CHAPTER 19

NEW FRONTIERS IN DIVERSITY RESEARCH: CONCEPTIONS OF DIVERSITY AND THEIR THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Victoria C. Plaut, Sapna Cheryan, and Flannery G. Stevens

Social psychology has long held an interest in psychological processes related to the functioning of diverse groups. That interest is now more relevant than ever as populations become increasingly diverse on a number of dimensions, including race and ethnicity. Many liberal democracies are currently struggling with how to manage a diverse society, and similar questions have surfaced in workplace and educational environments. How individuals and the institutions they constitute conceive of diversity has important implications for prejudice and intergroup relations. We argue that these conceptions—in particular what diversity is, with whom diversity is associated, what do to with diversity, and what consequences diversity can have—can be motivated by self- and group-based concerns and are essential to understanding contemporary intergroup processes.

A new frontier of diversity-related research sheds light on conceptions of diversity and their theoretical and practical implications. We examine this work in five sections. In the first section, we focus on conceptions of what diversity is. Here our review of the literature suggests that the term's slipperiness and ambiguity make it particularly susceptible to manipulation, especially when individuals are motivated to do so. In the second section, we highlight who is associated with diversity and potential consequences of these associations, again suggesting the ease of shifting representations. In the third section, we review literature on conceptions of what to do with diversity. Here, we focus on common approaches to diversity, including multiculturalism and color-blindness, and again examine evidence for motivated cognition. Our fourth section highlights perceptions of the consequences of addressing diversity, such as perceptions of discrimination, which often depend on individuals' vantage points. Our fifth and final section examines applications and solutions in law, organizations, and education.

WHAT IS DIVERSITY?

Part of diversity's challenge lies in its definition. What does diversity mean? As depicted in Table 19.1, a wide variety of definitions of diversity exist. They range from citing individual attributes (e.g., personality) to group identity (e.g., race/ethnicity); from a state or condition (e.g., composition) to a process (e.g., a political act, inclusion) to a value or an integral part of organizational identity; and from somewhat specific (e.g., country of origin) to vague (e.g., experiences, backgrounds). The term's complexity, internal contradictions, nebulousness, and slipperiness make it susceptible not only to debate but also to manipulation. In this section, we briefly review the historical background of diversity in the U.S. context and literature on conceptions of diversity. We also explore the motivated aspect of conceptions of diversity, though we recognize that these conceptions can also exist independent of motivation. Where possible, we draw out similarities and distinctions between minority and majority perspectives on diversity.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14341-019
APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology: Vol. 1. Attitudes and Social Cognition, M. Mikulincer and P. R. Shaver (Editors-in-Chief)

TABLE 19.1

Definitions of *Diversity*

Source or organization	Definitions of *Diversity* or objectives of diversity plan
Merriam-Webster	"The condition of having or being composed of differing variety; *especially*: the inclusion of different types of people (as people of different races or cultures) in a group or organization."
Wikipedia	"Cultural diversity, The respect of difference cultures and interculturality." "Diversity (business), The business tactic which encourages diversity to better serve a heterogeneous customer base." "Diversity (politics), The political and social policy of encouraging tolerance for people of different backgrounds."
Association of American Colleges and Universities	"Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations)."
U.S. Army	"The Army defines diversity as the different attributes, experiences, and backgrounds of our Soldiers, Civilians and Family Members that further enhance our global capabilities and contribute to an adaptive, culturally astute Army."
U.S. Office of Personnel Management	"We define diversity broadly, including, but not limited to, the legally protected categories. Diversity encompasses all that makes us unique, including the diversity of thought and perspective that accompanies our identity. Only then can we realize the full performance potential and harness the innovation that diversity offers. This is more than a legal or moral imperative, it is a business imperative for public service."
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	"Diversity is about who we are as individuals, both differences and similarities. The Corporation recognizes that its strength comes from the dedication, experience, and diversity of its employees and believes that, given the opportunity, each employee can make a difference. The [Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] is committed to promoting and supporting an inclusive environment that provides to all employees, individually and collectively, the chance to work to their full potential in the pursuit of the Corporation's mission."
Hewlett-Packard	"Diversity is the existence of many unique individuals in the workplace, marketplace and community. This includes men and women from different nations, cultures, ethnic groups, generations, backgrounds, skills, abilities and all the other unique differences that make each of us who we are."
IBM	"Diversity in IBM means welcoming all people to the workplace regardless of factors unrelated to job performance. IBM's definition of diversity includes all human characteristics that make us unique as individuals. It includes everyone and excludes no one. Race, gender, geographic origin, culture, lifestyle, age, disability, sexual orientation, economic status, marital status, and religion are just some of the characteristics that define us as people. Our needs are also characteristics that define us as people, for example, the need to take care of our children or aging parents."
Target	"At Target, diversity is much more than a goal or campaign. It's a core value we integrate into every area of our business—from our suppliers, to our teams, to the shopping experience in our stores. We foster an inclusive culture that allows our high-performing and diverse team to drive innovation."
Coca-Cola	"Diversity is at the heart of our business. We strive to create a work environment that provides all our associates equal access to information, development and opportunity. By building an inclusive workplace environment, we seek to leverage our global team of associates, which is rich in diverse people, talent and ideas. We see diversity as more than just policies and practices. It is an integral part of who we are as a company, how we operate and how we see our future."

