidarity. Research on intergroup political solidarity has focused on either the high status group’s orientation toward solidarity or when members of separate groups work together on behalf of a common low status group. There is thus a lack of research on intergroup political solidarity from the perspective of lower status groups.

It is proposed that recognition of group differences by the high status group influences orientations toward intergroup political solidarity. Specifically: 1) the endorsement of multiculturalism (which recognizes group differences) by a higher status group, compared to colorblindness (which minimizes group differences), would increase intergroup political solidarity; 2) trust in the high status group and perceptions of common values with the high status group would mediate the relation between multicultural endorsement by the high status group and solidarity, compared to colorblindness; 3) strength of group identification would be positively associated with intergroup political solidarity; and 4) group identification would moderate the direct relation between multiculturalism and intergroup political solidarity, such
that multiculturalism would increase solidarity under lower levels of group identification, compared to colorblindness.

Three experiments were conducted with two lower status groups, Latinos (Experiments 1 and 3) and people who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer (LGBTQ; Experiment 2), using two different methodological approaches, an internet experiment (Experiments 1 and 2) and an in-person laboratory experiment (Experiment 3). In all three experiments, the participants read a (fictional) press release that led them to believe that a relevant higher status group (Whites [Experiments 1 and 3] or heterosexual individuals [Experiment 2]) endorsed either multiculturalism or colorblindness. The conditions were compared on four dimensions of intergroup political solidarity: willingness to develop programs that promote social change with the high status group; willingness to engage in collective action with the high status group; attitudes toward joint action between low and high status groups; and willingness to work with the high status group without any specific action in mind. Group identification, common values and trust were measured. In Experiment 3, participants were led to believe they would interact with a high status group member and, thus, willingness to work with that person was also assessed. Experiments 2 and 3 tested the full meditation models.

The hypotheses were partially supported. Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to colorblindness, increased one of the four dimensions of solidarity: working on programs with the high status group (Experiments 1 and 2). Greater strength of identification with one’s low status group was related to greater solidarity across several of the outcome variables: working on programs (Experiments 1 and 2), collective action (Experiment 3), working with the high status group without any specific action (Experiment 3), and working with a member of the high status group (Experiment 3). Neither trust nor common values
mediated the relation between multicultural endorsement and solidarity (Experiments 1-3). There was partial evidence that group identification moderates the role of multiculturalism (Experiment 2). This finding occurred with only willingness to work on programs among LGBTQ.

The findings suggest that an alignment between who endorses multiculturalism and the type action in solidarity may be critical. Group identification may extend beyond increasing independent collective action, to action for the rights of one’s group alongside members of a higher status group. The results can be applied to future research on intergroup political solidarity, and also used by activist coalitions to encourage solidarity among the activists in their group.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

“When I talk about the masses, I'm talking about the white masses, I'm talking about the black masses, and the brown masses, and the yellow masses, too… We say you don't fight racism with racism. We're gonna fight racism with solidarity.” – Fred Hampton, Civil Rights Activist (1969)

“But during the planning for Freedom Summer the controversy over White participation in the movement rose again with new intensity… ‘On Friday, the first day of the session…there was a lively discussion of the role of Whites in the movement, and several suggestions for restricting their role…”’ – Doug McAdam, Freedom Summer (p. 32, 1988)

Overview

Political solidarity between historically low and high status groups can be a fruitful and important route to positive social change. As U.S. Civil Rights activist Fred Hampton’s statement (1969) suggests, solidarity between different groups for social change can be desirable. Indeed, the U.S. Civil Rights movement exemplifies a time when political solidarity between racially low and high status groups was realized and successful. A notable example of intergroup political solidarity during this time was the work done by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) during their Freedom Summer Campaign to register Black voters in 1964 (McAdam, 1988; Rothschild, 1982). Black activists choose to work in solidarity with White volunteers to register Black voters and marshal educational reform in Mississippi. This political solidarity achieved many positive outcomes, such as when approximately 80,000 Black residents cast votes in Mississippi that year.

Intergroup political solidarity also can be a contested route to positive social change. As historian Doug McAdam (1988) described in his analysis of intergroup relations during Freedom Summer, Black activists varied in the degree to which they were willing to work with White volunteers in Mississippi. Why did some Black activists question and others advocate political
solidarity with Whites during the Civil Rights movement? This leads to a broader question that this dissertation will address: When will members of lower status groups work for social change with a higher status group?

This problem has both theoretical and practical appeal. The field of social psychology has long investigated how to create social change in conflicting and unequal intergroup relations (Allport, 1954; Klandermans, 1984; Lewin, 1997; Tropp, 2012; van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). Largely, the focus has been on reducing prejudice between groups (Paluck & Green, 2009) and understanding the collective actions for change undertaken by low status groups (van Zomeren et al., 2008). Another path to social change is political solidarity between low and high status groups. Less work in social psychology has examined intergroup political solidarity (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Greenwood, 2008; Reicher, Cassidy, Wolpert, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006; Subašić, Reynolds, & Turner, 2008; Wiley, Srinivasan, Finke, Firnhaber, & Shilinsky, 2013). Further, studies of political solidarity have yet to investigate the perspective of the low status group regarding political solidarity with a higher status group. Exploring this issue can promote theoretical developments relevant to social change. Additionally, understanding this problem could provide activists with practical insights into how to enhance willingness to work with high status group allies among members of low status groups, such as LGBTQ activists working on behalf of LGBTQ’s rights alongside straight allies.

This dissertation investigates the conditions under which members of low status groups will work with a higher status group for social change, hereafter known as intergroup political solidarity. To do this, I draw on insights across social sciences disciplines as well as group identity and intergroup relation research. In this chapter, I propose a model that describes the conditions under which this intergroup political solidarity emerges.
Intergroup Political Solidarity

Intergroup political solidarity has been defined “as an outcome [that] involves the majority acting in solidarity with the minority to challenge the authority” (Subašić et al., 2008, p. 331), and “willingness to challenge an unjust social system on behalf of those who are disadvantaged by it” (Subašić, Schmitt, & Reynolds, 2011, p. 709). Political solidarity also has been described as “a ‘fellow feeling’ that may lead to actions that benefit others or to the actions themselves” (Reicher et al., 2006; p. 52). In the broadest sense, political solidarity is an orientation toward acting with members of other groups and/or the perception of shared identity with members of other groups within a political context. Notably, shared identity only applies when people already share a group membership (Greenwood, 2008; Leach et al., 2008). This dissertation is concerned with understanding low status groups’ political solidarity toward a separate higher status group, prior to the consolidation of a shared identity between those groups that motivates engagement in action for social change. Therefore, within the specific context examined in this dissertation, intergroup political solidarity is defined as the low status group’s orientation toward acting with members of a high status group for social change.

There is relatively little social psychological research investigating this type of intergroup political solidarity. Instead, theoretical analyses of intergroup political solidarity have focused either on the high status group’s perspective (Subašić et al., 2008) or omitted a specific focus on the low or high status group (Wiley & Bikmen, 2012). Much of the research relevant to intergroup political solidarity has focused on situations in which a high status group supports social change on behalf of the lower status group (Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003; Iyer & Ryan, 2009; Russell, 2011; Subašić et al., 2011; Wiley et al., 2013), for example, a study investigating non-Jewish Bulgarians’ aid for Jewish Bulgarians during World War II (Reicher et al., 2006).
Other research related to political solidarity has examined *intersectional solidarity*, which is when members of separate groups work together on behalf of a common low status group (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Greenwood, 2008). An example of research on intersectional solidarity is Greenwood’s (2008) work regarding when racially diverse women work for women’s rights. Although research regarding political solidarity from the perspective of the low status group is minimal, social psychological research that has focused on other types of political solidarity in combination with feminist and historical scholarship that has been done on the topic can aid in understanding how low status group members are oriented toward intergroup political solidarity.

On the topic of political solidarity, feminist scholar bell hooks (1984) has argued that “Women do not need to eradicate difference to feel solidarity…we can be sisters united by shared interests and beliefs, united in our appreciation for diversity, united in our struggle to end sexist oppression, united in political solidarity” (p. 67). Appreciating and recognizing the differences between groups of differing statuses may inspire intergroup political solidarity, and much feminist scholarship supports this idea (Alperin, 1990; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1984; Hurtado, 1989; Lorde, 1984; Pheterson, 1986). Women’s multicultural alliances, for example, may be enhanced by an interactive model of alliance, which holds that recognizing the important differences between low and high status groups is a foundation for intergroup political solidarity (Alperin, 1990).

Feminist work provides two additional insights that are useful in understanding the conditions that inspire intergroup political solidarity. First, appreciating group differences may be particularly effective at inspiring *low status group members’* political solidarity toward the higher status group. Indeed, hooks’ theorizing takes the perspective of Black women, where this
historically lower status group’s sense of political solidarity toward Whites is affected by an appreciation of group differences. This is linked to a second insight, which is that recognition of group differences by the high status group is crucial to inspiring intergroup political solidarity. As hooks explains, the way in which White women approach Black women is important. Specifically, hooks raises the issue that White women do not “encourage a diversity of voices, critical dialogue, and controversy” (1984, p. 10). The implication is that were White women to recognize group differences, Black women might be more amendable to intergroup political solidarity. In line with this thinking, I propose that recognition of group differences by the high status group will strengthen intergroup political solidarity.

History provides evidence for this possibility. In his book, *Freedom Summer*, Doug McAdam (1988) describes the varied preferences of Black and White activists for recognizing racial differences, and the critical impact this variance had on intergroup political solidarity. White volunteers were “supremely desirous of appearing color-blind” and “a good many [White] volunteers brought a kind of ‘missionary’ attitude to the project that only aggravated existing tensions” (emphasis in text; p. 103). Discussing preferences among Black activists, in contrast to Whites, McAdam explains, “rather than denying racial differences, their experiences in Mississippi had encouraged [Black activists] to emphasize them” (p. 103). Together, the “very different and increasingly incompatible psychologies of [activists] and volunteers” contributed to growing racial tensions and were partly responsible for Black activists’ reduced desire to work with Whites (p. 103). As illustrated in the opening quotation of this dissertation, this dynamic led to “a lively discussion of the role of Whites in the movement, and several suggestions for restricting their role” (p. 32). In line with this real-world event, it is possible that strength of
intergroup political solidarity may be influenced by the extent to which the high status group recognizes group differences.

Social psychological research on political solidarity provides support for this possibility. A qualitative study of engagement in Gay-Straight Alliances (GSA) among LGBTQ students suggests that LGBTQ students participated less in the GSA when the groups did not recognize the diversity in students’ sexual orientations (Heck, Lindquist, Stewart, Brennan, & Cochran, 2013). One participant in this study described their GSA as a “restrictive environment,” in which students “were not allowed to use the words ‘gay,’ ‘queer,’ or ‘rainbow’ in our advertising” (p. 94). These perceptions may have contributed to reduced participation, exemplified by the report that “Only one person routinely showed up at meetings” (p. 94). Although this study is limited in that it does not directly assess recognition of group differences or intergroup political solidarity, one interpretation of these findings is that whether or not a GSA allowed recognition of group differences influences LGBTQ students’ engagement in a political context with straight individuals.

In a study comparing the influence of women’s singular and intersectional political consciousness, Greenwood (2008) examined political solidarity among a racially heterogeneous group of women, representing racially low and high status groups. Whereas singular political consciousness downplays distinctions between low status and high status groups, intersectional political consciousness recognizes group differences. Among women, for example, whereas singular consciousness focuses on similarity among women, intersectional consciousness appreciates the different experiences women may have as a consequence of their simultaneous memberships in low and high status groups. The findings demonstrated that expression of political solidarity was higher when intersectional political consciousness was dominant.
Although the work focused on when low and high status group members work for a common low status group, this finding provides evidence that appreciating differences between low and high status groups may inspire intergroup political solidarity among people of varied group statuses.

In a theoretical analysis, Wiley and Bikmen (2012) discussed the role of group difference in intergroup political solidarity. They reasoned that an intersectional consciousness (Greenwood, 2008) may be foundational to the formation of intergroup alliances. That is, although political solidarity emerges through a common identity, it does so in a context that “respects subgroup differences and addresses power differentials among those subgroups” (Wiley & Bikmen, 2012, p. 200). Although this analysis did not focus on low or high status groups’ distinct orientations toward political solidarity, it supports the possibility that recognition of group differences may be critical to intergroup political solidarity.

Interdisciplinary work regarding different types of political solidarity provides insights into the conditions under which intergroup political solidarity may emerge. In specific, greater recognition of group differences by the high status group may strengthen intergroup political solidarity. Further support for this possibility can be garnered from other areas of social psychological research. Intergroup relations and group identity research that focuses on improving relations between low and high status groups in apolitical contexts, such as in business and educational settings, may clarify the conditions that foster intergroup political solidarity.

**Multiculturalism and Colorblindness**

Within intergroup relations research, varied recognition of group differences is represented in two common intergroup ideologies: *multiculturalism* and *colorblindness* (Albrecht & Brewer, 1990; Kull, 1992; McAdam, 1988; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Ratts, 2011;
Multiculturalism encourages the idea that differences between low and high status groups can and should be recognized and valued. In contrast, colorblindness promotes the idea that differences between low and high status groups can and should be ignored in favor of treating people as individuals (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Wolsko et al., 2000). Both ideologies arose through efforts to reduce inequality between low and high status groups and the “stratification” of those diverse groups (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004, p. 417). Group status is thus central to defining multiculturalism and colorblindness. I will begin with a description of the origin and definitions of multiculturalism and colorblindness, and then describe their associations with the quality of intergroup relations.

Colorblindness was articulated before multiculturalism. The idea appeared as early as 1896, in Justice John Harlan’s dissenting opinion in *Plessy v. Ferguson*: “Our Constitution is color-blind and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law.” The goal of this ideology was to reduce status differentials between historically low and high status racial groups (Albrecht & Brewer, 1990; Chavez, 1998; Kull, 1992). It was thought that intergroup relations would be improved by minimizing the differences between low and high status groups that historically were used to justify and reproduce division and animosity, thus allowing for more equal treatment across groups (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Karafantis, Pierre-Louis, & Lewandowski, 2010). Colorblind ideology continues to operate in society. In 2007, Chief Justice John Roberts’ opinion in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District*, exemplifies colorblindness today: “The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race, is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.”
Various definitions of colorblindness have been offered by social scientists. Wolsko and colleagues (2000) describe colorblind ideology as “learning to judge others as individuals and not on the basis of their social group membership” (p. 637). Applying this idea to real-world contexts, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) define colorblindness as the notion that “categories do not matter and should not be considered when making decisions such as hiring and school admissions” (p. 417). Furthermore, Hahn and her colleagues (2010) point out that colorblindness is characterized by an explicit effort to downplay group differences, describing colorblindness as “treating everyone the same without regard to [group membership] (i.e., we should not pay attention to group differences)” (p. 120). Drawing on these definitions and the historical purposes of colorblindness, which is to address the stratification of low and high status groups, colorblindness is defined in this dissertation as *the idea that differences between low and high status groups should be ignored in favor of treating people as individuals*. A central tenet of colorblindness is thus the minimization of differences between low and high status groups.

However, a colorblind approach may unintentionally support subtle racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2003), be detrimental to the well-being of low status group members (Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Sleeter, 1991), and produce more negative intergroup relations (Plaut et al., 2009; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007). Moreover, actually achieving colorblindness, where group differences are imperceptible, is highly unlikely, particularly when those group differences are visible. In response to shortcomings such as these, multiculturalism was developed as an alternative ideology. Multiculturalism is thought to improve intergroup relations and reduce inequity between low and high status groups by
increasing social tolerance and education regarding difference (Banks, 1995; Karafantis et al., 2010) and protecting the distinctiveness of valued group identities (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Dovidio et al., 2009; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Multiculturalism has been examined extensively within the social sciences (Arasaratnam, 2013; Bennett, 1988; Deaux & Verkuyten, 2014; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Ratts, 2011; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Wolsko et al., 2006). Wolsko et al. (2000) provide a basic definition of multicultural ideology as “learning to recognize and appreciate [group] diversity” (p. 637). Extending the idea of appreciation, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) point out that multiculturalism is the belief that “group differences and memberships should not only be acknowledged and considered, but also, celebrated” (p. 417). Similarly, a review by Rattan and Ambady (2013) explains that multiculturalism focuses on group differences and values those differences: “group memberships must not only be acknowledged but also valued” (p. 12). Accordingly, multiculturalism is defined in this dissertation as the idea that differences between low and high status groups should be recognized and valued.

Over the past two decades, social psychological research has examined multiculturalism and colorblindness in laboratory experiments, businesses, and educational settings (for review see Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Arasaratnam, 2013; Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000; Mazzocco, Cooper, & Flint, 2011; Plaut et al., 2009; Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Ryan et al., 2007; Wolsko et al., 2000). Research has explored, for example, how personal endorsement of the two ideologies influences intergroup prejudice (Ryan et al., 2010; Ryan et al., 2007) and how endorsement of the ideologies by the high status group influences engagement in the workplace among low status group members (Plaut et al., 2009). Research consistently illustrates that multiculturalism and colorblindness have different consequences for the positivity of intergroup
relations (for review see Sasaki & Vorauer, 2013). In the most general terms, multiculturalism inspires better relations between low and high status groups than does colorblindness.

Endorsement of multiculturalism improves the attitudes of low status group members toward the high status group and also increases their engagement in intergroup settings that require cooperation with the high status group. In a study comparing multiculturalism and colorblindness within the workplace, Plaut and colleagues (2009) measured endorsement of multiculturalism and colorblindness by White coworkers. They also assessed the extent to which racial minority employees valued their job success and organizational membership, referred to as psychological engagement, as well as their perceptions of bias. An example of the items that Plaut et al. used to measure colorblindness was “Employees should downplay their racial and ethnic differences,” and an example of a multicultural items was “Employees should recognize and celebrate racial and ethnic differences” (p. 444). The findings showed that stronger endorsement of multiculturalism by White coworkers was related to greater psychological engagement in the workplace and lower perceptions of bias among racial minority employees. In contrast, stronger endorsement of colorblindness by White coworkers was associated with lower psychological engagement and greater perceptions of bias.

In another study, Van Laar and colleagues (2013) examined Muslim women’s psychological engagement in workplace and school settings in relation to their perceptions that Dutch people recognized and valued differences between Muslims and native Dutch. An example of such perceptions is the extent to which Dutch people valued the cultural background of all employees. Greater acknowledgement of group differences by the high status group, as in multiculturalism but not colorblindness, increased the low status group’s motivation to put effort into their work, belief they could perform well at their jobs, and belief they could deal with
intergroup conflict within the workplace or school. Taking these specific outcomes together, this suggests that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group may enhance engagement in intergroup settings that require cooperation with the high status group among members of low status groups.

Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group also increases low status group members’ comfort in interactions with the high status group. Holoien and Shelton (2012), for example, primed White students with either multiculturalism or colorblindness, and then had the White students interact with racial minority students. Following interpersonal interactions, the experimenters measured cognitive depletion among the low status group members, based on their performance on a Stroop color-matching task (see MacLeod, 1991 for a thorough review of this measure of cognitive depletion). Low status group students’ cognitive depletion was lower following an interaction with a high status group student who was primed with multiculturalism, compared to colorblindness. This result is an indication that racial minority students had fewer psychological concerns and were more comfortable in the interactions where a high status group member was primed with multiculturalism.

In a study of prejudicial attitudes among high status group members, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) primed White participants with either multiculturalism or colorblindness and then assessed implicit and explicit bias toward various racial groups. In the multicultural condition, participants expressed lower implicit and explicit bias in favor of their own group. The opposite results were found in the colorblindness condition. In a different study among high status group members, Wolsko et al. (2000) primed participants with either multiculturalism or colorblindness and assessed intergroup attitudes. Salience of multiculturalism led participants to exhibit more positive attitudes toward racial minorities. Although these studies focused on the
attitudes of high status group members, their findings suggest that multiculturalism can be beneficial for intergroup attitudes, especially when compared to colorblindness.

Personal endorsement of multiculturalism is related to more positive intergroup attitudes among both low and high status group members, particularly in comparison to colorblindness. Ryan and colleagues (2007) examined the influence of personal endorsement of multiculturalism and colorblindness on intergroup attitudes among Black and White Americans. Results showed that greater personal endorsement of multiculturalism was associated with lower ethnocentrism among all participants. In a later study, Ryan and colleagues (2010) assessed the influence of personal endorsement of multiculturalism and colorblindness on intergroup attitudes among Latinos and non-Latino Whites, and again found that greater endorsement of multiculturalism was related to lower bias in favor of one’s own group.

In studies of group identity, intergroup attitudes are improved by recognizing group differences. Invoking a dual identity between racially low and high status groups – an identity that recognizes some group differences – increased low status group members’ willingness to engage in intergroup contact and also heightened their motivation to promote social change, compared to an identity that de-emphasizes group differences (Glasford & Dovidio, 2011). In studies when individuals were assigned to one of two arbitrary groups and asked to cooperate with the other group, recognition of the arbitrary group differences increased intergroup cooperation (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986). To the extent that multiculturalism emphasizes group differences, these studies offer additional evidence that multiculturalism, compared to colorblindness, may improve intergroup relations, and specifically enhance willingness to interact and work with high status group members.
This review of research on multiculturalism and colorblindness demonstrates that multiculturalism inspires better relations between low and high status groups than colorblindness across many outcomes in apolitical settings. These outcomes include reduced intergroup bias, increased engagement in intergroup settings that require cooperation, improved quality of intergroup interactions, heightened willingness for intergroup contact, greater intergroup cooperation, and enhanced motivation to promote social change. Furthermore, several of the studies provided evidence that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group is particularly effective at enhancing these outcomes among low status group members (e.g., Plaut et al., 2009; Van Laar et al., 2013).

This overall pattern is important to understanding intergroup political solidarity. Specifically, it is possible that the benefits found for intergroup relations apply to intergroup political solidarity. Indeed, many of these positive intergroup outcomes are germane to intergroup political solidarity, which is defined by its requirements that low status group members are willing to interact, engage, and cooperate with the high status group, with the goal of promoting social change. Moreover, given that multiculturalism and colorblindness are inherently political ideas (Ratts, 2011), which are intended to create societal change, these effects may translate to political contexts. Taking this possibility together with the interdisciplinary work reviewed earlier, I propose that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group will increase intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to endorsement of colorblindness. This hypothesis is illustrated by path a in Figure 1.