Historical Background

In 1978, Supreme Court Justice Powell authored an opinion in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* that would have far-reaching consequences for understandings of diversity. *Bakke* held that race could be used as one factor of many in university admissions to obtain "the educational benefits that flow from an ethnically diverse student body" (p. 306). The *Bakke* decision may have led to more diversity in higher education than if the use of race had been found unconstitutional. However, several aspects of Powell's opinion foreshadowed—and perhaps helped set the stage for—the complexity and problematic nature of conceptualizations of diversity today. First, race was equated with viewpoint. Powell suggested that "a black student can usually bring something that a white person cannot offer" (p. 316), though he did not address the reason that race influenced viewpoint. So diversity was cast as simply bringing something different to enhance "the robust exchange of ideas" (pp. 312–313). Second, and relatedly, diversity was portrayed as a characteristic of the individual (like being a talented musician) that might not even have anything to do with race. This shifted race (and diversity) from a group or community construct to an individual construct. Third, among the objectives Powell dismissed was the need to remedy past societal discrimination against certain groups. In other words, diversity was decoupled from the concept of inequality.

Finally, *Bakke* recast the United States as a nation of minorities, in which each group—including advantaged groups—has had to struggle to "overcome the prejudices . . . of a 'majority' composed of various minority groups" (p. 292). According to Powell, "Not all of these groups can receive preferential treatment and corresponding judicial tolerance of distinctions drawn in terms of race and nationality, for then the only 'majority' left would be a new minority of white Anglo–Saxon Protestants" (pp. 295–296). In other words, in one discursive move, Powell transformed the meaning of race into ethnicity, suggested that every group is equally disadvantaged, and turned the White majority into the vulnerable group (a theme to which we turn again in the Perceived Consequences of Diversity section). All four of these themes appear in the research we review on individuals' conceptions of diversity.

Another critical historical moment for the proliferation of meanings of diversity was the publication of the Hudson Institute's *Workforce 2000* report (Johnston & Packer, 1987), which projected a massive demographic shift such that women and minorities would make up 85% of the workforce by 2000. Though the perception of these changes had no doubt already been occurring as a result of, for example, increases in immigration, organizational scholars responded almost instantly. By 1988, references to diversity began to appear in management textbooks (see Edelman, Fuller, & Mara-Drita, 2001), and the field of diversity in organizations was born (Ragins & Gonzalez, 2003), coupled with a gradual and then steep increase in articles about diversity in psychology (see Plaut, 2010a). Organizations also showed a pronounced shift in their attention to what they conceptualized as diversity. By the late 1990s, 70% of Fortune 500 companies had diversity initiatives (see Ragins & Gonzalez, 2003), and 90% of large organizations reported having diversity practices by 2010 (Society for Human Resource Management, 2010). As suggested by Table 19.1, today the concept of diversity enjoys widespread use not only in the corporate world, but also in government agencies, the military, and colleges and universities. However, as we describe, this proliferation has been accompanied by a conceptual ambiguity that has left the definition of diversity subject to manipulation.