In addition to understanding the conditions that heighten intergroup political solidarity, this dissertation investigates factors that might explain why such conditions strengthen intergroup political solidarity. Turning now to this issue, I draw on group identity and intergroup relations
research to propose that trust in the high status group and perceived common values with the high status group will be critical factors in explaining intergroup political solidarity.

Trust and Common Values

Trust in the high status group (Cohen & Steele, 2002; Huo & Molina, 2006) and perceptions of common values with the high status group (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Gurin, Gurin, Matlock, & Wade-Golden, 2008) may play an explanatory role in intergroup political solidarity. In an intergroup context, trust is the prevalence of beliefs regarding whether another group has benevolent and egalitarian intentions (Montoya & Pittinsky, 2011; Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009). Common values are the important beliefs and principles one holds in common with other people or groups (Gurin et al., 2008). The roles of trust and common values in intergroup political solidarity are largely based on the conceptual distinction between multiculturalism and colorblindness in the extent to which each recognizes and values group differences (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Sasaki & Vorauer, 2013).

Trust

Trust in the high status group may be a key factor in intergroup political solidarity. Huo and Molina (2006) examined low status group members’ experience of subgroup respect, which is the assessment that one’s subgroup is recognized and valued by society, including the high status group. They assessed perceptions of subgroup respect and trust in mainstream society in a sample of African Americans and Latinos. Greater subgroup respect was associated with greater trust. This supports the possibility that greater recognition of group differences may increase, or at least be positively associated with, trust in the high status group. Additionally, high status group members who recognize group differences, such as differences based on inequality, are often the same high status group members who express benevolent and egalitarian intentions—a
definitional component of trustworthiness (Iyer et al., 2003; Leach, Iyer, & Pedersen, 2006). Among Whites, a greater belief that their higher status is illegitimate, which recognizes group status differences, was related to greater support for affirmative action, an indicator of an orientation toward group equality (Iyer et al., 2003). Together, these studies suggest that high status group members who recognize group differences may be more likely to be seen as trustworthy. It is possible then that when high status group members recognize group differences, low status group members will perceive that the high status group can be trusted. Insofar as multiculturalism recognizes group differences, whereas colorblindness does not, this provides support for the idea that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group may elevate trust in the high status group, particularly compared to colorblindness.

Trust between groups has many benefits for relations between low and high status groups. Trust in White teachers, for example, increased Black students’ receptivity to mentorship from these teachers (Cohen & Steele, 2002). Protestant and Catholics in Northern Ireland were more open to spending time with and talking to members of the other group when they felt greater intergroup trust (Tam et al., 2009). Greater trust between Israelis and Palestinians resulted in more openness to cooperation and ultimately reaching more peaceful intergroup relations within the Israel-Palestinian conflict (Baron, 2008).

On an interpersonal level, trust relates to greater willingness to cooperate with others (Ferrin, Bligh, Kohles, 2007; Lee, Stajkovic, & Cho, 2011). In a field study in the workplace, Lee and colleagues found that greater trust in one’s coworkers was associated with greater willingness to continue working with those coworkers and perceptions that cooperation will lead to better performance. Together, these studies suggest that trust can improve intergroup relations across many outcomes, including promoting contact between groups and increasing willingness
to cooperate. Because such outcomes are important features of intergroup political solidarity, these findings indicate that trust may heighten intergroup political solidarity.

On the basis of this research, I propose that trust will be a mediating mechanism explaining why multiculturalism increases intergroup political solidarity. That is, low status group members will be more willing to work for social change with the high status group if they trust the high status group, which is more likely to occur if the high status group endorses multiculturalism, compared to colorblindness. Paths b and c in Figure 1 illustrate this hypothesis.

**Common Values**

Common values between the low and high status groups may also be a critical factor in intergroup political solidarity, as they signify the important beliefs and principles one holds in common with other groups (Gurin et al., 2008). Group identity research provides support for this possibility. Specifically, social identity and self-categorization theories propose that group identity is the part of an individual’s self-concept that she or he derives from her or his membership within a social group “together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63). Low status group members are likely to value the low status group to which they belong (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 2009) takes this a step further: Group members value their group’s difference, a construct known as group distinctiveness. On the assumption that low status group members value their group’s differences (Brewer, 1991, 2009; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), when high status group members also recognize and value those differences, as conveyed through their multicultural endorsement, low status group members may develop a generalized sense that the two groups share common values.
In an experiment, Glasford and Dovidio (2011) primed members of a racially lower status group with either a dual identity, which recognized racial group differences, or a common identity, which minimized differences. The dual identity condition increased low status group members’ perceptions of shared values with all Americans, a group that included Whites. In a correlational survey study, Asian Americans and Latinos who perceived more common values with other race/ethnic groups had less negative attitudes toward educational practices that emphasized diversity between groups (Gurin et al., 2008). These findings suggest that recognition of group differences, as in multiculturalism, may elevate perceptions of common values between two groups. Taken together, theory and research indicate that recognizing and valuing group differences may inspire the perception of common values. To the extent that multiculturalism recognizes and values group differences, endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group may increase perceptions of common values, compared to colorblindness.

Perceptions of common values between the low and high status groups can improve intergroup relations and inspire political solidarity. Among members of a racially low status group, for instance, perceptions of common values among Americans increased willingness to have contact with Whites (Gurin et al., 2008). Similarly, in Glasford and Dovidio’s (2011) study, greater perceptions of common values were associated with more willingness to come in contact with the high status group. In a study of political solidarity from one racially lower status group to another, common values were critical to increased political solidarity between the two low status groups (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012). As common values may encourage contact between low and high status groups, which is an important part of intergroup political solidarity, this suggests that common values may strengthen intergroup political solidarity.
Altogether, this review supports the possibility that common values may have an explanatory role in intergroup political solidarity. It is expected that low status group members will be more willing to work for social change with the high status group if they perceive common values between their own group and the high status group, under endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to colorblindness. Paths b and c in Figure 1 illustrate this hypothesis.

**Differences between trust and common values.** Trust and common values are likely to be related, as both are influenced by the recognition of group differences. However, the two concepts are distinct. Whereas trust is defined by the perception that one holds about the intentions of another group, common values involve the perceptions one holds about the values of another group. Valuing racial equality, for example, is not the same as expressing intentions to promote racial equality, although the two can coincide; one can value racial equality and also intend to promote that equality. Because trust and common values are likely to be correlated, the two variables are conceptualized as parallel mediators, as depicted in Figure 1.

**Group Identification**

Intergroup political solidarity is fundamentally about creating social change. As such, one central factor in intergroup political solidarity may be the strength of group members’ identification with their group. This is a well-established antecedent to intentions to work for social change among members of lower status groups (for a meta-analysis see van Zomeren et al., 2008; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). *Level of group identification* is defined as the strength of affiliation with a group and the extent to which one finds value and emotional significance in the group (Ellemers et al., 2002; Leach et al., 2008; Tajfel, 1978). In two studies, Simon and colleagues (1998) found that stronger group identification among elderly and gay people was
associated with greater willingness to take collective action. Because level of group identification is strongly and positively related to intentions to work for social change, it is likely to contribute directly to intergroup political solidarity as well. Specifically, it is predicted that greater levels of group identification will increase intergroup political solidarity, as illustrated by path d in Figure 1.

Additionally, level of group identification may moderate the influence of endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group on intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to colorblindness. Again, support for social change increases with greater levels of group identification (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008). Because highly identified individuals have a strong pre-existing preference for social change, their orientation toward solidarity may be less influenced by specific circumstances. In essence, individuals with high group identity are already committed to the cause, and may require fewer conditions to support social change, such as multicultural endorsement by the high status group. Thus, when group identification is high, there may be little difference between those individuals who perceive that the high status group endorses multicultural versus colorblindness. In contrast, people with weaker group identification are less likely to work for social change on behalf of their group, and thus their orientation toward supporting social change and intergroup political solidarity may be more malleable, encouraged or discouraged by specific circumstances. Once the desire for the recognition of their group’s differences is achieved, those with low group identity may be inspired to support social change and intergroup political solidarity through the processes I have proposed. A moderating effect can be hypothesized, then, such that under lower levels of group identification, endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to colorblindness. Path e in Figure 1 illustrates this hypothesis. I do
not expect the indirect effect of multiculturalism, compared to colorblindness, through trust and common values to be moderated by level of group identification. There is little evidence that levels of intergroup trust and common values are modified by group identification.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

This dissertation aims to understand the conditions under which low status group members will work with the high status group for social change, that is, intergroup political solidarity. It will test the effect of endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to endorsement of colorblindness by the high status group, on intergroup political solidarity. The direct and moderating influences of level of group identification, as well as the mediating roles of trust and common values on intergroup political solidarity will be tested.

Three experiments test these relations with different low and high status groups and with different methods. Experiments 1 and 2 use an online survey to examine Latinos’ solidarity with Whites (Experiment 1) and LGBTQ individuals’ solidarity with straight people (Experiment 2). Experiment 3 also examines Latinos’ solidarity with Whites, but uses a social interaction paradigm in a laboratory setting. In all three experiments, low status participants are randomly assigned to conditions in which the high status group either endorses multiculturalism (Multicultural condition) or colorblindness (Colorblind condition). Experiments 1 and 2 include a control condition in order to attain a baseline measure of intergroup political solidarity and improve internal validity. Four outcome measures were developed and employed in all three experiments to assess conceptually distinct aspects of intergroup political solidarity. Experiments 2 and 3 add the constructs of trust and common values as mediators to the model tested in Experiment 1.
Figure 1 depicts the theoretical model that is tested across the three experiments. In this figure, the condition where the high status group endorses multiculturalism is designated (1) to assist in representing the positive relations between the multicultural condition and the mediating (paths b and c) and dependent variables (path a), compared to the condition where the high status group endorses colorblindness, which is coded (0). The control condition is omitted in this figure for clarity of presentation. Trust and common values are depicted together to represent their role as parallel and possibly overlapping mediating variables. Level of identification is included as a direct (path d) and moderating (path e) variable. The following hypotheses derive from Figure 1:

H1: Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to (H1a) colorblindness (Experiments 1-3) and (H1b) control conditions (Experiments 1 and 2), will increase intergroup political solidarity.

H2: Level of group identification will increase intergroup political solidarity (Experiments 1-3).

H3: Level of group identification will moderate the direct relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to (H3a) colorblindness (Experiments 1-3) and (H3b) control conditions (Experiments 1 and 2), such that multiculturalism will increase intergroup political solidarity under lower levels of group identification.

H4: Trust will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to (H4a) colorblindness (Experiments 2 and 3) and (H4b) control conditions (Experiment 2).
H5: Common values will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to (H5a) colorblindness (Experiments 2 and 3) and (H5b) control conditions (Experiment 2).
Chapter 2

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 tests the effect of endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group on intergroup political solidarity, compared to endorsement of colorblindness and also a control condition. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of three press release statements about the high status group’s positions: (1) endorsement of multiculturalism, (2) endorsement of colorblindness, or (3) positive attitudes toward the low status group. Intergroup political solidarity was assessed with four measures developed by the investigator for this dissertation.

The hypotheses for this experiment are:

$H_1$: Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to both ($H_{1a}$) colorblindness and ($H_{1b}$) control conditions, will be related to greater intergroup political solidarity.

$H_2$: Level of group identification will increase intergroup political solidarity.

$H_3$: Level of group identification will moderate the relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to ($H_{3a}$) colorblindness and ($H_{3b}$) control conditions, such that multiculturalism will increase intergroup political solidarity under lower levels of group identification.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 95 Latino/a undergraduate students at John Jay College who were born in the United States (74 female; 20 male; one person chose not to report sex), with a mean age of 20.25 years ($SD_{age} = 2.78$, range$_{age} = 18-33$). Socioeconomic status ranged from 2 to
10 on a 10-point scale ($M = 5.53, SD = 1.60$), with higher scores indicating higher SES. Seventy participants (74%) reported English as their first language, and the rest reported Spanish.

**Procedure**

The study was conducted online and was presented to participants as a study of “Groups & Cooperation.” Participants were recruited through the John Jay College subject pool and signed up using a web-based system (SONA.com). Participation was voluntary and in fulfillment of partial course credit. Because of a pre-screening survey, only Latino/Hispanic individuals could sign up. Data were collected through surveygizmo.com. The first page of the survey was the informed consent form. Participants could not complete the survey unless they checked a box indicating consent. Participants could not return to earlier survey pages once they had moved forward, and could not leave the survey and return at a later time. A copy of the consent form and all experimental materials can be found in Appendix A.

After indicating consent, participants read an introductory statement: “First, you will read a recent Press Release based on scientific research. After reading, you will answer questions about the content of the statement.” The online survey was constructed to automatically, randomly assign participants to one of three conditions in which the focus of a fictional press release regarding recent social science research was manipulated to represent a multicultural ($n = 35$), colorblind ($n = 28$), or emotionally positive perspective held by the high status group (control condition; $n = 32$). No other information was given about the press release (e.g., source, author). In the Multicultural condition, the press release stated that the high status group endorses multiculturalism, specifically, that the high status group approaches the low status group in ways that recognize and value differences between the low and high status groups. In the Colorblind condition, the press release stated that the high status group endorses colorblindness, specifically,
that the high status group approaches the low status group by treating people as individuals, minimizing a focus on group differences. In the Control condition, the press release described the high status group’s positive attitudes toward the low status group. The content of the multicultural and colorblind press releases (but not the control condition) was adapted from previous research (Karafantis et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000). After reading the press release, participants in the Multicultural and Colorblind conditions were asked to list up to five main points from the press release. This listing task reinforced the priming of multiculturalism or colorblindness. Participants in the Control condition listed up to five ways in which White Americans have positive views of Latinos, which was included to parallel the listing task in the experimental conditions.

All participants then responded to four dependent measures, which assessed distinct aspects of intergroup political solidarity. The prompt for dependent measures read: “When it comes to inequality facing Latinos, some Latinos are willing to work together with White Americans to create change; however, other Latinos are much less willing to work with Whites to create change (want Latinos to work independently). There are positive and negatives to each way. Consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions regarding your willingness.” The final questions included manipulation checks and demographic variables. Participants then read a debriefing statement.

Measures

Political Solidarity. Because no reliable and valid measures exist of intergroup political solidarity toward a higher status group from the perspective of the low status group, four conceptually distinct outcome measures were developed for the dissertation. Intergroup political
solidarity was defined as the low status group’s orientation toward acting with members of a high status group for social change. Based on this definition, the first measure of intergroup political solidarity, *Willingness to Work on Programs*, assesses personal willingness to act with the high status group to develop top-down policies and programs that promote social change. The second measure, *Willingness to Engage in Collective Action*, measures personal willingness to engage in grass-roots activism to promote social change alongside the high status group. The *Support for Political Solidarity* scale measures attitudes toward joint action between low and high status groups to promote social change. The fourth measure, *Willingness to Work with the High Status Group*, assesses personal willingness to work with the high status group without any specific action in mind. All items were answered with a 7-point response format with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. The results of all factor analyses that yielded a solution greater than one-factor are reported in tables in Appendix B. Variables with a skewness z-score greater than ±3 were transformed to reduce the skew to an acceptable level.

**Willingness to work on programs.** A measure was developed to assess willingness to work with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change. The seven-item scale was based on items developed by Swim and Miller (1999) and Iyer and colleagues (2003) that assess support for affirmative action policies. All items used the stem “I would work with Whites,” in order to frame items in terms of action with the higher status group. Sample items are: “I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial minority high school students for college admissions” and “I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for racial minorities.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 1. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation was conducted. The findings indicated a
one-factor solution, explaining 73.16% of the common variance. The items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater willingness to work on programs with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .93.

**Willingness to engage in collective action.** A modified version of a four-item scale developed by van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach (2004) that measured low status group members’ willingness to take collective actions for social change was used to assess personal willingness to take collective actions alongside the high status group. This measure differs from the measure of *Willingness to Work on Programs* in that it captures willingness to engage in bottom-up, grass-roots actions, rather than work to develop institutional programming. All items included the words “with Whites,” in order to frame items in terms of taking action with the high status group. Sample items are: “I would participate in raising our collective voice with Whites” and “I would participate in a future demonstration with Whites.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 2. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a one-factor solution, explaining 89.07% of the common variance. The four items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and so to account for this a reflected inverse transformation was performed, which reduced the skew to an acceptable level. Greater scores on this scale indicate greater willingness to engage in collective actions with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .96.

**Support for political solidarity.** A third dependent variable measured attitudes in support of joint action between low and high status groups to promote social change. In contrast to the other three dependent outcomes, which capture personal behavioral intentions, this scale assesses general attitudes about the desirability of political solidarity between the low and high status
groups. This scale included three items from a study of racial minority group members’ support for political solidarity with another minority group (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012). Three additional items were created so that the scale would include items with both positive and negative valence. Sample items are: “Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial equality” and “Whites should not be involved in Latinos’ efforts to promote racial equality.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 3. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 74.41% of the common variance. All items had loadings > .40, indicating that they all contributed to a factor’s variance. The three items with positive valence loaded on a first factor, explaining 55.44% of the covariance. The three items with negative valence loaded on a second factor, explaining an additional 18.97% of the covariance. In the questionnaire, the three items with positive valence were presented first, followed by the three items with negative valence. Given the high intercorrelation among the components ($r = .44$) and because the measurement order may have contributed to a two-factor solution, a single scale was created with all six items. After the three items with negative valence were reverse coded, the items were averaged to create one scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation was performed to reduce the skew to an acceptable level. Greater scores indicate greater support for political solidarity. The alpha coefficient was .83.

**Willingness to work with the high status group.** A measure of general willingness to work with the high status group, without reference to specific actions, was created for the dissertation. In contrast to the previous three dependent measures, which all suggest the goal of social change, this scale focused on willingness to take actions with the high status group without mentioning a specific goal. Six items had positive valance and three items had negative valence.
To frame items in terms of action with the high status group, all nine items included the words “with Whites.” Sample items are: “I would consider working with Whites” and “I would not be motivated to work with Whites.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 4. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 79.73% of the common variance). Items loading > .40 were considered to be part of a factor. The six items with positive valence loaded on a first factor, explaining 59.84% of the covariance. The three items with negative valence loaded on a second factor, explaining 19.89% of the covariance. The six items with positive valence were presented first, followed by items with negative valence, so methodological variance may be responsible for the two-factor structure. Because of this and the correlation between the two components (\(r = .38\)), a single scale was created. The three items with negative valence were reverse coded, and all items were averaged to create one scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation reduced the skew to an acceptable level. Greater scores indicate greater willingness to work with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .90.

*Relationships among dependent measures.* The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all variables are shown in Table 5. All means were above the midpoint on a 7-point scale. The four dependent measures were significantly and positively associated, with intercorrelations ranging from .31 to .71. As this is an initial inquiry into intergroup political solidarity from the perspective of the low status group, and because the measures were planned with conceptual distinctions in order to capture multiple dimensions of the construct, the measures were not combined. Specifically, willingness to work on programs was conceptually...
distinct from the other three measures because it focuses on personal behavioral intentions to develop top-down programs for social change. Willingness to engage in collective action is distinct from the other outcomes because it addresses behavioral intentions to take bottom-up action for social change. Support for political solidarity represents attitudes toward groups taking joint actions for social change, not one’s behavioral intentions for such actions. Willingness to work with the high status group is distinct from the other three measures in that it does not specify any actions or goals. Averaging across these four outcomes could lose information about potentially distinct aspects of intergroup political solidarity.

**Level of group identification.** Level of group identification was defined as strength of subjective affiliation with one’s low status group. It was assessed by a nine-item scale (Leach et al., 2008) that includes three subscales of three items each: satisfaction, centrality, and solidarity. Examples are: “I am glad to be Latino” (satisfaction), “The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity” (centrality), and “I feel a bond with Latinos” (solidarity).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 6. An exploratory Principal Components analysis of the nine items with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 78.24% of the common variance. The first factor was composed of the satisfaction and solidarity subscales. Two items from the centrality subscale loaded > .40 on both factors, and the third centrality item loaded on the second factor. This may have occurred because the items were presented by subscale. Because the subscale structure has been validated in seven other studies (Leach et al., 2008) the nine items were averaged to create a single scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Greater scores indicate greater level of group identification. The alpha coefficient was .83.
**Manipulation checks.** Two sets of items assessed the efficacy of the multicultural and colorblind conditions to produce the intended ideology. Participants were asked two questions about the high status group’s endorsement of multiculturalism (e.g., “White Americans want to approach Latinos in ways that recognize that we should celebrate the racial diversity of our shared nation”) and two that assessed colorblindness (e.g., “White Americans want to recognize that at the core of things we are all individuals”). The two items for each ideology were averaged, respectively, to create two scales with a possible range of 1 to 7. Greater scores indicate greater perceptions that the high status group endorsed multiculturalism or colorblindness, respectively.

**Demographic data.** Demographic items included age, sex, country of birth, racial/ethnic self-identification, first and second languages, and socioeconomic status.

**Data Analysis Plan**

Two specific hypotheses regarding differences between the three conditions were proposed: endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group (Multicultural condition) will increase intergroup political solidarity, in comparison compared to endorsement of colorblindness (Colorblind condition; H$_{1a}$) and to the Control condition (H$_{1b}$). It was predicted that level of group identification increases intergroup political solidarity (H$_2$). It was also predicted that level of group identification moderates the relation between the multicultural condition and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to the colorblindness (H$_{3a}$) and control (H$_{3b}$) conditions, such that multiculturalism increases intergroup political solidarity under lower levels of group identification.

To test these hypotheses, four separate hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to predict each of the dependent measures. In each regression equation, two planned dummy coded
variables for condition and also level of group identification were created and entered in on the first step (testing $H_1$ and $H_2$). The two interaction terms between each dummy variable and level of group identification were entered on the second step (testing $H_3$). The full equation for these analyses is:

$$Y = b_1D_1 + b_2D_2 + b_3ID + b_4(D_1 \times ID) + b_5(D_2 \times ID) + b_0$$

The first dummy coded variable compares the Multicultural condition to the Colorblind condition (Multicultural = 0, Colorblind = 1, Control = 0; $D_1$), called the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable. The second dummy coded variable compares the Multicultural condition to the Control condition (Multicultural = 0, Control = 0, Colorblind = 1; $D_2$), called the multicultural/control dummy variable. Because the Multicultural condition was coded (0) in both dummy coded variables, the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable represents the mean difference between the Multicultural and Colorblind conditions (testing $H_{1a}$), and the multicultural/control dummy variable represents the mean difference between the Multicultural and Control conditions (testing $H_{1b}$; Aiken & West, 1991; Hinkle & Oliver, 1986).

Level of group identification, the moderator, was mean centered (Aiken & West, 1991) before interaction terms between each dummy variable and level of group identification were created. The interactions terms were created by multiplying the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable by group identification (interaction term 1) and multiplying the multicultural/control dummy variable by group identification (interaction term 2). This approach is appropriate because a priori hypotheses were proposed regarding differences between specific conditions, assessed by $D_1$ and $D_2$ (Hinkle & Oliver, 1986). By forgoing additional comparisons, this approach increases statistical power and avoids analyses that might increase the possibility of a Type 2 error. A regression approach using dummy variables also allows for a stepwise approach
to testing for main effects of condition and level of group identification (H1 and H2; step 1) and the additional moderating effect of level of group identification (H3; step 2; see Aiken & West 1991 for further discussion of the benefits of this approach).

**Results**

**Preliminary Analyses**

Preliminary analyses were conducted to determine if any covariates were needed. These analyses tested for differences between experimental conditions on demographic variables, and examined whether sex and English as the first language were related to the outcome measures. There were no significant differences among the three conditions on any variables, nor were influences of sex or first language. Thus, no covariates were included in the models.

**Manipulation Check**

As expected, participants in the Multicultural condition rated endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group as being significantly greater ($M = 5.54, SD = 1.58$) than did the participants in both the Colorblind condition ($M = 4.79, SD = 1.40$), $t(61) = -1.99, p = .05$, and the Control condition ($M = 4.70, SD = 1.22$), $t(65) = 2.41, p = .02$. Participants in the Colorblind condition rated endorsement of colorblindness as being significantly greater ($M = 5.63, SD = 1.29$) than did the participants in the Multicultural condition ($M = 4.74, SD = 1.59$), $t(59) = 2.36, p = .02$, and the Control condition ($M = 4.82, SD = 1.24$), $t(58) = 2.44, p = .02$. Thus, the manipulations seem to have produced the intended effects.

**Main Analyses**

The full equation for the hierarchical linear regression model predicting *Willingness to Work on Programs* was statistically significant, but the equations for the other three dependent variables (*Willingness to Engage in Collective Action, Support for Political Solidarity, and*
Willingness to Work with the High Status Group) were not; therefore none of the individual predictors within these latter three equations should be evaluated. Condition means and standard deviations can be found in Table 7. Tables with statistics for the analyses with non-significant results can be found in Appendix C.

**Willingness to work on programs.** In the first step, the overall model was significant, $F(3, 87) = 3.63, p = .02, R^2 = .11$. The multicultural/colorblind dummy coded variable was significant, $\beta = -.25, t(87) = -2.18, p = .03$, indicating that low status group members expressed greater willingness to work on programs in the Multicultural condition ($M = 6.12, SD = 1.14$) compared to the Colorblind condition ($M = 5.55, SD = 1.21$). The multicultural/control dummy coded variable was not significant ($p = .41$). Level of group identification was related to willingness to work on programs, such that higher group identification was related to greater willingness to work on programs, $\beta = .27, t(87) = 2.57, p = .01$.

In the second step, with the interaction terms included, the overall model remained significant, $F(5, 85) = 2.43, p = .04, R^2 = .13$. The $\Delta R^2$ for the interaction was .01, which was not significant, $F(5, 85) = .66$. Neither of the beta weights for the two interaction terms were significant. Means and standard errors by condition are presented in Figure 2, and Table 8 presents the regression coefficients.

**Summary of Results**

There are three key findings in Experiment 1. First, as predicted, willingness to work on programs was greater in the Multicultural condition, compared to the Colorblind condition, supporting $H_{1a}$. However, counter to expectations, there was no difference between the Multicultural condition and the Control condition in willingness to work on programs. Second, counter to hypotheses, neither condition, level of group identification, nor their interactions was
related to the other three measures of solidarity, namely willingness to engage in collective action, support for political solidarity, or willingness to work with the high status group. Third, supporting H2, level of group identification was related to greater willingness to work on programs. Counter to H3, however, level of group identification did not moderate the effects of condition on any of the outcome measures.

Discussion

The results of the first experiment provide only partial evidence that endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group, compared to colorblindness, may increase intergroup political solidarity. Greater endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to colorblindness, was related to higher scores on the measure of willingness to work on programs, but was not related to the other three dependent measures. This result suggests that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group may influence specific types of intergroup political solidarity but not others – in this study, willingness to act with the high status group to develop top-down policies and programs that promote social change. The non-significant outcomes, in contrast, represent personal behavioral intentions to engage in bottom-up activism, attitudes in support of joint action between low and high status groups, and behavioral intentions to work with the high status group without social change as the specific goal.

Taken together, these findings suggest that intergroup political solidarity focused on institutional, top-down efforts to promote social change is more likely to be influenced by multicultural endorsement by the high status group than are other approaches to political solidarity. Indeed, because ideologies such as multiculturalism are often experienced within the context of institutions (Chávez, 1998; Kull, 1992; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), people may
more naturally associate multicultural endorsement by the high status group with institutional efforts for reform. Because schools promote multiculturalism, for instance, people may associate multiculturalism with educational policies that promote change.

The comparisons between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and control conditions did not support the hypotheses. When compared to the control condition, endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group was not related to political solidarity. There are two likely explanations for these results. The first has to do with the nature of the control condition, which explicitly stated that the high status group has increasingly positive views of the lower status group. This positivity could have generated reciprocated positive attitudes toward the high status group, which may have unintentionally created a positive halo in the control condition. The second explanation has to do with the base rate preference for multiculturalism among low status groups. Members of low status groups may operate through a multicultural lens, as some research suggests that they prefer multicultural perspectives (Dovidio et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007). Absent of stimuli indicating otherwise, as in the control condition, the default frame of reference may be multiculturalism. This may have unintentionally created a control condition that was similar to the multiculturalism condition, and contributed to the null comparison effects. Both explanations suggest that more thought needs to be given in the construction of a control condition in subsequent studies.

Although limited, the findings in this experiment could have important, practical applications. Notably, work in both experimental (Dovidio et al., 2009) and political contexts (hooks, 1986; McAdam, 1988) suggests that high status groups may prefer perspectives that evoke a blindness to group differences. Additionally, it is unlikely that real world settings will be absent of any ideology, at least implicitly (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). The more important
comparison, in terms of the ecological validity of this study and its applications, is between the multicultural and colorblind conditions, which more closely approximates what might happen in real-world contexts than do artificial control conditions. There may be a troubling incompatibility between the preference for and benefits of multiculturalism for low status group members versus the high status group’s documented inclination to minimize group differences. This incompatibility could prevent the successful genesis of intergroup political solidarity, and so is important information for activists to consider when bringing low and high status group members together for productive and successful action for social change.

Controlling for experimental condition, level of group identification was related to only one of four outcome measures, willingness to work on programs. This suggests that the commitment that one has to the group may only influence specific types of intergroup political solidarity. As historical examples illustrate, there are times when highly identified group members are not open to intergroup political solidarity. During the Civil Rights movement, for instance, members of the Black Panther Party, who presumably had a strong attachment to their racially lower status group, often exhibited reservations about solidarity with Whites regarding collective actions (Newton, 1972). It should be noted, however, that level of group identification had strong bivariate relationships with three measure of intergroup political solidarity. These relationships suggest that political solidarity at least increases with level of group identification.

Group identification did not moderate the influence of condition on willingness to work on programs. It is possible that the need to improve the status of one’s low status group is a stable and preexisting concern (Ellemers et al., 2002; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) that does not interact with relatively temporary information about context, here, endorsement of multiculturalism or colorblindness by the high status group. These findings are novel to the
extent that whether and how strength of commitment to one’s lower status group is related to intergroup political solidarity has not yet been examined.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations in the present study. First, there are issues with the measures of support for political solidarity and willingness to work with the high status group. The two-factor solutions in exploratory factor analyses for support for political solidarity and willingness to work with the high status group may have been an artifact of the order in which items were measured: items with positive valence were presented first, followed by items with negative valence. No similar measurement issue existed for the measure of willingness to work on programs, where predicted results were observed. Moreover, many of the outcome measures had relatively high intercorrelations, which may be the result of the measurement approach. The large number of items, which may have led to participant fatigue, in combination with very similar item stems across the measures may have contributed to artificially high correlations between the measures. Future psychometric research is needed to develop measures of intergroup political solidarity.

The wording of several dependent variables referred to increasing equality for racially low status groups. Because Latinos in the U.S. are sometimes considered an ethnic minority rather than a racial minority group (e.g., U.S. Census, 2011), Latinos in this study may have perceived these questions differently than they would when relevant to ethnic groups. The number of men was relatively small, which limits the generalizability of results to Latino men. This can be addressed in the future by sampling an even number of men and women. An additional limitation is the control condition, which introduced the idea of positive intergroup relations rather than being neutral on the topic. As previously suggested, this positivity may have
created a general favorability toward the high status group that influenced their responses, independent of any ideology. To address some of these three issues, the next study will randomize the order of the items for each measure, substitute a more neutral control condition, and refer to ‘race/ethnic’ groups.
Chapter 3

Experiment 2

Experiment 2 uses the same three conditions (multiculturalism, colorblindness, control) and online survey methodology as Experiment 1, but involves three changes: First, it adds trust and common values as mediators of the relationship between experimental condition and outcomes in order to test the theoretical model presented in Figure 1. Second, participants in Experiment 2 are from a different low status group – sexual minorities – for replication and generalization of the findings of Experiment 1. Third, rather than using a press release that was topically related to attitudes about the target group for the control condition, the control message in Experiment 2 concerned people’s attitudes regarding climate change.

The hypotheses for Experiment 2 are:

H₁: Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to (H₁a) colorblindness and (H₁b) control conditions, will increase intergroup political solidarity.

H₂: Level of group identification will increase intergroup political solidarity.

H₃: Level of group identification will moderate the direct relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to (H₃a) colorblindness and (H₃b) control conditions, such that multiculturalism will increase intergroup political solidarity under lower levels of group identification.

H₄: Trust will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to (H₄a) colorblindness and (H₄b) control conditions.

H₅: Common values will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to (H₅a) colorblindness and (H₅b) control conditions.
Method

Recruitment

People who identified as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, or Queer (LGBTQ) were recruited through LGBTQ student groups at colleges in the United States. An internet search for LGBTQ student groups at each college was conducted. When a college had an LGBTQ student group (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance, Pride Alliance), the name of the group and email address for the group’s administrator was obtained. Emails were sent to each administrator, asking that the administrator send information about the study to their members. Participants completed the study online, through surveygizmo.com. The groups were told that the survey was completely voluntary and no compensation would be provided. All recruitment materials can be found in Appendix A.

Participants

Participants (N = 115) were self-identified Bisexual (n = 36), Lesbian (n = 32), Gay (n = 24), and Queer (n = 23) individuals aged 17 to 51 (M_age = 22.68, SD_age = 5.83). Participants identified as male (n = 26), female (n = 67), or a non-binary sex (for example, Transgender; n = 18); four participants did not report their sex. The sample was 77% White, 7% Asian, 5% Biracial, with fewer than 5% identifying as Latino, Native American, or Black. Five people did not indicate their race/ethnicity. All participants currently lived in the United States: 39% Midwest, 20% Northeast, 19% in the West, and 10% in the South; 11% declined to respond. Socioeconomic status (SES) ranged from 2 to 10 on a 10-point scale (M_ses = 6.68, SD_ses = 1.83), with higher scores indicating higher SES.
Procedure

The study was conducted online and was presented to participants as a study of “Groups & Cooperation.” The study procedures were identical to Experiment 1, with the addition of the potential mediating variables of trust and common values and a change in the control condition. Unlike the control condition in Experiment 1, which was related to the attitudes of the high status group regarding the low status group, the control condition in Experiment 2 presented information about the unrelated issue of people’s attitudes regarding climate change. The online survey was constructed to randomly assign participants to the Multicultural (n = 36), Colorblind (n = 36), or Control (n = 43) conditions. As in Experiment 1, participants also listed five main points from the press release, which reinforced the priming of the experimental conditions. Outcome measures and demographic variables were then presented. The prompt for the measures was similar to Experiment 1, adapted to the LGBTQ context. Unlike Experiment 1, the item order within each measure was randomized by a random number generator to prevent method effects of positive and negative valence. After completing all measures, participants read a debriefing statement. The consent form, all experimental materials, and debriefing statement can be found in Appendix A.

Measures

The four outcome measures that were developed in Experiment 1 were used to assess aspects of intergroup political solidarity and adapted to the LGBTQ context. Measures of Trust in the high status group and of Common Values with the high status group were developed for the dissertation. All items were answered with a 7-point response format with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Variables with a skewness z-score greater than ±3 were
transformed to reduce the skew to an acceptable level. Results of factor analyses that yielded solutions that were greater than one-factor are reported in tables in Appendix B.

**Political Solidarity.**

**Willingness to work on programs.** The seven-item measure that was developed in Experiment 1 to assess willingness to act with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change was adapted to a LGBTQ context. Sample items are: “I would work with straight people to develop sensitivity training programs for employees, regarding sexual orientation” and “I would work with straight people on a project that recruited LGBT high school students for college admissions.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 9. An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 69.11% of the common variance. All items had loadings > .40, indicating that they all contributed to a factor’s variance. Four items loaded on a first factor, explaining 51.02% of the covariance, and three items loaded on a second factor, explaining 18.10% of the covariance. Because of the relatively high intercorrelation between the two factors ($r = .44$), consistent with Experiment 1, the items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to work on programs. The alpha coefficient was .83.

**Willingness to engage in collective action.** The four-item measure that was developed in Experiment 1 to assess willingness to engage in collective action with the high status group was adapted for the LGBTQ context. Sample items are: “I would participate in raising our collective voice with straight people for LGBT rights” and “I would do something together with straight people for LGBT rights.”
Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 10. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a one-factor solution, explaining 86.54% of the common variance. The items were averaged to create a single scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The composite scale was considerably negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation was employed to reduce the skew to an appropriate level. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to engage in collective action. The alpha coefficient was .94.

**Support for political solidarity.** Attitudes in support of political solidarity between low and high status groups were measured with the scale developed in Experiment 1, along with three additional items based on considerations of the construct in past work (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012). Of the nine items, three had negative valence. Examples of the items are: “LGBT people would be better off if they worked together with straight people to promote equality” and “Work toward equality for LGBT rights should be done only by LGBT people, without straight people being involved.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 11. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a one-factor solution, explaining 68.82% of the common variance. The nine items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7, having had the items with negative valence reverse coded. The scale had substantial negative skew, and a reflected inverse transformation corrected the skew to an acceptable level. Higher scores indicate greater support for political solidarity. The alpha coefficient was .94.

**Willingness to work with the high status group.** The scale of willingness to work with the high status group that was developed in Experiment 1 was adapted to a LGBTQ context.
Sample items are: “I would consider working with straight people” and “I would not prefer to work with straight people.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 12. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a one-factor solution, explaining 71.31% of the common variance. The items with negative valence were reverse coded, and then all items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and so to account for this a reflected inverse transformation was performed, which reduced the skew to a tolerable level. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to work with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .94.

**Relationships among outcome variables.** As shown in Table 13, some of the outcome measures were also significantly correlated with each other (significant r’s ranged from .19 to .69). Despite these associations, I did not combine any of the four outcome measures because of the important conceptual distinctions that were described in Experiment 1. As this work is an initial inquiry into intergroup political solidarity from the perspective of the low status group, among LGBTQ individuals in particular, I decided to retain separate measures based on these conceptual distinctions.

**Mediators.**

**Trust.** The measure of trust in the high status group was developed for this dissertation based on past work by Tam et al. (2009). Trust in the high status group was defined as the *belief that the high status group has benevolent and egalitarian intentions*. In this context, the construct is conceptualized as a belief about the intentions of a high status group with regard to working for equality. Eight items were developed based on those used by Tam and colleagues (2009) in a study of intergroup trust within the Northern Ireland conflict. The items were framed in terms of
the intentions of “straight people,” so that all items explicitly referred to the intentions of the relevant high status group. All items were phrased in terms of intentions to promote equality for people who are LGBTQ, thus assessing intentions framed in terms of egalitarianism. Four items had positive valence (e.g., “If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would trust straight people's intentions.”) and four had negative valence (e.g., “I do not trust straight people to work for the benefit of LGBT rights”).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 14. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a one-factor solution, explaining 66.46% of the common variance. The items with negative valence were reverse coded, and items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and so to account for this a reflected inverse transformation was performed, which reduced the skew to an acceptable level. Higher scores indicate greater trust in the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .93.

**Common values.** The measure of perceptions of common values with the high status group was developed for this dissertation based on work by Gurin et al. (2008) and Glasford and Calcagno (2012) in studies of how racially low status groups assess the likelihood of having common values with an outgroup. Common values was defined as the perception that *one’s low status group holds important beliefs and principles in common with the high status group.* The construct is conceptualized as perceptions of the attitudes held by the low and high status groups and, specifically, the extent to which those attitudes align. Of the 11 items, eight referenced general beliefs and principles held between LGBTQ and straight people; four had positive valence (e.g., “LGBT people have key principles in common with straight people”) and four had negative valence (e.g., “It is unlikely that LGBT people and straight people share their core
values and principles. Three items, all with positive valence, were created by the author. These items refer only to the values of straight people and tapped the participant’s beliefs about those values (e.g., “Straight people value the differences between LGBT and straight people”).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 15. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 65.72% of the common variance. All 11 items had loadings > .40, indicating that they all contributed to the factor solution. The first eight items loaded on one factor, explaining 50.07% of the covariance; the three created specifically for this study loaded on the second factor, accounting for 15.65% of the covariance. The correlation between the two factors was relatively low ($r = .26$). Because only the eight items regarding general beliefs and principles were based on past work (Gurin et al., 2008; Glasford & Calcagno, 2012), and given that the two-factor structure may be attributed more to method variance than to construct variance, the last three items were not included in the common values scale. Thus, Common Values was composed of eight items that addressed the extent to which the low and high status groups shared general beliefs and principles. After the four items with negative valence were reverse coded, items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation reduced the skew to an acceptable level. Higher scores indicate greater perceived common values with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .92.

**Relationships among mediators.** The two mediator variables (trust and common values) were highly correlated ($r = .59$). Despite the strong statistical relationship, based on past work I have proposed an important conceptual distinction between the two variables: trust indicates perceptions of intentions while common values represents perceptions of attitudes. Accordingly,
the two variables were not averaged for these analyses. Instead, they will be employed as parallel mediating variables in the mediational analyses.

**Level of group identification.** The construct was measured with the nine items that were used in Experiment 1, and adapted to LGBTQ group membership. An example item is: “I am glad to be LGBT.” Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 16. An exploratory Principal Components analysis with oblique rotation indicated a two-factor solution, explaining 65.78% of the common variance. Items with loadings > .40 were considered to be part of a factor. Five items loaded on a first factor, explaining 49.79% of the common variance, and four items loaded on a second factor, explaining 15.99% of the common variance. Because of the high intercorrelation between the two factors (r = .46) and also because the factor structure has been validated in seven other studies (Leach et al., 2008), a single nine-item scale was created. The items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate greater level of group identification. The alpha coefficient was .87.

**Demographic data.** Demographic questions included items such as participants’ age, sex, country of birth, racial/ethnic self-identification, first and second languages, level of education, and socio-economic status.

**Data Analysis Plan**

As in Experiment 1, hierarchical linear regression will be used to test whether endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to colorblindness and control conditions, increases intergroup political solidarity (H1). These regression equations will also test the extent to which level of group identification increases intergroup political solidarity (H2) as well as the moderating role of level of group identification in the relation between the
multicultural condition and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to colorblindness and control conditions (H₃). The full equation for these analyses is:

\[ Y = b_1D_1 + b_2D_2 + b_3ID + b_4(D_1 \times ID) + b_5(D_2 \times ID) + b_6S_1 + b_7S_2 + b_0 \]

The regression analyses followed the same approach used in Experiment 1. Two planned dummy coded variables compared the conditions. The first dummy coded variable for condition compares the Multicultural to the Colorblind condition (D₁; Multicultural = 0, Colorblind = 1, Control = 0; multicultural/colorblind dummy variable), and the second compares the Multicultural to the Control condition (D₂; Multicultural = 0, Control = 0, Colorblind = 1; multicultural/control dummy variable). Level of group identification was mean centered, and two interaction terms were created by multiplying each dummy variable for condition by group identification (Aiken & West, 1991).

Significant sex differences were found on measures of support for political solidarity, trust, and level of group identification (See Table 17). No other significant differences among the three conditions emerged on any of the demographic variables. Consequently, sex was used as a covariate in all analyses. Specifically, two dummy coded variables will control for sex. The first variable compares females to non-binary sex (SD₁; female = 1, male = 0, non-binary = 0), called the female/non-binary dummy variable, and the second dummy coded variable for sex compares males to non-binary sex (SD₂; female = 0, male = 1, non-binary = 0), called the male/non-binary dummy variable. In each regression, the two dummy coded variables for sex will be entered as a set in step 1, the multicultural/colorblind and multicultural/control dummy coded variables and level of group identification will be entered as a set in step 2, and the two interaction terms will be entered as a set in step 3.
To test whether trust and common values explain why endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to colorblind and control conditions, four mediation models will be examined using a bootstrapping approach (H₄ and H₅). The bootstrapping approach is particularly suited to smaller sample sizes, does not hold samples to an assumption of normal distribution, and does not require a direct relation between the independent and outcome variables (Efron & Tibshirani, 1993; Hayes, 2009, 2013; Hayes & Preacher, 2014; Preacher & Hayes, 2004, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002; Taylor, MacKinnon, & Tien, 2008). This approach evaluates the certainty of the proposed mediation. Specifically, bootstrapping estimates the indirect effect by repeatedly sampling the data, and through this resampling procedure produces confidence intervals of the indirect (mediating) effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2004, 2008). These indirect effects will be estimated with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling (Hayes, 2013). When the 95% confidence interval for an indirect effect does not include zero, it is acceptable to conclude that the indirect effect is significantly different from zero at \( p < .05 \) (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

The mediation models will be tested by following the specific approach developed by Hayes (2013), using the SPSS PROCESS macro (Model 5). A conceptual model of this analysis is depicted in Figure 3. Each mediation analysis includes one of the four measures of intergroup political solidarity as the outcome variable (Y); the multicultural/colorblind and multicultural/control dummy variables as independent variables (X); level of group identification as a moderator of the direct effects of the independent variables on the outcome variable (W); and trust and common values as parallel mediators of the indirect effects of the independent variables on the outcome variable (M). The two sex dummy coded variables will be included as covariates (C).
Results

Predictors of Political Solidarity

Hypotheses 1 through 3 were tested first. The full regression equation for Willingness to Work on Programs was the only one of the four outcomes that proved to be statistically significant. The overall model was not significant for Willingness to Engage in Collective Action, Support for Political Solidarity, or Willingness to Work with the High Status Group; and therefore none of the individual predictors should be evaluated. Condition means and descriptive statistics can be found in Table 18. Tables with statistics for the analyses with non-significant results can be found in Appendix C.

Willingness to work on programs. Figure 4 presents the means and standard errors by condition, and regression coefficients for this analysis are presented in Table 19. Neither dummy coded variable for sex predicted willingness to work on programs, $F(2, 107) = .03, R^2 = .001$.

The overall model at step 2 was significant, $F(5, 104) = 4.80, p = .001, R^2 = .19$. The change in $R^2$ was .19, which was highly significant, $F(5, 104) = 7.97, p < .001$. The beta coefficient for the multicultural/colorblind dummy coded variable was significant, $\beta = -.22, t(104) = -2.03, p = .05$, indicating that low status group members expressed greater willingness to work on programs in the Multicultural condition ($M = 5.67, SD = .94$) compared to the Colorblind condition ($M = 5.17, SD = 1.37$). The beta coefficient for the multicultural/control dummy coded variable was not significant; in fact the means for these conditions were almost identical. Level of group identification had a direct effect on willingness to work on programs, such that higher group identification predicted greater willingness to work on programs, $\beta = .40, t(104) = 4.34, p < .001$. 
The overall model with all variables entered was significant, $F(7, 102) = 4.80, p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$. The change in $R^2$ was .05, which was significant, $F(7, 102) = 3.24, p = .04$. The direct effect of the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable remained significant, $\beta = -.23, t(102) = -2.20, p = .03$; however, level of group identification was no longer related to willingness to work on programs. The results revealed a significant interaction between the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable and group identification, $\beta = .29, t(102) = 2.11, p = .04$, but not between the multicultural/control dummy variable and group identification.

To understand the interaction between the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable and group identification a simple slopes analysis was first performed. This analysis revealed that the slope of the multicultural condition was not significantly different from zero, $\beta = .22, t(102) = 1.23, p = .22$, indicating that level of group identification was not influential in the multicultural condition. In the colorblind condition, the simple slope was significantly different from zero and in a positive direction, $\beta = .71, t(102) = 4.66, p < .001$, indicating that in the colorblind condition, lower commitment to one’s group related to less willingness to work on programs with the high status group.

Figure 5 depicts this interactive effect by plotting willingness to work on programs as a function of level of group identification. At low levels of group identification, the multicultural condition produced greater willingness to work on programs, compared to the colorblind condition, $p < .001$ at -1 SD, and $p = .03$ at the mean. However, at high levels of group identification, there was no difference in willingness between the multicultural and colorblind conditions.
Mediation Analyses

The hypothesized mediation models (H4 and H5) were tested following the approach developed by Hayes (2013; SPSS PROCESS macro Model 5). The indirect effects were estimated with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling. All four mediation models produced 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effects that included zero, indicating that neither trust nor common values mediated the indirect effects of the multicultural condition on intergroup political solidarity outcomes, compared to colorblindness and control conditions (Hayes, 2013; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Table 20 presents coefficients, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals of the indirect effects.

Summary

The results of Experiment 2 substantially replicate the findings in Experiment 1 with a different low status group. In both studies, willingness to work on programs was higher in the Multicultural condition, compared to the Colorblind condition, supporting H1a. Group identification was again associated with greater willingness to work on programs, which supports H2. Also as predicted, above and beyond their direct effects, the Multicultural and Colorblind conditions interacted with group identification, in support of H3a. Specifically, under lower levels of group identification, the low status group’s willingness to work on programs was greater when the high status group endorsed multiculturalism, then when it endorsed colorblindness. Counter to hypotheses, but consistent with Experiment 1, willingness to engage in collective action, support for political solidarity, and willingness to work with the high status group were not influenced by condition, level of group identification, or their interaction. Results of Experiment 2 failed to support Hypotheses 4 and 5: Neither trust nor common values mediated the direct
effects of the Multicultural condition on intergroup political solidarity, compared to both Colorblind and Control conditions.

Discussion

The results of the second experiment provide additional evidence that endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group, when compared to colorblindness, can relate to greater intergroup political solidarity in some cases. As in Experiment 1, greater endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to colorblindness, was associated with greater willingness to act with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change. These results support the argument that endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group will inspire specific types of intergroup political solidarity. This interpretation is consistent with the non-significant effects of multiculturalism on measures of political solidarity with the three alternative types of action assessed in this study.

The comparisons between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and control condition yielded results that were similar to those of Experiment 1. Endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group did not produce an increase in any of the four outcome measures when compared to the control condition. In Experiment 1, I suggested this finding may resulted from the particular message in the control condition, specifically its emphasis on the positive attitudes of the high status group toward the low status group. I speculated that this positivity increased scores in the control condition and produced no differences between multicultural and control conditions. This possible explanation is not viable for Experiment 2, however, given its similar results using a completely different topic in the control condition, which did not mention the high status group.
My second interpretation of the finding of no difference between the multicultural and control conditions in Experiment 1 focused on the base-rate attitudes among members of low status groups. If low status group members prefer multicultural perspectives, as some work has suggested (Dovidio et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007; Saguy, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2008), then they may think in terms of multiculturalism in the absence of any specific information to the contrary. Given similar results with a quite different control condition, this interpretation seems more likely. Without specific information, low status group members may default to a multicultural perspective and use multiculturalism as a guideline when considering intergroup political solidarity.

The findings and interpretation of these results are intriguing, given the reality of low and high status groups’ divergent preferences for multiculturalism and colorblindness. Unlike the experimentally created control conditions, naturally-occurring intergroup situations are rarely devoid of information about the perspectives of low and high status groups, particularly in political settings (e.g., hooks, 1986), and high status members may be likely to endorse positions that evoke a blindness to group differences (Dovidio et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007). Thus, situations in which intergroup political solidarity could develop may run the risk of high status group members promoting colorblindness, and unintentionally impede intergroup political solidarity. This process has, in fact, been observed in real-world political contexts (hooks, 1986; McAdam, 1988). Taken together with past research, the results from the comparison between multiculturalism and colorblindness in this study suggests a troubling incompatibility between the preferences of the low and high status groups. This work shows that precisely how high status group members are likely to behave, namely, promoting blindness to difference, can have
an adverse impact on intergroup political solidarity, at least in the form of working on programmatic efforts for social change, compared to multiculturalism.

Strength of identification with the low status group not only directly increased willingness to work on programs, but also moderated the influence of endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group on willingness to work on programs, compared to colorblindness. When levels of group identification are high, the position expressed by the high status group did not seem to affect willingness to work on programs. Under lower levels of group identification, however, willingness to work on programs was greater when the high status group endorsed multiculturalism than when it endorsed colorblindness. If the goal is social change, then increasing the proportion of low status group members who participate in the social movement, especially in intergroup solidarity, is highly important. Because individuals with lower levels of identification are typically less likely work for social change (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008) and also may decline opportunities to work on behalf of their group (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990), these individuals may require an extra push to become committed to the advancement of their low status group (Ellemers et al., 2002). The present findings suggest that one way to guide those with low group identity toward supporting social change and solidarity is to present them with a multicultural perspective endorsed by the high status group.

Contrary to expectations, trust in the high status group and perceived common values with the high status group did not mediate the relation between multicultural endorsement and intergroup political solidarity. The definition and subsequent operationalization of trust may have been problematic. Perhaps the central issue is not about trust in the intentions of the high status group to work for equality, which was implied in the measure, but rather that multiculturalism inspires a broader trust in society to do the right thing for lower status groups. Huo and Molina
(2006), for example, found that stronger perceptions of subgroup respect, which is the belief that one’s group is recognized and valued by society, were related to greater trust in society.

With regard to common values, the construct and measure may have been too general. It is possible that common values need to be defined as valuing differences between groups, in line with the concerns that low status group members have for the valuation of their group and its differences (Ashmore et al., 2004; Brewer, 1991, 2009; Tajfel, 1978). Moreover, the items that comprised the measure referred to principles and beliefs held by both groups, but did not specify any phenomenon to which those principles and beliefs pertained. Participants may have anchored responses to their own meanings of ‘principles and beliefs,’ creating unknown variance in responses. Again, valuation of group differences may be key to understanding how low status group members are orientated toward intergroup political solidarity.

**Limitations**

There are limitations in the present study, many of them related to the measures. There may be ceiling effects, as the mean of all outcome variables were above the scale midpoint, with many of the means falling above a score of 6 on a 7-point scale. This may have reduced the possibility of detecting significant differences between conditions. In the future, it may be important to measure intergroup political solidarity with behavioral outcomes that require more effort than simply expressed intentions to support the development of programs or bottom-up activism, such as willingness to contact high status group members through social media (e.g., Facebook) to solicit their support.

Congruent with Experiment 1, many of the measures had high intercorrelations. The large number of items, which could lead to participant fatigue, in combination with similar item stems may have produced artificially high correlations between the measures. Additionally, across the
measures all items were framed in terms of agreement (i.e., “agree” or “disagree” anchors), which may also have inflated intercorrelations. Future psychometric research is needed to develop measures of intergroup political solidarity independent of their use in experiment studies.

Other measurement issues involved the measures of common values and willingness to work on programs, as both measures produced two-factor solutions in exploratory factor analyses. Decisions were made as to how best address these issues, such as excluding items with low inter-item correlations and combining factors when highly correlated. Regarding willingness to work on programs, is possible that the two-factor solution may have to do with the content of the items, which were developed by Swim and Miller (1999) to address race relations in the U.S. Those items may be less consistent with the current experiences of a low status group that does not have the same history, such as the LGBTQ community, which created unknown variance in responses and altered the factor structure. In the future, items assessing willingness to work on programs should be adapted to consider policies that are most akin to issues faced by the particular low status group.

Another limitation was the small sample size considering the relatively large number of statistical tests, which may have limited statistical power. The sample was uneven in terms of the sex ratio, which may limit the generalizability to men and also people who identify as a non-binary sex. Future studies with an even gender ratio can address this issue going forward. In this work, this problem was partially addressed by controlling for sex.
Chapter 4

Experiment 3

Experiment 3 extends the previous studies by examining the model in an intergroup interaction setting, to test whether the effects of endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group can extend beyond intergroup political solidarity outcomes, to actually agreeing to work with an individual member of the high status group. In contrast to Experiments 1 and 2, which used an online survey methodology, Experiment 3 uses an interpersonal laboratory setting. Experiment 3 includes the two experimental conditions (multiculturalism and colorblindness) and the low status group (Latinos) in Experiment 1, but tests the full model of predictors as was done in Experiment 2. In addition to the outcomes used in Experiment 1 that focused on attitudes toward intergroup political solidarity, variables are assessed at the partner-level: participants’ willingness to work with their anticipated interaction partner, trust in that partner, and perceived common values with that partner. Two conceptual models are hypothesized, one regarding attitudes toward intergroup political solidarity (Model 1) and one regarding the partner-level outcomes (Model 2).

The hypotheses for the two models are as follows:

Model 1

H$_1$: Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to colorblindness, will increase intergroup political solidarity.

H$_2$: Level of group identification will increase intergroup political solidarity.

H$_3$: Level of group identification will moderate the relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to
colorblindness, such that multiculturalism will increase intergroup political solidarity under lower levels of group identification.

H₄: Trust will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to colorblindness.

H₅: Common values will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases intergroup political solidarity, compared to colorblindness.

Model 2

H₆: Endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to colorblindness, will increase willingness to work with the partner.

H₇: Level of group identification will increase willingness to work with the partner.

H₈: Level of group identification will moderate the direct relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and willingness to work with the partner, in comparison to colorblindness, such that multiculturalism will increase willingness to work with the partner under lower levels of group identification.

H₉: Trust in the partner will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases willingness to work with the partner, compared to colorblindness.

H₁₀: Common values with the partner will mediate endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group increases willingness to work with the partner, compared to colorblindness.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 60 Latino/a undergraduate students from John Jay College (n = 34) and Hunter College (n = 26). There were 41 female and 19 male participants, with a mean age of 19.55 years (SD = 2.98; range = 17-33). Socioeconomic status ranged from 2 to 10 on a
10-point scale ($M = 5.13, SD = 1.43$), with higher scores indicating higher SES. Thirty-four participants (57%) reported English as their first language, 24 reported Spanish, and 2 did not respond to the question. Ten additional individuals completed the study, but their data are excluded from analyses because they did not correctly report their partner’s race (2) or expressed the belief that the partner was not real (8).

**Procedure**

The study was conducted in laboratory rooms at John Jay College and Hunter College and was presented to participants as a study of “Groups & Cooperation.” Participants were recruited through the subject pool and signed up using a web-based system (SONA.com). Participation was voluntary and in fulfillment of partial course credit. A pre-screening survey ensured that only Latino/Hispanic individuals could sign up. An overview of the procedures is described below; a script with full procedures can be found in Appendix A.

When participants arrived for their individual session they were greeted by the experimenter, who was female and White. All participants were led to expect an interaction with another student (although in fact there was no other student). To set this expectation, the researcher stated: “Today you’ll be participating in a study where you’ll be working on a task with another student. First you’ll work separately from each other. The other student will start in another room, doing the same things you are doing. You will first complete an information sheet and then I will exchange your information sheet with your partner’s. After the exchange, you’ll complete an initial survey about your initial impressions. Your partner won’t see your responses on that survey. Once you’ve both completed that survey, I’ll bring you together and explain more about the task you’ll be working on.” The experimental rooms contained a conference table,
which made the likelihood of a partner coming in more believable. Following this introduction, written informed consent was obtained (see Appendix A).

After indicating consent, participants completed an information sheet about themselves, which included their race/ethnicity, sex, and additional questions to obscure that the study was focused on race/ethnicity. While the participant completed the information sheet, the experimenter left the room under the pretense of checking on the fictitious partner. After two minutes the experimenter returned to collect the participant’s information sheet and give the participant the partner’s information sheet. The partner’s information sheet always indicated that the partner was White. This procedure thus ensured that participants believed they would be interacting with a partner from the high status group. The sex of the partner was matched with the participant’s sex. During the information sheet exchange, the participant also received what they were told was an initial survey, which was, in reality, the questionnaire containing the experimental manipulation and all outcome measures.

The manipulations and measures are similar to that used in Experiments 1 and 2. The experimental condition was presented first, in the form of a press release. A random number generator was used to assign participants to either the Multicultural \((n = 27)\) or Colorblind \((n = 33)\) condition, and the experimenter was unaware of condition assignment. All participants then responded to the outcome measures, questions checking that they were aware of their partner’s race and sex, and demographic items. After giving the participant the partner’s information sheet and the questionnaire, the experimenter left the room, under the pretense of delivering the participant’s information sheet to the partner. The experimenter returned twice to check on the participant’s progress. Upon completing the questionnaire, participants were verbally debriefed, and told that their anticipated partner was fictitious. During debriefing, the experimenter probed
the participants to ascertain whether they had any suspicions about the study. Copies of all materials can be found in Appendix A.

**Measures**

The four dependent measures that were used in Experiments 1 and 2 were used again to assess intergroup political solidarity. The Trust and of Common Values measures that were developed in Experiment 2 were adapted for a race/ethnicity context. Three partner-level measures – Willingness to Work with Partner, Trust in Partner, and Common Values with Partner – also were developed for this study. Items were answered with a 7-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*). Variables with a skewness z-score greater than ±3 were transformed to reduce the skew to an acceptable level. Results of all factor analyses that yielded a solution greater than one-factor are reported in tables in Appendix B.

**Political Solidarity.**

*Willingness to work on programs.* Willingness to work programs with the high status group was assessed with the seven-item scale used in Experiments 1 and 2. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 21. The factor structure was consistent with the factor analyses for Experiment 2. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and was transformed using a reflected inverse transformation. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to work on programs with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .89.

*Willingness to engage in collective action.* The same 4-item scale from Experiments 1 and 2 was used. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 22. Because the scale was negatively skewed, a reflected inverse transformation was applied. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to engage in collective action. The alpha coefficient was .86.
Support for political solidarity. Attitudes in support of political solidarity were measured with the same scale used in Experiment 2, adapted to the race/ethnicity context. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 23 and the exploratory factor analysis can be found in Appendix B. Higher scores indicate greater support for political solidarity. The alpha coefficient was .88.

Willingness to work with the high status group. The same scale used in Experiments 1 and 2 was used here. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 24 and the exploratory factor analysis can be found in Appendix B. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation was applied. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to work with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .88.

Mediators.

Trust. The eight-item measure developed for Experiment 2 to assess trust in the high status group was adapted to a race/ethnicity context. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 25. The negative items were reverse coded and then all items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate greater trust in the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .90.

Common values. The 11-item measure of common values with the high status group that was developed in Experiment 2 was adapted to a race/ethnicity context. As in Experiment 2, eight items reference general beliefs and principles held between Latinos and Whites and three items refer to only Whites’ values. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 26. The same factor structure as in Experiment 2 emerged (a two-factor solution with uncorrelated factors), so only the 8 items comprising the first factor were averaged after item
reversals, as in Experiment 2. Higher scores indicate greater perceived common values with the high status group. The alpha coefficient was .62.

**Partner-level measures.** Three measures to tap attitudes toward the anticipated interaction partner were developed for the dissertation.

**Willingness to work with partner.** The eight-item scale developed in Experiment 1 to assess willingness to work with the high status group was adapted to a social interaction. All items included the words “with my partner,” in order to explicitly frame each item in terms of action with the high status group partner. Half of the items were negatively worded. Sample items are: “I feel positive about working with my partner” and “I am not looking forward to working with my partner.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 27. The negatively worded items were reversed and all items were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. The scale was substantially negatively skewed, and a reflected inverse transformation was employed to reduce the skew to an acceptable level. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to work with the partner. The alpha coefficient was .88.

**Trust in partner.** The eight items used to measure trust in the high status group in Experiment 2 were modified to assess partner-level trust. Adapted to a social interaction setting, the scale captures the belief that an individual member of the high status group has intentions to act in a manner that is equitable when working together, for example, “I trust my partner to contribute when we work together today.”

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 28. An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis with oblique rotation indicated a three-factor solution, explaining 78.48% of the common variance. All items had loadings > .40, but there were several
cross-loadings. Five items loaded on one factor, explaining 51.98% of the covariance, with one of those items cross-loading onto the second factor. Two additional items loaded onto second factor, explaining a further 13.92% of the covariance. One item loaded on the third factor, accounting for 12.59% of the covariance. There was a high correlation between the first and second factors ($r = .41$), while both had low correlations with the third factor ($r’s = .03$ and .15). The item on factor three was excluded and the items on factors 1 and 2 averaged after reverse coding, to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate greater trust in the high status group partner. The alpha coefficient was .87.

**Common values with partner.** The measure of perceptions of common values between oneself and one’s anticipated interaction partner was created by adapting the 11 items developed in Experiment 2 to a social interaction setting. Eight items reference general beliefs and principles held between oneself and one’s interaction partner (e.g., “My partner and I may have similar values”) and three items refer to the partner’s values (e.g., “It is likely that my partner values the difference between Latinos and Whites”).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 29. An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis with oblique rotation indicated a three-factor solution, explaining 70.20% of the common variance. All items had loadings $> .40$. Six items loaded on the first factor, explaining 45.01% of the common variance, with one of those items cross-loading onto the third factor. Three items loaded on the second factor, explaining an additional 15.33% of the covariance. Three items loaded on the last factor, which explained 9.87% of the covariance. There was a relatively strong correlation between the first and third factors ($r = .38$), while both had low correlations with the second factor ($r’s = .05$ and .16). Because of the lower correlation, the three items on the second factor about the partner’s perceptions regarding
difference were excluded, consistent with the other measure of common values. The eight items were averaged, after reverse coding the negative items, to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of common values with the high status group partner. The alpha coefficient was .89.

**Relationships among measures.** Means and standard deviations for each scale are shown in Table 30. The means for all measures were above the scale midpoint. The two mediators, *Trust* and *Common Values*, were highly correlated \((r = .70, \ p < .001)\). *Trust in Partner* and *Common Values with Partner* were also correlated strongly \((r = .57, \ p < .001)\). However, because there is a conceptual distinction between trust and common values, the two sets of mediating variables were not combined for analyses, although the pair of variables will be tested as a set within the mediation models. Also shown in Table 30, a number of other outcome variables were also correlated strongly \((r’s \ range \ from \ .41 \ to \ .74)\). As in the first two experiments, these measures were not combined to assess conceptually distinct variables.

**Level of group identification.** The construct was measured with same nine items used in Experiment 1, the online study of Latinos, which is made up of three subscales: centrality, satisfaction, and solidarity (Leach et al., 2008). Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are presented in Table 31. An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis with oblique rotation indicated a three-factor solution, explaining 63.27% of the common variance, but apart from the first factor (satisfaction items) the other items did not load onto the appropriate factors and many were not correlated with each other. Because of this and because this dissertation assumes that level of group identification is defined by “the value and emotional significance attached to that [group] membership,” I decided to use only the three items that comprise the satisfaction subscale, which were averaged to create a scale with a possible range of 1 to 7. As
the scale was negatively skewed, a reflected inverse transformation was performed. Higher scores indicate greater level of group identification. The alpha coefficient was .71.

Demographics variables. Standard demographic variables, as in Experiments 1 and 2, were assessed (see Appendix A).

Data Analysis Plan

The same procedures for testing mediation and moderation that were used in Experiment 2 will be used here. First, hierarchical linear regressions were used to test whether endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to colorblindness, increases intergroup political solidarity, for each of the four intergroup political solidarity outcomes (H1). These regressions will also test the extent to which level of group identification increases intergroup political solidarity (H2), and the moderating role of level of group identification in the relation between the multicultural condition and intergroup political solidarity, in comparison to colorblindness (H3). An additional hierarchical linear regression will test whether the multicultural condition, in comparison to colorblindness, increases the partner-level outcomes (H6-H8).

This conceptual mediation model for the intergroup political solidarity outcomes (conceptual Model 1) is depicted in Figure 6 (H4 and H5). An additional mediation model tested the relations among partner-level outcomes, specifically, whether trust in the high status group partner and common values with the partner explain why endorsement of multiculturalism increases willingness to work with the partner, compared to colorblindness (H9 and H10; conceptual Model 2). The conceptual model of partner-level outcomes is illustrated in Figure 7. As in Experiment 2, for each mediation analysis, the indirect effects will be estimated with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling (Hayes &
Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted to test for differences between conditions and data collection sites on demographic variables. There were no differences between the two conditions or the two data collection sites on any of the demographic variables. Preliminary analyses also examined whether the outcome measures varied by research site or participant sex. Only one of nine tests was statistically significant: Participants from John Jay College expressed lower common values with the high status group (\(M = 4.97, SD = 1.39\)) than did participants from Hunter College (\(M = 5.66, SD = .89\)), \(t(57) = -2.20, p = .02\). There were no sex differences in any of the outcome variables. Thus, no variables were included as covariates in the analyses.

Predictors of Political Solidarity

The hypothesized differences between the Multicultural and Colorblind conditions, level of group identification, and relationship of the interaction term to the outcome measures were tested first. The overall models for three of the five outcomes variables were significant: Willingness to Engage in Collective Action, Willingness to Work with the High Status Group, and Willingness to Work with the Partner. The full equations for Willingness to Work on Programs and Support for Political Solidarity were not significant, and therefore none of the individual predictors were evaluated. Condition means and descriptive statistics for all outcomes can be found in Table 32, and Table 33 presents regression coefficients for the significant models. Tables with statistics for the analyses with non-significant results can be found in Appendix C.
**Willingness to engage in collective action.** The overall model in the first step was significant, \( F(2, 57) = 4.27, p = .02, R^2 = .13 \). Higher group identification was related to greater willingness to engage in collective action, \( \beta = .36, t(57) = 2.91, p = .005 \). The multicultural/colorblind dummy coded variable was not significant. The overall model was significant in the second step, \( F(3, 56) = 3.54, p = .02, R^2 = .16 \). The change in \( R^2 \) was .03, which was not significant, \( F(3, 56) = 1.94 \). The relationship between group identification and collective action remained significant, \( \beta = .53, t(56) = 3.08, p = .003 \); however, neither the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable nor the interaction term were significant.

**Willingness to work with the high status group.** The overall model was significant in the first step, \( F(2, 57) = 5.38, p = .007, R^2 = .16 \). Level of group identification was associated with greater willingness to work with the high status group, \( \beta = .40, t(57) = 3.24, p = .002 \). However, there was no effect of condition. In the second step, the overall model was significant, \( F(3, 56) = 4.69, p = .005, R^2 = .20 \). The change in \( R^2 \) was .04, which was not significant, \( F(3, 56) = 2.95 \). Again, there was a positive relation between group identification and willingness to work with the high status group, \( \beta = .59, t(56) = 3.57, p = .001 \). Neither the multicultural/colorblind dummy variable nor the interaction term was significant.

**Willingness to Work with the Partner.** The overall model in the first step was significant, \( F(2, 57) = 4.81, p = .01, R^2 = .14 \). Stronger group identification was related to greater willingness to work with the partner, \( \beta = .36, t(57) = 2.90, p = .005 \). The multicultural/colorblind dummy coded variable was not significant. At step 2, the model was significant, \( F(3, 56) = 3.94, p = .01, R^2 = .17 \). There was not a significant change in the \( R^2 \) statistic, \( \Delta R^2 = .03, F(3, 56) = 2.04 \). Higher group identification was associated with willingness to work with the partner, \( \beta = \)
.52, \( t(56) = 3.10, p = .003 \). There were no effects of condition, nor was the interaction term significant.

**Mediation Analyses**

The hypothesized mediation models (H4 and H5, H9 and H10) were tested following the approach developed by Hayes (2013; SPSS PROCESS macro Model 5). The indirect effects were estimated with bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling. For both the set of intergroup political solidarity outcomes and the partner-level outcomes, all 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effects included zero, indicating that there were no mediation effects: Neither trust nor common values mediated the indirect effects of the multicultural condition. Tables 34 and 35 present coefficients, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals of the indirect effects.

**Summary of Results**

Willingness to engage in collective action, willingness to work with the high status group, and willingness to work with the partner were associated with greater strength of identification with the low status group; however, neither willingness to work on programs nor support for political solidarity were influenced by level of group identification. Counter to predictions, exposure to multicultural versus colorblind information was unrelated to any of the outcomes; nor was it moderated by group identification. Third, there were no indirect effects through trust or common values on intergroup political solidarity outcomes, and no indirect effects of trust in the partner or common values with the partner on willingness to work with the partner.
**Discussion**

The results of the third experiment provide support for the hypotheses regarding level of group identification. Strength of low status group members’ identification with their group increased intergroup political solidarity on some of the outcomes, specifically, behavioral intentions to engage in bottom-up activism and behavioral intentions to work with the high status group *without* social change as the specific goal. The results suggest that level of group identification may influence specific types of intergroup political solidarity in an intergroup social interaction setting. This finding is consistent with a large body of research illustrating how level of identification with one’s lower status group relates to willingness to engage in collective action for the rights of one’s group (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008; van Zomeren et al., 2004). These results contribute to that area of research, suggesting the level of identification with one’s lower status group extends beyond only collective action, to collective action for the rights of one’s group alongside members of a higher status group.

Moreover, willingness to work with the high status group partner in an upcoming interaction was greater when group identification was high. This result suggests that strength of identification with one’s low status group may be associated with a greater orientation toward intergroup political solidarity in intergroup social interaction settings. This interpretation may be somewhat speculative, as the measure of willingness to work with the partner did not include the specific goal of working *for social change*. In defense of this interpretation, however, intergroup political solidarity requires that low status group members are willing to interact with members of the high status group and work together in real-world situations. Attending protests together, for example, requires a foundational willingness to interact and work with members of the high status group.
Not supporting the hypotheses, endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, compared to colorblindness, did not predict any of the four political solidarity outcomes. This leads to a conclusion that endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group is not influential in intergroup social interactions. The first possible explanation for this findings is that unlike reading about the high status group on paper, low status group members have immediate concerns that may override information about the high status group when placed in actual or anticipated interaction settings (Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Vorauer, 2006). In intergroup interactions, low status group members have concerns and anxieties about how they will be evaluated by a high status group interaction partner (Finchilescu, 2010; Vorauer, 2006; Vorauer & Sakamoto, 2008), particularly, concerns with being respected and seen as competent (Bergsieker, Shelton, & Richeson, 2010). They are also likely to be concerned with being the target of prejudice (Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Shelton, Richeson, & Salvatore, 2005). Future research should include baseline measures of feelings of respect and competence, concerns with prejudice, and intergroup anxiety. These may moderate effects, for example, with lower concerns about prejudice allowing participants to pay greater attention to other information about their interaction partner (Richeson & Shelton, 2007), including the endorsement of multiculturalism by the group to which the partner belongs.

An alternative explanation for the non-significant effects of multiculturalism is the format of the experimental conditions. The press release statements conveyed endorsement of either multiculturalism or colorblindness by the high status group as a whole. This was done to be methodologically consistent across the experiments, and with the expectation that people may extend what they know about an outgroup (such as the high status group’s attitudes) to specific members (e.g., outgroup homogeneity; Haslam, Oakes, Turner, McGarty, 1995). Instead,
however, participants may have been concerned with knowing whether their high status group interaction partner personally endorsed multiculturalism or colorblindness, consistent with their overriding concerns with interaction partners’ attitudes (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Vorauer & Sakamoto, 2008). Determining whether, in intergroup social interactions, it is the attitudes of the interaction partner or attitudes of the high status group that influence intergroup political solidarity is a priority for future research. That distinction has important implications for the application of this work: in intergroup coalitions, where interpersonal interactions are unavoidable, high status group members may need to express their personal support for multiculturalism rather than promote the idea that their high status group endorses multiculturalism.

Trust in the high status group and perceived common values with the high status group did not mediate the relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity (Model 1). As noted in Experiment 2, the definitions and operationalizations of these variables may have been problematic. Trust may need to be re-conceptualized as a broader trust in society to do the right thing for lower status groups, consistent with Huo and Molina’s (2006) findings that trust in society was positively associated with the perception that one’s group is recognized and valued. Common values may have been too broad and participants may have anchored their responses to their own meanings of principles and beliefs. It is also possible that common values are not germane to solidarity between groups with status differences. In Glasford and Calcagno’s (2012) study, common values inspired political solidarity between two lower status groups. Thus, common values are important to intergroup political solidarity from one low status group to another, but perhaps not between groups of low and high statuses. This remains to be tested in future research.
Trust in the partner and common values with the partner did not mediate the relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and willingness to work with the partner, failing to support hypotheses (Model 2). Similar to the questions about trust and common values with the high status group, the definitions of both trust in the partner and common values with the partner may be problematic, as they were based on the definitions of trust and common values with the high status group. Perhaps, again in line with Huo and Molina’s (2006) notion of broader trust in society to operate in an egalitarian manner, the issue in interaction settings may be trust that the interaction partner prefers egalitarian treatment of groups in that society, rather than trust in the partner to work equitably. It is possible that common values with the partner must be about valuation for differences between groups, rather than general principles and beliefs. This definition would be more consistent with the concerns that low status group members have for the valuation of their group’s differences (Ashmore et al., 2004; Brewer, 1991, 2009). Further, the items that made up the common values measure did not specify any phenomenon to which those principles and beliefs pertained, and so responses to this partner-level measure may have been anchored to own meanings of principles and beliefs.

Limitations

Issues of research design issues limit the conclusions that can be made based on this study. The sample was mostly women, which calls into question the generalizability of findings to men. Thus, in future studies it may be necessary to sample for an equal gender ratio. The small sample size in combination with a relatively large number of statistical tests may have limited statistical power.

Again, there were a number of limitations related to the measures. Many of the dependent measures demonstrated little variation and ceiling effects, which may have lessened the
likelihood of detecting significant differences between conditions. The psychometric analyses question the construct validity of the measures, which may not be capturing the underlying constructs. Many of the measures were highly intercorrelated. This may be a result of several aspects of the measurement approach. The large number of items may have produced fatigue and led participants to select the same answers across the measures. Many items had similar stems and all were framed in terms of agreement, which may have contributed to artificially high correlations between the measures. To address psychometric concerns, future research might include behavioral outcomes that require more personal commitment. A priority for future research is to conduct psychometric studies that develop and validate measures of intergroup political solidarity from the perspective of the low status group toward a higher status group.
Chapter 5

General Discussion

“Women do not need to eradicate difference to feel solidarity…We can be sisters united by shared interests and beliefs, united in our appreciation for diversity, united in our struggle to end sexist oppression, united in political solidarity” – bell hooks (1986, p. 67)

The aim of the present research was to understand the conditions under which members of low status groups will work for social change with a higher status group, a phenomenon known as intergroup political solidarity. The dissertation integrated social psychological research regarding intergroup ideologies with interdisciplinary insights about intergroup political solidarity to develop a new model that describes those conditions. It was proposed that the extent to which a relevant higher status group recognized group differences would influence intergroup political solidarity, as implicated in the above quote from bell hooks’ analysis of intergroup solidarity. In three experiments, participants were lead to believe that a relevant high status group endorsed multiculturalism, which recognizes group differences, or colorblindness, which minimizes group differences. Differences in orientation toward intergroup political solidarity among members of low status group members were then tested. The experiments were conducted with two distinct lower status groups, Latinos and people who are LGBTQ, using two different methodological approaches, surveys and an in-person laboratory analogue experiment, in order to examine the validity of the model across more than one method and lower status group.

Three major findings emerged. First, in Experiments 1 and 2, endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group, compared to endorsement of colorblindness by the high status group, increased one specific form of intergroup political solidarity: behavioral intentions to work with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change. Other forms of political solidarity – willingness to engage in collective action, support for political solidarity, and willingness to work with the high status group – were not affected by the
different stances. Second, greater intergroup political solidarity was related to a greater strength of identification with one’s own group in all three experiments. Third, there was some evidence in Experiment 2 that level of group identification moderates the role of endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group, compared to colorblindness, but this finding occurred with only one kind of intergroup political solidarity specifically, willingness to work with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change.

This chapter will first offer a synthesized interpretation of the findings, based on the results of the experiments taken together. I will then describe the limitations of the present research. The chapter will end with a discussion of the contributions of this work to confirming past research and applications for both future work and real-world social change movements.

**Is Multiculturalism Related to Intergroup Political Solidarity?**

The primary hypothesis was that endorsement of multiculturalism by a higher status group, compared to endorsement of colorblindness by the high status group, would increase intergroup political solidarity among members of lower status groups. This expectation was partially supported by the results Experiments 1 and 2: the expressed willingness of participants to act with the high status group to develop policies and programs that promote social change was greater under multicultural endorsement by the high status group, compared to colorblindness. Other possible indices of intergroup political solidarity showed no effect.

Why did endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group, in comparison to colorblindness, influence only this single outcome? One possible explanation is because multicultural and colorblind ideologies are often experienced within institutions (Chávez, 1998; Kull, 1992; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), people may associate multicultural versus colorblind endorsement by the high status group with institutional efforts for reform. Because schools
promote multiculturalism, for instance, people may associate multiculturalism with educational policies that promote social change. This interpretation suggests that the kinds of outcomes likely to be affected by multicultural endorsement by the high status group, compared to colorblindness, will be those that are related to institutional, top-down efforts for social change.

An alternative explanation is that the experimental manipulation may have biased the results toward certain types of action. In all three experiments, the manipulations indicated that high status group endorsed an ideology at a societal level. The manipulations stated, for example, “Social scientists agree that, overall, White Americans have begun to approach Latinos in ways that celebrate...” That level of endorsement most aligns with taking action to develop policies and programs that promote social change at a societal level.

An alignment between who endorses an ideology and the type action in political solidarity may be critical. For example, willingness to work with a specific member of the high status group may require a manipulation that indicates that the specific person endorses an ideology. An orientation toward collective action may require a manipulation that indicates that the specific high status group members who are engaged in the collective action endorse an ideology. This example is illustrated in the U.S. Civil Rights movement (McAdam, 1988), where Black activists varied in their willingness to engage in collective action with White volunteers as a function of the extent to which those specific Whites volunteers endorsed multicultural ideals, rather than White Americans as a whole. This alternative explanation could be tested in future studies by including an experimental factor that varies whether the ideology is endorsed by the high status group as a whole or a single high status group individual.

There was also no support for the hypothesis that the multicultural condition would be related to greater intergroup political solidarity when compared to a control condition (with no
ideology primed). If low status group members prefer perspectives that recognize differences between groups, as some work has suggested (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007; Saguy et al., 2008), then they may think in terms of multiculturalism when less situational information is provided, and rely on that multicultural lens to make judgments about intergroup political solidarity. Although the present research was primarily concerned with the comparison between multicultural and colorblind conditions, which more closely resembles political situations in the real-world (McAdam, 1988), research is needed to assess the reason for lack of a difference between multicultural and control conditions.

One strategy to assess that lack of difference might be to compare the influence of the conditions on measures of personal endorsement of multiculturalism (Ryan et al., 2010; Ryan et al., 2007). If both the multicultural and control conditions evoke similar levels of a multicultural perspective, this would validate the contention that members of lower status groups prefer perspectives that recognize group differences (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2009). It would also support the interpretation that absent of specific information, lower status group members may default to a multicultural perspective, and use that as a guideline for judgments and decision making.

Additionally, pre-test measures of personal preference for multiculturalism and colorblindness could be obtained. The extent to which one is influenced by endorsement of a multicultural or colorblind perspective in the experiment may be determined by one’s existing perspective. Those who hold strong multicultural preference may have that preference validated in the multicultural condition, which could further heighten intergroup political solidarity. In contrast, endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group may not influence individuals who have a little desire for a multicultural perspective.
Does Group Identification Relate to Intergroup Political Solidarity?

Level of group identification was positively related to at least one measure of intergroup political solidarity in all three experiments. This is congruent with research showing a positive relation between group identification and collective action (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008). The dissertation extends that area of research by providing more specificity on how group identification affects intergroup political solidarity. For example, the studies illustrate that level of identification with one’s lower status group may extend beyond independent collective action (Simon & Klandermans, 2001), to action for the rights of one’s group alongside members of a higher status group. Additionally, there was some evidence in Experiment 2 that level of group identification moderated the role of endorsement of multiculturalism by a high status group, compared to colorblindness. This expected moderating role occurred among LGBTQ people (Experiment 2), but not Latinos/as (Experiment 1), for whom there was only a direct association.

This difference suggests that the context of the low status group may be relevant to understanding the factors that increase intergroup political solidarity. Latinos and LGBTQ people face different social realities, such as the extent to which they can conceal the visibility of their group membership, the ethnic composition of their group, and the social capital of the group. Whereas sexual minorities, for example, may be able to conceal their identities, being Latino is often a more visible group membership. The variability in visibility of a lower status group identity impacts one’s experiences across many domains (Cook, Calcagno, Arrow & Malle, 2011; Goffman, 1963; Jones, Farina, Hastorf, Markus, Miller, & Scott, 1984; Smart & Wegner, 1999). A priority in future work is to examine whether the findings in this dissertation and the hypothesized model generalize to other low status groups, and to identify the unique features of each group that shape orientations toward intergroup political solidarity.
Trust and Common Values did not Influence Intergroup Political Solidarity

Neither trust nor common values mediated the relation between endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group and intergroup political solidarity. As I have suggested in previous chapters, the definitions and operationalization of trust and common values may have been problematic. Rather than trust in the high status group, trust may need to be re-conceptualized as a broader trust in society to do the right thing for lower status groups (Huo & Molina, 2006). The definition of common values may need to be refined to include valuing differences between groups (Brewer, 1991, 2009; Tajfel, 1978). Moreover, common values may have been conceptualized too broadly and participants may have anchored their responses to their own meanings of ‘principles and beliefs.’ It is also difficult to assess common values without creating items where participants are forced to simultaneously judge the values of their own and other groups. Lastly, although common values have been shown to inspire political solidarity between two lower status groups (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012), they may not be relevant to solidarity between groups with different statuses.

Limitations

There were several methodological limitations across the three experiments that may have influenced the findings, or the lack of findings. First, although the manipulation of multiculturalism and colorblindness has been used in past studies (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2010), it may require refinement. The multicultural manipulation explicitly recognized group differences, but may have evoked a sense of commonality in its mention of “one nation that is also racially and ethnically diverse.” The colorblind statement may have minimized attention to group differences through a mixture of themes related to commonality and individualism. The colorblind manipulation mentioned, for example, “a similar cultural background” and “a nation
of individuals.” Removing the commonality content from both of the manipulations could increase the magnitude of the effects.

Several measurement issues also require consideration. First, there was low variance and ceiling effects for many of the measures, which decreased the possibility of detecting effects by condition. Second, factor analyses indicated that many measures, particularly those developed for this dissertation, might not have captured the underlying constructs; it will be important to test construct validity for these measures before using them in future studies. Third, in all three experiments, group identification was measured after the measures of intergroup political solidarity, despite the fact that it was conceptualized as a predictor of those outcomes. This order raises the concern of whether the experimental conditions or the outcome variables influenced participants’ reported group identification. This concern is diminished by the fact that level of group identification did not vary by experimental condition in any of the studies and that it is considered a relatively stable, individual-level construct (e.g., Ellemers et al., 2002). However, in future studies it is critical to be aware of unintended priming.

Many of the variables – mediators and outcomes – were highly correlated. Each experiment had a large number of items, which could have produced participant fatigue and led participants to select the same response for each item across the measures. Moreover, many items had similar if not identical stems. Although some of these issues were identified in Experiment 1 and changed for Experiments 2 and 3, as stated above, psychometric work needs to be done to determine the core components of intergroup political solidarity and to make sure that those measures show discriminant validity for the measures used to predict them.

The sample sizes were small relative to the number of statistical tests performed, which may have limited statistical power. With regard to external validity, the samples were fairly
homogeneous: for example, three-fourths of the LGBTQ sample was White and all three samples were young, with a mean age in the low 20s. Whether the results extend to older generations, whose experiences with social change and activism may be different from younger generations, requires further examination. The uneven sex ratio, particularly the small number of men (Experiments 1-3) and non-binary sex identified people (Experiment 2) may also limit generalizability of the results across gendered lines. A boundary condition of the results worth future consideration is that this research was conducted among groups who live in a diverse environment (Latinos in NYC) or have a high degree of intra-group diversity (Latinos and LGBTQ). Participants’ familiarity with diversity may have decreased the strength of the results, and environments where diversity is less tolerated could see stronger effects of endorsement of multiculturalism by a higher status group.

A potentially important question that needs to be addressed in the future is the role of common identity in intergroup political solidarity. The majority of research regarding intergroup political solidarity has emphasized the importance of common identities (e.g., Reicher et al., 2006; Subašić et al., 2008; Wiley & Bikmen, 2012; Wiley et al., 2013). However, that research has only been conducted in the context of the high status group’s motivations. The present research took the perspective that, especially for low status group members, there may be alternate motivations than common identity – existing common identities may not always be a basis for actions. In fact, low status group members can react negatively to the salience of a common identity (Dovidio et al., 2009). Although the dissertation did not rule out common identity as an additional motivational factor, future investigations should explore its usefulness in conjunction with intergroup ideologies.
Implications for Future Research and Social Change

Social change research. Past work regarding social change has had a strong focus on understanding when low status group members take collective actions without the high status group, relative to the amount of work focusing on intergroup political solidarity. The small amount of psychological scholarship that has examined intergroup political solidarity (e.g., Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Greenwood, 2008; Subašić et al., 2008; Wiley et al., 2013) has not focused on intergroup political solidarity toward a higher status group among low status group members. This dissertation provides an opening to that literature, highlighting the need for more psychological research on intergroup political solidarity overall. It also extends past research by investigating intergroup political solidarity exclusively from the perspective of lower status groups toward a higher status group.

One important finding was that members of low status groups were relatively open to the idea of intergroup political solidarity. Across the three experiments, the mean orientation toward solidarity on four different measures was above the midpoint on a seven-point scale. The question remains, however, as to the conditions under which that openness can be maintained. As seen in the Civil Rights movement, even when solidarity was achieved, it was tenuous and eventually unsustainable (McAdam, 1988). A possible mechanism for the preservation of that initial openness may be the maintenance of a multicultural perspective and promotion of a strong sense of group identification with one’s own low status group.

Many of the approaches applied to understanding when low status group members will work on behalf of their group without assistance from the high status group conceptualize strength of identification with one’s low status group as a foundation to increased collective action for social change. The apparent role of group identification in this research suggests that
models of collective action could be applied to further understand the conditions under which low status group members are oriented toward intergroup political solidarity. It is possible that mechanisms that explain engagement in collective action, such as group efficacy (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008), could be useful to understanding motivations for engaging in intergroup political solidarity.

Broadly, group efficacy is the extent to which one feels that actions for social change will bring about the desired changes. In the context of intergroup political solidarity, there may be parallel beliefs about the efficacy of collective action and the efficacy of intergroup political solidarity that influence orientations toward solidarity. The emergence of intergroup political solidarity could hinge on whether the belief in the efficacy of collective action outweighs belief in the efficacy of solidarity, and vice versa. It is also possible that the two beliefs are not mutually exclusive. Future research should integrate models of collective action with intergroup political solidarity research to test these ideas.

No individual belongs to only one low or high status group. Intersectionality is a necessary reality that must be addressed (Collins, 1990; Crenshaw, 1993; hooks, 1984; Shields, 2008; Warner & Shields, 2013), and especially more so in the context of intergroup political solidarity (Greenwood, 2012; Wiley & Bikmen, 2012). The present work did not address intersectionality but rather conceptualized low and high status groups in unidimensional terms. However, Latinos and LGBTQ individuals, the two groups under study in this research, include people of differing nationalities, sex, gender, class, and religion; further, it is possible that they do not see high status groups as homogeneous either. In moving forward with this work, it is critical to consider how multiple group identifications might shape intergroup political solidarity, consistent with bell hooks’ (1984) analysis of solidarity between Black and White women, which
showed that race and gender shaped solidarity. It is possible that an intersectional ideology, which recognizes group differences across multiple dimensions, and thus adds further complexity to the idea of multiculturalism, might have a greater influence on intergroup political solidarity. This hypothesis could be tested by including an additional experimental condition that invokes endorsement of intersectionality. One could also focus on the more specific concerns of distinct subgroups, such as the unique concerns of LGBTQ people of color.

**Intergroup ideology research.** This dissertation research offered a new application of multicultural and colorblind ideologies, as a framework for understanding intergroup political solidarity. Although the empirical evidence for the framework was weak, this dissertation is the first to explicitly propose that multicultural and colorblind ideologies could be influential in a politicized context. This research also complements a trend within intergroup relations research to recognize the influential role that the behavior of the high status group plays in the attitudes and behaviors of low status group members (Gómez, Dovidio, Huici, Gaertner, & Cuadrado, 2008; Plaut et al., 2009; Van Laar et al., 2013; Zagefka, Gonzalez, & Brown, 2011). In both political and apolitical contexts, additional research is needed that explores the high status group’s role.

**Practical applications.** The findings of these experimental studies could potentially have applications for current, real-world social movements. In particular, high status group members who want to work for social change on behalf of the low status group, at least in the form of developing programs that promote greater equality, should consider approaching low status group members with multiculturalism rather than blindness to group differences. Straight people who want to participate in Gay-Straight alliances, for instance, would be advised to recognize those differences rather than to minimize them. This recommendation may be difficult to
implement, however, because members of high status groups often prefer perspectives that minimize group differences, as suggested by historical example (McAdam, 1988) and past research (Dovidio et al., 2009; Gómez et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2007; Saguy et al., 2008). There may be an unavoidable incompatibility between the factors that orient low status group members toward intergroup political solidarity and those that motivate members of high status groups to work as allies (Russell, 2011).

How this incompatibility might be overcome is an important next research question: What are the mechanisms by which endorsement of multiculturalism by the high status group inspires intergroup political solidarity? Although this dissertation provided only partial evidence for the influence of multicultural endorsement by the high status group and group identification on intergroup political solidarity, trust and common values were not part of the equation. Other dimensions of intergroup ideology, such as intersectionality, may do a better job of explaining how multiculturalism, or aspects of it, guide intergroup solidarity.

**Conclusion**

The primary research question in this dissertation addresses an enduring, pervasive political phenomenon that has not received much attention in social psychology: When do members of low status groups want to work with members of a higher status group for social change? As a current example, consider the Black Lives Matter movement in the United States in 2014-2015. During this movement, Black and White activists came together to address the systematic mistreatment of Black Americans by law enforcement personnel. One clear message that emerged was the hashtag ‘Black Lives Matter.’ That message aligns with the multicultural ideal of affirming group difference. At the same time, an alternative message that minimized group difference emerged, the hashtag ‘All Lives Matter.’ This latter message caused a great deal
of controversy, with many people (mostly Black) expressing opposition to solidarity with people (mostly White) who endorse the hashtag ‘All Lives Matter.’ One activist stated, “Yes, all lives matter, but right now we are focused on the Black lives…If you can’t see why we are exclaiming #blacklivesmatter you are part of the problem.” It is striking that the same challenges for solidarity that occurred fifty years ago, in 1964 during the U.S. Civil Rights movement (McAdam, 1988), emerge again in the context of intergroup solidarity today. Both multiculturalism and strength of group identification can have a relation to intergroup political solidarity. Now more than ever, expanding on this research and increasing our understanding of the conditions that create and maintain the kinds of intergroup political solidarity that can endure the trials of tenuous intergroup relations is a critical endeavor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial minority high school students for college admissions.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would work with Whites to raise funds for qualified racial minority high school students to visit college campuses.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would work with Whites to develop sensitivity training programs for employees.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.98***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would work with Whites to rally for monetary reparations to racial minority group members for historical discrimination.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for racial minorities.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would work with Whites to set up special programs to make sure that racial minorities are given equal opportunities in employment and education.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would work with Whites to create special entitlement for racial minority students.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Engage in Collective Action Items in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would participate in raising our collective voice with Whites.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would do something together with Whites.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would participate in a future demonstration with Whites.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would participate in some form of collective action with Whites.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.97***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Support for Political Solidarity Items in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial equality.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to promote racial equality.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites promote racial equality.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial equality. (R)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved. (R)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial equality. (R)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Work with the High Status Group Items in Experiment 1*

(all ns = 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would consider working with Whites.</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would be willing to work with Whites.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be interested in working with Whites.</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would like to work with Whites.</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would feel good about working with Whites.</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would feel positive about working with Whites.</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would not prefer to work with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would not be motivated to work with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would dislike working with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among all Variables in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Willingness to Engage in Collective Action*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support for Political Solidarity*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness to Work with the High Status Group*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables.

*Indicates measures that were transformed prior to analyses to reduce skew.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Level of Group Identification Items in Experiment 1*

(all ns = 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often think about the fact that I am Latino.</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity.</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.48***.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am glad to be Latino.</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24*.78***.61***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is pleasant to be Latino.</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.31**.67***.65***.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being Latino gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.33**.71***.67***.84***.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel a bond with Latinos.</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.21*.62***.60***.68***.70***.74***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel solidarity with Latinos.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.15.57***.50***.56***.59***.62***.74***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel committed to being Latino.</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.32**.72***.76***.66***.70***.75***.69***.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 7  
*Condition Means and Standard Deviations among Dependent Variables in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Multicultural (n = 35)</th>
<th>Colorblind (n = 28)</th>
<th>Control (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>6.12 (1.14)ₐ</td>
<td>5.55 (1.21)ₐ</td>
<td>5.80 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action*</td>
<td>5.88 (1.18)</td>
<td>5.32 (1.73)</td>
<td>5.85 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Political Solidarity*</td>
<td>5.99 (.86)</td>
<td>5.59 (1.20)</td>
<td>5.72 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group*</td>
<td>5.80 (1.20)</td>
<td>5.74 (.97)</td>
<td>6.30 (.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables. Means that do not share a common subscript are statistically different. All means without subscripts are not statistically different.

*Indicates measures that were transformed prior to analyses to reduce skew.
Table 8

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Willingness to Work on Programs in Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable ($D_1$)</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable ($D_2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable ($D_1$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable ($D_2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_1 \times$ Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2 \times$ Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Multicultural condition was coded (0) and the comparison condition coded (1) for each dummy variable ($D_1$ and $D_2$).

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 9

**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Willingness to Work on Programs Items in Experiment 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I would work with straight people to develop sensitivity training programs for employees, regarding sexual orientation.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would work with straight people on a project that recruited LGBT high school students for college admissions.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would work with straight people to develop affirmative action programs for LGBT people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would work with straight people to rally for monetary reparations to LGBT people for historical discrimination.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would work with straight people create special entitlement for LGBT students.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would work with straight people to set up special programs to make sure that LGBT people are given equal opportunities in employment and education.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would work with straight people to raise funds for qualified LGBT high school students to visit college campuses.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 10

**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Engage in Collective Action Items in Experiment 2**

(all *ns* = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would participate in raising our collective voice with straight people for LGBT rights.</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would do something together with straight people for LGBT rights.</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would participate in a future demonstration with straight people for LGBT rights.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would participate in some form of collective action with straight people for LGBT rights.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Support for Political Solidarity Items in Experiment 2*

(all ns = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LGBT people would be better off if they worked together with</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight people to promote equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Straight and LGBT people must stick together and work with</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each other to promote equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work toward equality for LGBT rights should be done only by</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people, without straight people being involved. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My preference is that LGBT people include straight people in</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts to promote equality for LGBT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prefer that LGBT people involve straight people in actions for</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality between our groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer that LGBT people work together with straight people</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to promote equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LGBT people should work separately from straight people to</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote equality. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Straight people should not be involved in LGBT efforts to</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote equality for LGBT. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Straight and LGBT people should work together to promote</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality for LGBT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Work with the High Status Group Items in Experiment 2* 
(all *ns* = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th><em>M</em></th>
<th><em>SD</em></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. I would feel positive about working with straight people.</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would feel good about working with straight people.</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would like to work with straight people.</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would dislike working with straight people. (R)</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be interested in working with straight people.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would not be motivated to work with straight people. (R)</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.88***</td>
<td>.90***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would not prefer to work with straight people. (R)</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be willing to work with straight people.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would consider working with straight people.</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 13

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Dependent Variables in Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. Trust</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common Values*</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness to Engage in Collective Action*</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support for Political Solidarity*</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Willingness to Work with the High Status Group*</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates measures that were transformed prior to analyses to reduce skew.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Note: The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables.
Table 14

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Trust Items in Experiment 2
(all ns = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I do not trust straight people to work for the benefit of LGBT rights. (R)</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust straight people when they work on behalf of LGBT rights.</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would be suspicious of straight people. (R)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I trust straight people to work with LGBT people to promote equal rights.</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not trust that straight people will genuinely work with LGBT people to promote equal rights. (R)</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would trust straight people's intentions.</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would feel trust toward straight people.</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If they approached me to work together for equality, I would distrust straight people. (R)</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 15

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Common Values Items in Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is unlikely that LGBT people and straight people share their core values and principles. (R)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is unlikely that LGBT people have shared values with straight people. (R)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LGBT people have key principles in common with straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LGBT people and straight people have similar values.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There may be common values between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LGBT people’s important principles are likely to overlap with straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LGBT people’s core values are dissimilar to those of straight people. (R)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LGBT people and straight people do not have shared beliefs. (R)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Straight people value the differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Straight people recognize the differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.16†</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Straight people perceive that there are key differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16†</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 16

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Level of Group Identification Items in Experiment 2*

(all ns = 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being LGBT gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being LGBT is an important part of how I see myself.</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often think about the fact that I am LGBT.</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel a bond with LGBT people.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is pleasant to be LGBT.</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am glad to be LGBT.</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel solidarity with LGBT people.</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The fact that I am LGBT is an important part of my identity.</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel committed to being LGBT.</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 17

*Means and Standard Deviations by Sex among All Variables in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Female (n = 67)</th>
<th>Male (n = 26)</th>
<th>Non-Binary (n = 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5.54 (1.17)</td>
<td>5.85 (1.17)</td>
<td>4.88 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>6.16 (.86)</td>
<td>5.98 (.97)</td>
<td>5.50 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>5.49 (1.09)</td>
<td>5.45 (1.31)</td>
<td>5.54 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</td>
<td>6.22 (1.26)</td>
<td>6.48 (.82)</td>
<td>6.14 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Political Solidarity</td>
<td>5.69 (1.15)</td>
<td>6.11 (1.02)</td>
<td>5.18 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</td>
<td>5.91 (1.14)</td>
<td>6.24 (.97)</td>
<td>5.46 (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>5.61 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.48 (.92)</td>
<td>6.20 (.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables. Means that do not share a common subscript are statistically different. All means without subscripts are not statistically different.

*p < .05.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Multicultural ($n = 36$)</th>
<th>Colorblind ($n = 36$)</th>
<th>Control ($n = 43$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>$5.65 (1.07)$</td>
<td>$5.49 (1.36)$</td>
<td>$5.42 (1.29)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>$6.20 (.75)$</td>
<td>$5.70 (1.24)$</td>
<td>$6.10 (.83)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>$5.60 (.97)_{a}$</td>
<td>$5.17 (1.37)_{b}$</td>
<td>$5.65 (.98)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</td>
<td>$6.35 (1.10)$</td>
<td>$6.22 (1.36)$</td>
<td>$6.23 (.98)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Political Solidarity</td>
<td>$5.83 (1.20)$</td>
<td>$5.82 (1.11)$</td>
<td>$5.56 (1.16)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</td>
<td>$6.23 (.88)$</td>
<td>$5.79 (1.33)$</td>
<td>$5.79 (1.28)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables. Means that do not share a common subscript are statistically different. All means without subscripts are not statistically different.
Table 19

*Standardized Regression Coefficients from the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Willingness to Work on Programs in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female/non-binary variable</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/non-binary variable</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable (D₂)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The Multicultural condition was coded (0) and the comparison condition coded (1) for each dummy variable (D₁ and D₂).*

*p < .05. ***p < .001.*
Table 20

*Indirect Effects of Trust and Common Values on Dependent Variables in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Willingness to Work on Programs</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</th>
<th>Support for Political Solidarity</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
<td><strong>B(SE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lower</strong></td>
<td><strong>Upper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>- .001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable (D₂)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals were generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling using SPSS Macro Model 5 (Hayes, 2013).
Table 21

**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Work on Programs Items in Experiment 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I would work with Whites to develop sensitivity training programs for employees.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial/ethnic minority high school students for college admissions.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for racial/ethnic minorities.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would work with Whites to rally for monetary reparations to racial/ethnic minority group members for historical discrimination.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would work with Whites create special entitlement for racial/ethnic minority students.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would work with Whites to set up special programs to make sure that racial/ethnic minorities are given equal opportunities in employment and education.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would work with Whites to raise funds for qualified racial/ethnic minority high school students to visit college campuses.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01. ***p < .001.**
Table 22

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Engage in Collective Action Items in Experiment 3
(all ns = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would participate in raising our collective voice with Whites.</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would do something together with Whites.</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would participate in a future demonstration with Whites.</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would participate in some form of collective action with Whites.</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.
Table 23

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Support for Political Solidarity Items in Experiment 3*

(all ns = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved. (R)</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My preference is that Latinos include Whites in efforts to promote equality.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prefer that Latinos involve Whites in actions for equality between our groups.</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer that Latinos work together with Whites to promote equality.</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality. (R)</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial/ethnic equality. (R)</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p < .10.  *p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
Table 24  
**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Work with the High Status Group Items in Experiment 3**  
(all n = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would feel positive about working with Whites.</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would feel good about working with Whites.</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would like to work with Whites.</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.67*** .76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would dislike working with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.61*** .61*** .68***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be interested in working with Whites.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.71*** .76*** .80*** .49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would not be motivated to work with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.42*** .37** .48*** .59*** .37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would not prefer to work with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.51*** .50*** .59*** .70*** .43*** .72***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be willing to work with Whites.</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.33** .40** .37** .19 .39** .11 .22†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would consider working with Whites.</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.38** .37** .37** .27* .35** .54*** .35** .24†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 25

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Trust Items in Experiment 3

(all $ns = 60$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</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. I do not trust Whites to work for the benefit of racial/ethnic minorities' rights. (R)</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust Whites when they work on behalf of racial/ethnic minorities' rights.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would be suspicious of Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I trust Whites to work with racial/ethnic minorities' to promote equal rights.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not trust that Whites will genuinely work with racial/ethnic minorities' to promote equal rights. (R)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would trust Whites’ intentions.</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would feel trust toward Whites.</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If they approached me to work together for equality, I would distrust Whites. (R)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 26

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Common Values Items in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is unlikely that Latinos and Whites share their core values and principles. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is unlikely that Latinos have shared values with Whites. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Latinos have key principles in common with Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Latinos and Whites have similar values.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51*** .55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There may be common values between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54*** .59*** .68*** .73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Latinos’ important principles are likely to overlap with Whites.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28* .30* .33* .27* .47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Latinos’ core values are dissimilar to those of Whites. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48*** .47*** .46*** .52*** .54*** .23‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Latinos and Whites do not have shared beliefs. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65*** .80*** .49*** .50*** .55*** .33* .48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whites value the differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07 .06 .06 .08 .07 .13 -.14 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whites recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 .10 .09 -.04 -.05 .33* -.10 .10 .51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Whites perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11 -.09 -.05 -.20 .02 -.38* -.23‡ .30* .45***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 27

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Willingness to Work with Partner Items in Experiment 3*

(all ns = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I am interested in working with my partner.</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel good about working with my partner.</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel positive about working with my partner.</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel negative about working with my partner. (R)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think I will dislike working with my partner. (R)</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am not looking forward to working with my partner. (R)</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I think I will like working with my partner.</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am not motivated to work with my partner. (R)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.24†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 28

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Trust in Partner Items in Experiment 3
(all ns = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. I distrust that my partner will be helpful when we work together. (R)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust that my partner will work hard on this task.</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I trust my partner to work as equals with me on this task.</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not trust that my partner will be genuinely engaged during the task today. (R)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am suspicious at my partner will not be cooperative today. (R)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I trust that my partner will not take over the task today.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I will be suspicious of my partner’s intentions when we work together today. (R)</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I trust my partner to contribute when we work together today.</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 29

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Common Values with Partner Items in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My partner and I will not have important principles in common. (R)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will have common values with my partner.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My partner and I may have similar values.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My core values will be dissimilar from those of my partner. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.24†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There may be common values between me and my partner.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I will not share important values with my partner. (R)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is unlikely that my partner and I share core values. (R)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The important beliefs I hold will be in common with my partner.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My partner is likely to recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My partner and is likely to perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is likely that my partner values the difference between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 30

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Outcome Variables in Experiment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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. Trust</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common Values</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willingness to Work on Programs(^a)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness to Engage in Collective Action(^a)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support for Political Solidarity</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Willingness to Work with the High Status Group(^a)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trust in Partner</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Common Values with Partner</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Willingness to Work with Partner(^a)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Level of Group Identification(^a)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*. The means and standard deviations correspond to untransformed variables.

\(^a\)Indicates measures that were transformed prior to analyses to reduce skew.

\(^*\) *p < .05. \(^**\) *p < .01. \(^***\) *p < .001.
Table 31

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Level of Group Identification Items in Experiment 3*
(all ns = 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being Latino gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often think about the fact that I am Latino.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel a bond with Latinos.</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is pleasant to be Latino.</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am glad to be Latino.</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel solidarity with Latinos.</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.22†</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.24†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel committed to being Latino.</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
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Table 32

*Condition Means and Standard Deviations among Outcome Variables in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Multicultural (n = 27)</th>
<th>Colorblind (n = 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work on Programs</td>
<td>6.06 (1.14)</td>
<td>6.12 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</td>
<td>6.33 (.94)</td>
<td>6.36 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Political Solidarity</td>
<td>5.77 (1.05)</td>
<td>5.78 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</td>
<td>6.15 (.97)</td>
<td>6.37 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work with the Partner</td>
<td>6.04 (1.09)</td>
<td>6.34 (.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The means and standard deviations presented here correspond to untransformed variables. No means are statistically different.
### Table 33

**Standardized Regression Coefficients from the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses in Experiment 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ $R^2$</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Multicultural condition was coded (1) and the Colorblind condition was coded (0) for the condition dummy coded variable (D₁).

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
Table 34

*Indirect Effects of Trust and Common Values on Intergroup Political Solidarity Outcome Variables in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Willingness to Work on Programs</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Support for Political Solidarity</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals were generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling using SPSS Macro Model 5 (Hayes, 2013).
Table 35

*Indirect Effects of Trust in the Partner and Common Values with the Partner on Willingness to Work With the Partner in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the Partner</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Values with the Partner</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals were generated from 10,000 bootstrap resampling using SPSS Macro Model 5 (Hayes, 2013).
Figure 1. A theoretical model of intergroup political solidarity
**Figure 2.** Means and standard errors for *Willingness to Work on Programs* by condition in Experiment 1

* * p < .05.
Figure 3. A conceptual model of the mediation analyses in Experiment 2
Figure 4. Means and standard errors for Willingness to Work on Programs by condition in Experiment 2

*p < .05.
Figure 5. *Willingness to Work on Programs* as a function of level of group identification and experimental condition in Experiment 2

*Indicates simple slope is significantly different from zero at $p < .001$.  

\[ \beta = .71^* \]  

\[ \beta = .22 \]
Figure 6. A conceptual model of the mediation analyses of intergroup political solidarity outcomes in Experiment 3.
Figure 7. A conceptual model of the mediation analysis of the partner-level outcomes in Experiment 3
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Experiment 1 Consent Form

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

John Jay College
Department of Psychology

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

Project Title: Groups & Cooperation

Principal Investigator: Justine Calcagno, M.A.
Graduate Student
The Graduate Center
365 5th Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 817-1911

Faculty Advisor: Demis Glasford, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
John Jay College
524 West 59th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 237-8780

Site where study is to be conducted: Online/Internet

Introduction/Purpose: You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is conducted by Justine Calcagno, M.A., under the direction of Demis Glasford, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at John Jay College. The purpose of this research study is to examine how people think and feel about working alongside members of other social groups on important projects. The purpose of this study will be explained more fully after your participation is complete. The results of this study may help us to better understand how people think about and relate to other people in society and cooperate with members of other social groups.

Procedures: Approximately 404 individuals are expected to participate in this study. Each participant will be asked to complete a survey. Participants will review research materials, and then answer questions about their attitudes regarding those materials. The time commitment of each participant is expected to be about ten to thirty minutes. Each survey will take place online/via the internet, via the hyperlink/URL provided by the research team.

Possible Discomforts and Risks: Your participation in this study may involve reading about some topics that may make you slightly uncomfortable. We anticipate that this uncomfortable feeling, however, will
be short-lived. To minimize these risks we will provide you the contact information of the researchers, so you may contact the researchers to discuss any uncomfortable feelings that you might have.

**Benefits:** There are no direct benefits of participating in this research. However, participating in the study may increase general knowledge of attitudes towards different groups in psychology. You will learn more about how psychological research is conducted.

**Alternatives:** None applicable.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may decide not to participate without prejudice, penalty, or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to discontinue participation in the study, you may do so. If so, please email the Principal Investigator, Justine Calcagno, at jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu, informing her/him of your decision to discontinue participation in the study.

**Financial Considerations:** There is no financial compensation for those who volunteer via listervs.

**Confidentiality:** The data obtained from you will be via a web survey. The collected data will be accessible to the principal investigator, research team, and IRB members and staff. The researcher will protect your confidentiality by not collecting identifying information on the web survey and securely storing the data in a file, on a password protected computer, in a locked room. We may publish the results of the study, but all results will be reported in aggregate without any identifying characteristics.

**Contact Questions/Persons:** If you have any questions about the research now or in the future, you should contact the Principal Investigator, Justine Calcagno, at jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact Carina M. Quintian at the John Jay College office of Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) by phone at (212) 237-8961 or email at jjirb@jjay.cuny.edu.

**Statement of Consent:** “I have read the above description of this research and I understand it. I have been informed of the risks and benefits involved, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. Furthermore, I have been assured that any future questions that I may have will also be answered by the principal investigator of the research study. I voluntary agree to participate in this study.

By checking the box below I have not waived any of my legal rights to which I would otherwise be entitled. I will be given a copy of this statement.”

☐ Please check here to indicate that you have read this consent form, fully understand the nature and consequences of participation, have had all questions regarding participation in this study answered satisfactorily, and agree to the Statement of Consent.
Experiment 1 Questionnaire

Introduction
First, you will read a recent Press Release based on scientific research. After reading, you will answer questions about the content of the statement. You will be prompted to recall and write down key points.

Please note, it is important to the integrity of the research that you take your time, read and think carefully about the questions you are asked in this survey.

[Multicultural Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release
Social scientists agree that, overall, White Americans have begun to approach Latinos in ways that celebrate the diversity of the nation, by appreciating that we are all different races and ethnicities within one nation. In fact, 77% say that they, “Believe that the U.S. has diverse cultural backgrounds,” and 81% of White Americans agreed that they, “Want Latinos to feel that Latinos belong to one nation that is also racially diverse.” A significant portion said that they, “Want Latinos to feel that Whites support the idea that there are many different ways of life.”

Regarding relations between Whites and Latinos, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that Whites definitely want to approach Latinos in ways that emphasize that at the core of things this one shared nation is filled with diverse racial groups.” He has found that more and more, White Americans think it is important to celebrate the various racial and ethnic groups that make our nation diverse.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.

[Colorblind Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release
Social scientists agree that, overall, White Americans have begun to approach Latinos in ways that recognize that, at the core, we are all similar individuals. In fact, 77% say that they “Believe that we are individuals who share a similar cultural background,” and 81% of White Americans agreed that they, “Want Latinos to feel that they belong to a nation of individuals.” A significant portion also said that they, “Want Latinos to feel that they believe individuality is a key way of life in the U.S.”

Regarding relations between Whites and Latinos, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that Whites definitely want to approach Latinos in ways that emphasize that at the core of things all people in this nation are individuals.” He has found that more and more, White Americans think it is important to focus on how we are similar individuals.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.
[Control Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release

Social scientists agree that, overall, more and more White Americans have improved views of Latinos. In a recent survey a majority of White Americans agreed that they “Feel positive about Latinos in the United States.” Much more than in past decades, a significant number of White Americans express encouraging views, such as that they see Latinos as good coworkers, neighbors, and citizens.

Please list up to five (5) ways in which White Americans have positive views of Latinos.

When it comes to inequality facing Latinos, some Latinos are willing to work together with White Americans to create change, however, other Latinos are much less willing to work with Whites to create change (want Latinos to work independently). There are positive and negatives to each way.

Consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions regarding your willingness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I would consider working with Whites.
- I would be willing to work with Whites.
- I would be interested in working with Whites.
- I would like to work with Whites.
- I would feel good about working with Whites.
- I would feel positive about working with Whites.
- I would not be motivated to work with Whites.
- I would not prefer to work with Whites.
- I would dislike working with Whites.
Consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial equality.
- Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to promote racial equality.
- Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites to promote racial equality.
- Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial equality.
- Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved.
- Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial equality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I would participate in raising our collective voice with Whites.
- I would do something together with Whites.
- I would participate in a future demonstration with Whites.
- I would participate in some form of collective action with Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial minority high school students for college admissions.
- I would work with Whites to raise funds for qualified racial minority high school students to visit college campuses.
- I would work with Whites to develop sensitivity training programs for employees.
- I would work with Whites to rally for monetary reparations to racial minority group members for historical discrimination.
- I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for racial minorities.
- I would work with Whites to set up special programs to make sure that racial minorities are given equal opportunities in employment and education.
- I would work with Whites to create special entitlement for racial minority students.
Based on the Press Release you read, how do White Americans think about groups and people in the U.S.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- White Americans want to recognize that at the core of things we are all individuals.
- White Americans want to approach Latinos in ways that recognize that we are all individuals.
- White Americans want to approach Latinos in ways that recognize that we should celebrate the racial diversity of our shared nation.
- White Americans want to recognize that at the core of things we are diverse racial groups within one nation.

How do you see your Latinos and Whites in the U.S.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I see Latinos and Whites as two separate groups.
- I see Latinos and Whites as the same one group.
- I see Latinos and Whites as two groups within one larger group.

The questions are about how you feel about being Latino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I often think about the fact that I am Latino.
- The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity.
- Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.
- I am glad to be Latino.
- It is pleasant to be Latino.
- Being Latino gives me a good feeling.
- I feel a bond with Latinos.
- I feel solidarity with Latinos.
- I feel committed to being Latino.
Description of Research Participants
When we report the results of this study, readers will be interested in knowing what kinds of people participated in it, such as their nationality, age, and so forth. Please answer the following questions about yourself for this purpose. This information will be used to describe the variety of people in the study (e.g., they ranged in age from 18-90), not to identify anyone personally.

Your age in years?

Are you:
• Male
• Female
• Other (I identify as...)

Your race or ethnicity?

Do you identify as Hispanic/Latino(a)?

In what country were you born?

If you were not born in the U.S.A., how old were you when you arrived in the U.S.A?

What is your mother's country of birth?

What is your father's country of birth?

What is your first language?

What is your second language (if applicable)?

Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States
At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder? Please select the rung where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States.

____ Top
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____ Bottom
Experiment 1 Debriefing Form

Groups & Cooperation
Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study! Your participation is extremely important to our research.

Because this is an ongoing research project at John Jay College we ask that you please do NOT discuss your experiences here today with other students at John Jay College or other individuals. The validity of the research depends on participants being blind to the study procedures and hypotheses until after their participation is complete.

The purpose of this study is to examine how people think and feel about working with members of other groups on important projects. We asked you to read a pamphlet created for a group working to benefit and increase equality for a social group to which you belong. We then examined a number of dependent variables, including your ratings of preference to work with members of the other group, and some demographic information. You read one of several versions of the group’s pamphlet. We expect that there will be variance in preference to work with members of the other group depending on the content of the pamphlet.

If you would like to learn about the results of the study once we have them or if you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact the principal investigator, Justine Calcagno, via email at jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact Carina M. Quintian at the John Jay College office of Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) by phone at (212) 237-8961 or email at jjirb@jjay.cuny.edu.
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Research Study: Groups & Cooperation

Principal Investigator: Justine Calcagno, M.A.  
Graduate Student

Faculty Advisor: Tracey Revenson, Ph.D.  
Professor  
Hunter College  
Psychology Department

Research Sponsor: N/A

You are being asked to participate in a research study because you may be a member of a student group at your college/university.

Purpose:
The purpose of this research study is to examine how people think and feel about working alongside members of other social groups on important projects. The purpose of this study will be explained more fully after your participation is complete. The results of this study may help us to better understand how people think about and relate to other people in society and cooperate with members of other social groups.

Procedures:
If you volunteer to participate in this research study, we will ask you to do the following: Participants will be asked to complete a survey. Specifically, participants will first review research materials and then answer survey questions. Those questions have to do with working alongside members of other social groups. We expect 501 individuals are expected to participate in this study. All research procedures take place online, via your personal computer. Altogether the time commitment of is expected to be approximately 20 minutes.

Time Commitment:
Your participation in this research study is expected to last for a total of 20 minutes.

Compensation/Incentives:  
N/A

Potential Risks or Discomforts:  
Your participation in this study may involve reading about some topics that may make you slightly uncomfortable. We anticipate that this uncomfortable feeling, however, will be short-lived. To minimize
these risks we will provide you the contact information of the researchers, so you may contact the researchers to discuss any uncomfortable feelings that you might have.

**Potential Benefits:**
You will not directly benefit from your participation in this research study. Your participation is important as the study may increase general knowledge of attitudes toward working together with different people and groups. You will learn more about how psychological research is conducted.

**Alternatives to Participation:**
*None applicable.*

**Costs:** N/A

**Payment for Participation:**
You will not receive any payment for participating in this research study.

**Research Related Injury:** N/A

**Confidentiality:**
We will make our best efforts to maintain confidentiality of any information that is collected during this research study, and that can identify you. We will disclose this information only with your permission or as required by law.

We will protect your confidentiality with the following steps: The consent forms will be stored separately from the surveys and no ID numbers or other identifying information will be kept with or attached to the consent forms. No identifying information will be written on the survey, and surveys will be stored separately from the consent forms. All written materials will be kept in a locked room.

The research team, authorized CUNY staff and government agencies that oversee this type of research may have access to research data and records in order to monitor the research. Research records provided to authorized, non-CUNY individuals will not contain identifiable information about you. Publications and/or presentations that result from this study will not identify you by name.

**Participants’ Rights:**
- Your participation in this research study is entirely voluntary. If you decide not to participate, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
- You can decide to withdraw your consent and stop participating in the research at any time, without any penalty. Withdrawal from the study will not impact your standing in the department, college or University.

**Questions, Comments or Concerns:**
If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to one of the following researchers:
Justine Calcagno, MA
jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or you have comments or concerns that you would like to discuss with someone other than the researchers, please call the CUNY Research Compliance Administrator at 646-664-8918. Alternately, you can write to:

CUNY Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
Attn: Research Compliance Administrator
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

By checking the box below I have not waived any of my legal rights to which I would otherwise be entitled. I will be given a copy of this statement.”

☐ Please check here to indicate that you have read this consent form, fully understand the nature and consequences of participation, have had all questions regarding participation in this study answered satisfactorily, and agree to the Statement of Consent.
Greetings,

I am a graduate student at the City University of New York, and am currently collecting people’s responses to a survey for my dissertation project. I am approaching student groups at a number of universities, and so I am writing to you because you’re listed as the contact for [University Name]’s [Student Group]. Would you be willing to forward my request for participation in my survey to your group's email list? The survey focuses on the experiences of people who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, or Transgender (LGBT) and/or identify as a sexual minority, within student organizations. People tend to find this research interesting, as it is relevant to personal social identities and social change.

The survey should take 20 to 30 minutes. Participation is voluntary, confidential, and participants can withdraw their consent and stop participating at any time without any penalty. The first page of the survey has a full informed consent form, which provides information about the research. At the end of the survey, more detailed information about the purpose of the study will be given. I am attaching the consent form for your review.

Survey link is as follows: [URL]

If you have questions about the survey first please email me: [email address]

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Justine Calcagno
Experiment 2 Questionnaire

This survey focuses on the experiences of people who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, or Transgender, and/or identify as a sexual minority. In this survey, LGBT is used as a broad term to encompass these various identities.

Do you identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, or Transgender, and/or identify as a sexual minority?
Yes
No

What is your sexual orientation? _________________________

Introduction

First, you will read a recent Press Release based on scientific research. After reading, you will answer questions about the content of the statement. You will be prompted to recall and write down key points.

Please note, it is important to the integrity of the research that you take your time, read and think carefully about the questions you are asked in this survey.

[Multicultural Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release

Social scientists agree that, overall, straight people in America have begun to approach LGBT people in ways that celebrate the diversity of the nation, by appreciating that people can identify in many different ways in terms of their sexual orientations. In fact, 77% of straight Americans say that they “Believe that the U.S. has a diversity of sexual orientations,” and 81% agree that they “Want LGBT people to feel that they belong to a nation that is diverse in terms of its citizens’ sexual orientations.” A significant portion say that they “Want LGBT people to feel that straight people support the idea that there are many different preferences for sexual orientation in the U.S.”

Regarding relations between straight and LGBT people, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that straight people definitely want to approach LGBT people in ways that emphasize that at the core of things, this one shared nation is filled with diverse possibilities for sexual orientation.” He has found that, more and more, straight people think it is important to focus on the fact that people have a variety of preferences when it comes to their sexual orientation, and that makes our nation diverse.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.

[Colorblind Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release
Social scientists agree that, overall, straight people in America have begun to approach LGBT people in ways that celebrate that, at the core, we are all similar individuals, by appreciating that all people are unique. In fact, 77% of straight Americans say that they “Believe that the U.S. is a country of individuals,” and 81% agree that they “Want LGBT people to feel that they belong to a nation of citizens.” A significant portion also say that they “Want LGBT people to feel that straight people support the idea that individuality is a key way of life in the U.S.”

Regarding relations between straight and LGBT people, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that straight people definitely want to approach LGBT people in ways that emphasize that at the core of things, all people are individuals.” He has found that, more and more, straight people think it is important to focus on the fact that we are similar people.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.

[Control Condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

**Press Release**

Social scientists agree that, overall, people believe many things about the climate, particularly that climate change is an important issue to discuss. In fact, 77% of people say that they are “Concerned about the impact that climate change might have in the future,” and 75% agree that they “Believe that issues related to climate change could be solved through government programs and interventions.” A significant portion also says that they “Want to discuss possible causes and solutions to global climate change.”

Regarding climate change, a professor of Ecology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that people believe that it is a personal responsibility to make lifestyle choices that address climate change.” He has found that, more and more, people think that climate change is a pressing issue that must be addressed at this time and in the future.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.
When it comes to inequality facing LGBT people, some LGBT people are willing to work together with straight Americans to create change, however, other LGBT people are much less willing to work with straight people to create change (want LGBT people to work independently). There are positive and negatives to each way.

Consider the press release you just read, especially the way many straight people are approaching LGBT people. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- I would work with straight people to develop sensitivity training programs for employees, regarding sexual orientation.
- I would work with straight people on a project that recruited LGBT high school students for college admissions.
- I would work with straight people to develop affirmative action programs for LGBT people.
- I would work with straight people to rally for monetary reparations to LGBT people for historical discrimination.
- I would work with straight people to create special entitlement for LGBT students.
- I would work with straight people to raise funds for qualified LGBT high school students to visit college campuses.
- I would participate in raising our collective voice with straight people for LGBT rights.
- I would do something together with straight people for LGBT rights.
- I would participate in a future demonstration with straight people for LGBT rights.
- I would participate in some form of collective action with straight people for LGBT rights.

Once more, please consider the press release you just read, especially the way many straight people are approaching LGBT people. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- I do not trust straight people to work for the benefit of LGBT rights.
- I trust straight people when they work on behalf of LGBT rights.
• If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would be suspicious of straight people.
• I trust straight people to work with LGBT people to promote equal rights.
• I do not trust that straight people will genuinely work with LGBT people to promote equal rights.
• If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would trust straight people’s intentions.
• If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would feel trust toward straight people.
• If they approached me to work together for equality, I would distrust straight people.

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | 7 |

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

• It is unlikely that LGBT people and straight people share their core values and principles.
• It is unlikely that LGBT people have shared values straight people.
• LGBT people have key principles in common with straight people.
• LGBT people and straight people have similar values.
• There may be common values between LGBT and straight people.
• LGBT people’s important principles are likely to overlap with straight people.
• LGBT people’s core values are dissimilar to those of straight people.
• LGBT people and straight people do not have shared beliefs.

Once more, please consider the press release you just read, especially the way many straight people are approaching LGBT people. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Strongly agree | 7 |

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

• Straight people value the differences between LGBT and straight people.
• Straight people want to approach LGBT people in ways that recognize that we should celebrate the diversity of our shared nation.
• Straight people want to recognize that at the core of things we are diverse groups within one nation.
• Straight people recognize the differences between LGBT and straight people.
• Straight people perceive that there are key differences between LGBT and straight people.
Once more, please consider the press release you just read, especially the way many straight people are approaching LGBT people. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- LGBT people would be better off if they worked together with straight people to promote equality.
- Straight and LGBT people must stick together and work with each other to promote equality.
- Work toward equality for LGBT rights should be done only by LGBT people, without straight people being involved.
- My preference is that LGBT people include straight people in efforts to promote equality for LGBT.
- I prefer that LGBT people involve straight people in actions for equality between our groups.
- I prefer that LGBT people work together with straight people to promote equality.
- LGBT people should work separately from straight people to promote equality.
- Straight people should not be involved in LGBT efforts to promote equality for LGBT.
- Straight and LGBT people should work together to promote equality for LGBT.

Considering the press release you just read, please answer the following questions regarding your willingness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- I would feel positive about working with straight people.
- I would feel good about working with straight people.
- I would like to work with straight people.
- I would dislike working with straight people.
- I would be interested in working with straight people.
- I would not be motivated to work with straight people.
- I would not prefer to work with straight people.
- I would be willing to work with straight people.
- I would consider working with straight people.
The following questions are about how you feel about being LGBT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- Being LGBT gives me a good feeling.
- Being LGBT is an important part of how I see myself.
- I often think about the fact that I am LGBT.
- I feel a bond with LGBT people.
- It is pleasant to be LGBT.
- I am glad to be LGBT.
- I feel solidarity with LGBT people.
- The fact that I am LGBT is an important part of my identity.
- I feel committed to being LGBT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

How do you see LGBT and straight people in the U.S.?

- I see LGBT and straight people as two separate groups.
- I see LGBT and straight people as the same one group.
- I see LGBT and straight people as two groups within one larger group.
You received this survey through a student group with which you are involved. What is the name of that student group (such as, LGBT Student Association)?

For purposes of anonymity, please do not include your University or College name.

Please answer the following set of questions in reference to the group that you just named.

What is this group’s composition in terms of its members’ sexual orientation? (Select one.)
- All LGBT
- Mostly LGBT
- A mix of LGBT and straight allies

What is this group’s composition in terms of its members’ gender? (Select one.)
- Mostly women
- Mostly men
- Mostly transgender people
- A mix of women, men, and transgender people

What is this group’s composition in terms of its members’ race/ethnicity? (Select one.)
- Mostly White
- Mostly racial minorities and people of color
- A mix of people from diverse racial/ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How involved in this group are you?

Please indicate the activities that you usually engage in through this group. You may select all that apply.
- Receive emails
- Attend meetings/events
- Coordinate meetings/events
- Work in a leadership position
- Other/additional activities: _________________

Why are you involved in this group? (Select all that apply.)
- To participate in a LGBT community
- Because of its programs and services
- To participate in advocacy for LGBT rights
- It offers a safe space for LGBT students
- It offers social support for LGBT students
- It offers mental health support for LGBT students
- It offers academic support for LGBT students

Additional comments regarding your involvement in this group: __________________________
What is the primary mission of this group? (Select one.)

- Foster an LGBT community
- Offer programs and services for LGBT students
- Foster advocacy for LGBT rights
- Provide a safe space for LGBT students
- Offer social support for LGBT students
- Offer mental health support for LGBT students
- Offer academic support for LGBT students

Additional comments regarding this group’s mission: __________________________

Please rate the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent does the student group you named above value and celebrate diversity?
To what extent does your University/College value and celebrate diversity as a whole?
Description of Research Participants

When we report the results of this study, readers will be interested in knowing what kinds of people participated in it, such as their nationality, age, and so forth. Please answer the following questions about yourself for this purpose. This information will be used to describe the variety of people in the study (for example, participant ages ranged in age from 18 to 90), not to identify anyone personally.

Your age in years?
Your sex?
• Male
• Female
• I identify as...

What is your sexual orientation?

The following questions are about the extent to which others know about your sexual orientation.

What percentage of straight/heterosexual friends know your sexual orientation?
What percentage of straight/heterosexual coworkers and peers know your sexual orientation?
What percentage of straight/heterosexual family members know your sexual orientation?

In what state do you reside? (You may choose not to respond)

Your race or ethnicity?
Do you identify as Hispanic/Latino(a)?
• Yes
• No

In what country were you born?
If you were not born in the U.S.A., how old were you when you arrived in the U.S.A?
What is your mother’s country of birth?
What is your father’s country of birth?
What is your first language?
What is your second language (if applicable)?

Which of the following best describes your family situation?
• My family has a hard time buying the things we need.
• My family has just enough money for the things we need.
• My family has no problem buying the things we need and sometimes we can also buy special things.
• My family has enough money to buy pretty much anything we want.

How far have you gone in school?
• Some high school or less
• High school graduate or GED
• Vocational college or some college
• College degree
• Professional or graduate degree
Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States. At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?

Please select the rung where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States.

____ Top
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____ Bottom

Are you now…
• Married or in a long-term or partnered relationship
• Single (Never married)
• Divorced
• Separated
• Widowed

What is your current religious affiliation?
• Catholic
• Jewish
• Muslim
• Protestant
• None
• Other (please write in) ______________________________

Which of the following best describes your current work status:
• Employed (including self employment)   Fulltime ___ or Part-time ___
• Retired
• Keeping house (not paid)
• Student
• Seeking work
• On medical leave or disability
• Other (please specify) ______________________
Experiment 2 Debriefing Form

Groups & Cooperation
Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study! Your participation is extremely important to our research.

The purpose of this study is to examine how people think and feel about working with members of other groups on important projects. We asked you to review a press release. You read one of several versions of the press release. We then examined a number of dependent variables, including your ratings of preference to work with members of the other group, and some demographic information. We expect that people’s preference to work with members of other groups might vary based on the type of press release they read.

Because this is an ongoing research project at CUNY we ask that you please do NOT discuss your experiences here today with other students at CUNY or other individuals. The quality of the research depends on participants being unaware of the study procedures and hypotheses until after their participation is complete.

If you would like to learn about the results of the study once we have them or if you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact the principal investigator, Justine Calcagno, via email at jcalcagno@ge.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Hunter College Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) Office at (212) 650-3053 or via email at hrpp@hunter.cuny.edu.
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Research Study: Groups & Cooperation

Principal Investigator: Justine Calcagno, M.A.
Graduate Student

Faculty Advisor: Tracey Revenson, Ph.D.
Professor
Hunter College
Psychology Department

Research Sponsor: N/A

You are being asked to participate in a research study because you are an undergraduate student in the Psychology Department’s research experience program.

Purpose:
The purpose of this research study is to examine how people think and feel about working alongside members of other social groups on important projects. The purpose of this study will be explained more fully after your participation is complete. The results of this study may help us to better understand how people think about and relate to other people in society and cooperate with members of other social groups.

Procedures:
If you volunteer to participate in this research study, we will ask you to do the following:
Participants will be asked to work with another student to review and develop some materials for a future study. Participants will first work separately from their partner, who is in another research room. Specifically, participants will first review research materials and answer initial survey questions. Those questions focus on working with the partner in the upcoming task as well as working alongside members of other social groups. Reviewing the materials and questions will take approximately 10 minutes. Next, participants will be brought together with their partner to work on the partner task. The task will take approximately 20 minutes. We expect 501 individuals are expected to participate in this study. All research procedures take place in the Psychology testing rooms at Hunter College or testing rooms on the 10th floor of the New Building at John Jay College. Altogether the time commitment of is expected to be approximately 30 minutes.

Time Commitment:
Your participation in this research study is expected to last for a total of 30 minutes.

Compensation/Incentives:
As a participant through the Psychology Department’s Research Experience Program you will receive 1 participation credit. If you leave the study before completion you will not be granted the 1 credit for participation.

**Potential Risks or Discomforts:**
Your participation in this study may involve reading about some topics that may make you slightly uncomfortable. We anticipate that this uncomfortable feeling, however, will be short-lived. To minimize these risks we will provide you the contact information of the researchers, so you may contact the researchers to discuss any uncomfortable feelings that you might have.

**Potential Benefits:**
You will not directly benefit from your participation in this research study. Your participation is important as the study may increase general knowledge of attitudes toward working together with different people and groups. You will learn more about how psychological research is conducted.

**Alternatives to Participation:**
None applicable.

**Costs:** N/A

**Payment for Participation:**
You will not receive any payment for participating in this research study.

**Research Related Injury:** N/A

**Confidentiality:**
We will make our best efforts to maintain confidentiality of any information that is collected during this research study, and that can identify you. We will disclose this information only with your permission or as required by law.

We will protect your confidentiality with the following steps: The consent forms will be stored separately from the surveys and no ID numbers or other identifying information will be kept with or attached to the consent forms. No identifying information will be written on the survey, and surveys will be stored separately from the consent forms. All written materials will be kept in a locked room.

The research team, authorized CUNY staff and government agencies that oversee this type of research may have access to research data and records in order to monitor the research. Research records provided to authorized, non-CUNY individuals will not contain identifiable information about you. Publications and/or presentations that result from this study will not identify you by name.

**Participants’ Rights:**
- Your participation in this research study is entirely voluntary. If you decide not to participate, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
- You can decide to withdraw your consent and stop participating in the research at any time, without any penalty. Withdrawal from the study will not impact your standing in the department, college or University.

**Questions, Comments or Concerns:**
If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to one of the following researchers:
Justine Calcagno, MA
jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or you have comments or concerns that you would like to discuss with someone other than the researchers, please call the CUNY Research Compliance Administrator at 646-664-8918. Alternatively, you can write to:

CUNY Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
Attn: Research Compliance Administrator
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

**Signature of Participant:**
If you agree to participate in this research study, please sign and date below. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

_____________________________________________________
Printed Name of Participant

___________________________________
Signature of Participant

__________________________
Date

**Signature of Individual Obtaining Consent**

_____________________________________________________
Printed Name of Individual Obtaining Consent

___________________________________
Signature of Individual Obtaining Consent

__________________________
Date
Experiment 3 Questionnaire

Introduction to the Survey

First, you will read a recent Press Release based on scientific research. After reading, you will answer questions about the content of the statement. You will be prompted to recall and write down key points.

Please note, it is important to the integrity of the research that you take your time, read and think carefully about the questions you are asked in this survey.

[Multicultural condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release

Social scientists agree that, overall, White Americans have begun to approach Latinos in ways that celebrate the diversity of the nation, by appreciating that we are all different races and ethnicities within one nation. In fact, 77% of White Americans say that they “Believe that the U.S. has diverse cultural backgrounds,” and 81% agree that they “Want Latinos to feel that Latinos belong to one nation that is also racially and ethnically diverse.” A significant portion say that they “Want Latinos to feel that Whites support the idea that there are many different ways of life.”

Regarding relations between Whites and Latinos, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that Whites definitely want to approach Latinos in ways that emphasize that at the core of things this one shared nation is filled with diverse racial groups.” He has found that more and more, White Americans think it is important to focus on the fact that there are many different racial and ethnic groups, and that makes our nation diverse.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.

[Colorblind condition]
Please read the following Press Release.

Press Release

Social scientists agree that, overall, White Americans have begun to approach Latinos in ways that celebrate that, at the core, we are all similar individuals, by appreciating that all people are unique. In fact, 77% of White Americans say that they “Believe that we are individuals who share a similar cultural background,” and 81% agree that they “Want Latinos to feel that they belong to a nation of individuals.” A significant portion also say that they “Want Latinos to feel that they believe individuality is a key way of life in the U.S.”

Regarding relations between Whites and Latinos, a professor of Psychology, who is a specialist on the topic, said in an interview, “My research shows that Whites definitely want to approach Latinos in ways that emphasize that at the core of things, all people are individuals.” He has found that, more and more, White Americans think it is important to focus on the fact that we are similar people.

Please list up to five (5) main points from this report.
When it comes to inequality facing Latinos, some Latinos are willing to work together with White Americans to create change, however, other Latinos are much less willing to work with White Americans to create change (want Latinos to work independently). There are positive and negatives to each way.

Consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- I would work with Whites to develop sensitivity training programs for employees.
- I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial/ethnic minority high school students for college admissions.
- I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for racial/ethnic minorities.
- I would work with Whites to rally for monetary reparations to racial/ethnic minority group members for historical discrimination.
- I would work with Whites create special entitlement for racial/ethnic minority students.
- I would work with Whites to set up special programs to make sure that racial/ethnic minorities are given equal opportunities in employment and education.
- I would work with Whites to raise funds for qualified racial/ethnic minority high school students to visit college campuses.

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

How do you feel about working with Whites for racial/ethnic equality?

- I would participate in raising our collective voice with Whites.
- I would do something together with Whites.
- I would participate in a future demonstration with Whites.
- I would participate in some form of collective action with Whites.
Once more, please consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- I do not trust Whites to work for the benefit of racial/ethnic minorities’ rights.
- I trust Whites when they work on behalf of racial/ethnic minorities’ rights.
- If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would be suspicious of Whites.
- I trust Whites to work with racial/ethnic minorities to promote equal rights.
- I do not trust that Whites will genuinely work with racial/ethnic minorities to promote equal rights.
- If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would trust Whites’ intentions.
- If they approached me to work with them for equality, I would feel trust toward Whites.
- If they approached me to work together for equality, I would distrust Whites.

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- It is unlikely that Latinos and Whites share their core values and principles.
- It is unlikely that Latinos have shared values with Whites.
- Latinos have key principles in common with Whites.
- Latinos and Whites have similar values.
- There may be common values between Latinos and Whites.
- Latinos’ important principles are likely to overlap with Whites.
- Latinos’ core values are dissimilar to those of Whites.
- Latinos and Whites do not have shared beliefs.
Once more, please consider the press release you just read, especially the way many Whites are approaching Latinos. Please answer the following questions with that in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- Whites value the differences between Latinos and Whites.
- Whites want to approach Latinos in ways that recognize that we should celebrate the racial/ethnic diversity of our shared nation.
- Whites want to recognize that at the core of things we are diverse racial/ethnic groups within one nation.
- Whites recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.
- Whites perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality.
- Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to racial/ethnic racial equality.
- Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved.
- My preference is that Latinos include Whites in efforts to promote racial/ethnic equality.
- I prefer that Latinos involve Whites in actions for equality between our groups.
- I prefer that Latinos work together with Whites to promote equality.
- Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality.
- Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial/ethnic equality.
- Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial/ethnic equality.
Considering the press release you just read, please answer the following questions regarding your willingness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- I would feel positive about working with Whites.
- I would feel good about working with Whites.
- I would like to work with Whites.
- I would dislike working with Whites.
- I would be interested in working with Whites.
- I would not be motivated to work with Whites.
- I would not prefer to work with Whites.
- I would be willing to work with Whites.
- I would consider working with Whites.
In the next part of the study, you will work on a task with your partner.

Before that task begins, we are interested about your initial thoughts and feelings about your partner based on the information you have been given.

What was the gender your partner wrote down? _________________________

What was the race/ethnicity your partner wrote down? _________________________

Please think about how you feel about interacting with your partner today, based on the information you have been given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- I am interested in working with my partner.
- I feel good about working with my partner.
- I feel positive about working with my partner.
- I feel negative about working with my partner.
- I think I will dislike working with my partner.
- I am not looking forward to working with my partner.
- I think I will like working with my partner.
- I am not motivated to work with my partner.

Once more, please think about how you feel about interacting with your partner today, based on the information you have been given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- I distrust that my partner will be helpful when we work together.
- I trust that my partner will work hard on this task.
- I trust my partner to work as equals with me on this task.
- I do not trust that my partner will be genuinely engaged during the task today.
- I am suspicious at my partner will not be cooperative today.
- I trust that my partner will not take over the task today.
- I will be suspicious of my partner’s intentions when we work together today.
- I trust my partner to contribute when we work together today.
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- My partner and I will not have important principles in common.
- I will have common values with my partner.
- My partner and I may have similar values.
- My core values will be dissimilar from those of my partner.
- There may be common values between me and my partner.
- I will not share important values with my partner.
- It is unlikely that my partner and I share core values.
- The important beliefs I hold will be in common with my partner.

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- My partner is likely to recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.
- My partner will want to recognize that at the core of things we are members of diverse racial/ethnic groups within one nation.
- My partner will want to approach me in ways that recognize that we should celebrate the racial/ethnic diversity of our shared nation.
- My partner and is likely to perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.
- It is likely that my partner values the difference between Latinos and Whites.
Description of Research Participants

When we report the results of this study, readers will be interested in knowing what kinds of people participated in it, such as their nationality, age, and so forth. Please answer the following questions about yourself for this purpose. This information will be used to describe the variety of people in the study (for example, participant ages ranged in age from 18 to 90), not to identify anyone personally.

The following questions are about how you feel about being Latino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

- Being Latino gives me a good feeling.
- Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.
- I often think about the fact that I am Latino.
- I feel a bond with Latinos.
- It is pleasant to be Latino.
- I am glad to be Latino.
- I feel solidarity with Latinos.
- The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity.
- I feel committed to being Latino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Enter your rating in the space to the left of each question.

How do you see Latinos and Whites in the U.S.?

- I see Latinos and Whites as *two separate groups*.
- I see Latinos and Whites as the *same one group*.
- I see Latinos and Whites as *two groups within one larger group*. 
How often do you interact with White students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In your opinion, to what extent does the College value and celebrate diversity overall?

How many of your close friends are White? Please give a rough estimate. _______

Your age in years? ___________

Your sex?
_____ Male
_____ Female
_____ Other: ___________________

In what state do you reside? ________________________

Your race or ethnicity? ________________________________

Do you identify as Hispanic/Latino(a)?
_____ Yes
_____ No

In what country were you born? _________________________________

If you were not born in the U.S.A., how old were you when you arrived in the U.S.A? ___________

What is your mother’s country of birth? ___________________________

What is your father’s country of birth? ___________________________

What is your first language? _________________________________

What is your second language (if applicable)? ______________________

Which of the following best describes your family situation?
_____ My family has a hard time buying the things we need.
_____ My family has just enough money for the things we need.
_____ My family has no problem buying the things we need and sometimes we can also buy special things.
My family has enough money to buy pretty much anything we want.

How far have you gone in school?
____ Some high school or less
____ High school graduate or GED
____ Vocational college or some college
____ College degree
____ Professional or graduate degree

Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in the United States. At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off – who have the least money, least education and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this ladder?
Please place a large “X” on the rung where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States.

____ Top
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____ Bottom

In terms of sexual orientation, are you:
____ Bisexual
____ Gay
____ Lesbian
____ Pansexual
____ Straight or heterosexual
____ Something else (please specify): ______________________
____ Prefer not to respond

Are you now…
____ Married or in a long-term or partnered relationship
____ Not married
   a. If you circled “Not married” which bests describes your current status?
      ____ Single (Never married)
      ____ Divorced
      ____ Separated
      ____ Widowed

What is your current religious affiliation?
____ Catholic
____ Jewish
___ Muslim
___ Protestant
___ None
___ Other (please write in) ______________________________

Which of the following best describes your current work status:
___ Employed (including self employment)     Fulltime ___ or Part-time ___
___ Retired
___ Keeping house (not paid)
___ Student
___ Seeking work
___ On medical leave or disability
___ Other (please specify) _______________________
Experiment 3 Debriefing Form

Groups & Cooperation
Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study! Your participation is extremely important to our research.

The purpose of this study is to examine how people think and feel about working with members of other groups on important projects. You were led to believe you would be interacting with another individual, who was a member of another social group, later in the study. This interaction partner is fictitious. You were led to believe that you would be interacting with another individual so as to create a relatively realistic social interaction situation. We did this because we are specifically interested in how people think and feel in social interaction settings. We then asked you to read a press release and we also examined a number of dependent variables, including your ratings of preference to work with members of the other group, and some demographic information. We expect that people’s preference to work with members of other groups might vary based on the type of press release they read.

Because this is an ongoing research project at CUNY we ask that you please do NOT discuss your experiences here today with other students at CUNY or other individuals. The quality of the research depends on participants being unaware of the study procedures and hypotheses until after their participation is complete.

If you would like to learn about the results of the study once we have them or if you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact the principal investigator, Justine Calcagno, via email at jcalcagno@gc.cuny.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Hunter College Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) Office at (212) 650-3053 or via email at hrpp@hunter.cuny.edu.
## Appendix B

### Factor Analyses

Table B1

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Support for Political Solidarity Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>18.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial equality.</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to promote racial equality.</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites promote racial equality.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial equality. (r)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved. (r)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial equality. (r)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 74.41% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
Table B2

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Willingness to Work with the High Status Group Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.84</td>
<td>19.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would consider working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested in working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel good about working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel positive about working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not prefer to work with Whites. (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not be motivated to work with Whites. (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would dislike working with Whites. (r)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 79.73% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
**Table B3**

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Level of Group Identification Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>66.74</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the fact that I am Latino.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad to be Latino.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is pleasant to be Latino.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Latino gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a bond with Latinos.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel solidarity with Latinos.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to being Latino.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 78.24% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
Table B4

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Willingness to Work on Programs Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people to set up special programs to make</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure that LGBT people are given equal opportunities in employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people on a project that recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT high school students for college admissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people to develop sensitivity training</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs for employees, regarding sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people to raise funds for qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT high school students to visit college campuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people to rally for monetary reparations</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to LGBT people for historical discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people create special entitlement for</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with straight people to develop affirmative action</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs for LGBT people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 69.11% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
Table B5

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Common Values Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that LGBT people and straight people share their core values and principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>50.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that LGBT people have shared values straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>15.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people have key principles in common with straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people and straight people have similar values.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be common values between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people's important principles are likely to overlap with straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people's core values are dissimilar to those of straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT people and straight people do not have shared beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight people value the differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight people recognize the differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight people perceive that there are key differences between LGBT and straight people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 65.72% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.

*Superscript indicates the items that were excluded from the final scale.*
Table B6

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Level of Group Identification Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>15.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that I am LGBT is an important part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being LGBT is an important part of how I see myself.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a bond with LGBT people.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the fact that I am LGBT.</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel solidarity with LGBT people.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is pleasant to be LGBT.</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad to be LGBT.</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being LGBT gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to being LGBT.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 65.78% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
Table B7

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Willingness to Work on Programs Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>62.79</td>
<td>14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites on a project that recruited racial/ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority high school students for college admissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites to develop sensitivity training programs</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites to set up special programs to make sure</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that racial/ethnic minorities are given equal opportunities in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment and education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites to develop affirmative action programs for</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racial/ethnic minorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites create special entitlement for racial/ethnic</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites to rally for monetary reparations to</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racial/ethnic minority group members for historical discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would work with Whites to raise funds for qualified racial/ethnic</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority high school students to visit college campuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 77.33% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
### Table B8

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Support for Political Solidarity Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My preference is that Latinos include Whites in efforts to promote equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer that Latinos involve Whites in actions for equality between our groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer that Latinos work together with Whites to promote equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites and Latinos should work together to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites and Latinos must stick together and work with each other to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos would be better off if they worked together with Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos should work separately from Whites to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites should not be involved in Latinos' efforts to promote racial/ethnic equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work toward equality for Latinos should be done only by Latinos, without Whites being involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 69.12% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
Table B9

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Willingness to Work with the High Status Group Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel good about working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested in working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.73</strong></td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel positive about working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.73</strong></td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.66</strong></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not be motivated to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td><strong>0.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not prefer to work with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td><strong>0.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would dislike working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would consider working with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td><strong>-0.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 69.72% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.
### Table B10

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Common Values Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor % of Variance Explained</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that Latinos have shared values with Whites.</td>
<td>43.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that Latinos and Whites share their core values and principles.</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be common values between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos and Whites have similar values.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos and Whites do not have shared beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos have key principles in common with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos’ core values are dissimilar to those of Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos’ important principles are likely to overlap with Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites value the differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 61.81% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.

*aSuperscript indicates the items that were excluded from the final scale.*
Table B11

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Trust in the Partner Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>51.98</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that my partner will work hard on this task.</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my partner to contribute when we work together today.</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my partner to work as equals with me on this task.</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I distrust that my partner will be helpful when we work together.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not trust that my partner will be genuinely engaged during the task today.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be suspicious of my partner’s intentions when we work together today.</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am suspicious at my partner will not be cooperative today.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that my partner will not take over the task today.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 78.48% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.

Superscript indicates the items that were excluded from the final scale.
Table B12

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Common Values with the Partner Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I may have similar values.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have common values with my partner.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be common values between me and my partner.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I will not have important principles in common.</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The important beliefs I hold will be in common with my partner.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that my partner and I share core values.</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner is likely to recognize the differences between Latinos and Whites.*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that my partner values the difference between Latinos and Whites.*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and is likely to perceive that there are key differences between Latinos and Whites.*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td><strong>0.71</strong></td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My core values will be dissimilar from those of my partner.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td><strong>0.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not share important values with my partner.</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 70.20% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.

*a* Superscript indicates the items that were excluded from the final scale.
Table B13

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Level of Group Identification Items with Oblique Rotation in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad to be Latino.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is pleasant to be Latino.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Latino gives me a good feeling.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Latino is an important part of how I see myself.¹</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that I am Latino is an important part of my identity.²</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the fact that I am Latino.²</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a bond with Latinos.²</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel solidarity with Latinos.²</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to being Latino.²</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 63.27% of variance explained. All item loadings in table are bolded for the factor they are on.

¹Superscript indicates the items that were excluded from the final scale.
### Appendix C

**Results of Non-Significant Analyses**

Table C1

*Standardized Regression Coefficients from the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses with Non-Significant Results in Experiment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</th>
<th>Support for Political Solidarity</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable (D₂)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ <em>R</em>²</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Multicultural condition was coded (0) and the comparison condition coded (1) for each dummy variable (D1 and D2). No regression analyses were statistically significant at *p* < .05.
### Table C2

*Standardized Regression Coefficients from the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses with Non-Significant Results in Experiment 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage in Collective Action</th>
<th>Support for Political Solidarity</th>
<th>Willingness to Work with the High Status Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/non-binary variable</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/non-binary variable</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Control variable (D₂)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ (R^2)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Multicultural condition was coded (0) and the comparison condition coded (1) for each dummy variable (D1 and D2).

*\(p < .05\). **\(p < .01\).*
### Table C3

*Standardized Regression Coefficients from the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses with Non-Significant Results in Experiment 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage to Work on Programs</th>
<th>Support for Political Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Colorblind variable (D₁)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Group Identification</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ x Level of Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ <em>R</em>²</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The Multicultural condition was coded (1) and the Colorblind condition was coded (0) for the condition dummy coded variable (D₁). No regression analyses were statistically significant at *p* < .05.
Notes

During data collection, 30 foreign-born individuals completed the survey. Per inclusion criteria, these people were not included in this report.
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