Conceptions of Diversity

How do individuals and institutions think about diversity? Several studies have illuminated common conceptions of diversity in contemporary U.S. society. In one study of White college students' conceptions of diversity (Banks, 2009), 61.6% associated diversity with race, 24.5% with ethnicity, and 41.1% with culture (coding was not mutually exclusive). Yet, reflecting the nebulousness of the diversity construct, 47% identified something beyond race, culture, or ethnicity, and of these many simply identified "differences" or "backgrounds." More than 40% referred to groups interacting, but it does not appear that this theme included the concept of diversity as addressing segregation or group inequality, an absence that was also noted in other work on the

dissociation of diversity from issues of power (e.g., Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Additionally, a significant number of students (33.1%), reflecting Powell's nation of minorities, referred to the presence of diversity among Whites. For example, one student stated, "There are many different kinds of Whites, that is, Polish, Greek, Italian, and so forth. I think more people have to recognize that" (Banks, 2009, p. 153).

Bell and Hartmann (2007) reported on a nationally representative survey of adults and on interviews conducted in four U.S. cities in different regions in which a racially diverse set of respondents were asked questions such as "What does diversity mean to you?" Although many respondents offered positive or upbeat responses (e.g., "adds beauty to life," "interesting," and "exciting"), when pressed to explain or offer examples they stuck to generic platitudes. One response Bell and Hartmann profiled perfectly echoes Powell's conception of viewpoint diversity: "a positive value for the community at large in ensuring that one's exposed to different experiences, different viewpoints, and different backgrounds" (2007, p. 899). Similarly, others pinned diversity to cultural consumption in explaining the benefits of diversity: how non-Whites (deemed to be exotic or different) benefit Whites (deemed to be the neutral standard) by offering variety or expanded choice (e.g., food, music). Notably, respondents often conditioned their positive responses, finding it easier to discuss the challenges and difficulties of diversity. Many, however, were unable to talk about problems such as inequality with respect to diversity. Moreover, although most respondents used general, seemingly race-neutral definitions of diversity, a large number also suggested that other Americans use diversity to talk about race (e.g., "It's all about race for most folks").

The Bell and Hartmann (2007) study also offered some insights into differences in minority and majority respondents' conceptions of diversity. Notably, in contrast to White respondents, racial minority respondents were more likely to see diversity as a moral or civic responsibility than as a demographic fact. When responding to a question about the drawbacks of diversity, Whites were primarily preoccupied with disunity and misunderstanding, whereas African Americans and Latinos expressed concerns about inequality and intolerance.

This perspective on diversity as inequality resonates with the arguments of sociologists and scholars of organizations who have been critical of the trajectory of diversity as a concept in organizations and society. For example, some have argued that through diversity, organizations and organizational scholars have shifted their attention away from equal opportunity and the work climate experienced by historically disadvantaged groups (Edelman et al., 2001; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998). In one study, Edelman et al. (2001) analyzed the evolution of the conception of diversity in the management literature. Tracing diversity rhetoric in this literature to the mid-1980s, Edelman et al. showed not only the rise of a managerial conception of diversity, but also that this conception added non–legally protected dimensions (e.g., geography, attitudes, communication style) that dissociated diversity from civil rights. This dissociation also appears in the definitions of diversity offered by major U.S. companies (see Table 19.1). As with the studies on individuals' conceptions of diversity, therefore, a picture emerges of a general and slippery concept that has been defined in many different ways and that has diverted attention away from group power relations (Bell & Hartmann, 2007; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Ragins & Gonzalez, 2003).

Motivated Conceptions of Diversity

Consistent with research on motivated cognition (Kunda, 1990), research has also suggested that what diversity is shifts with individuals' motivations. In one set of studies, Unzueta, Knowles, and Ho (2012) examined how motivation to maintain the racial hierarchy (social dominance orientation) could shift construals of diversity. In particular, they hypothesized that people with anti-egalitarian motives would adopt a broad, nonracial conception of diversity (e.g., diversity as different occupations such as accountants and engineers) as evidence of diversity in an organization. Indeed, they found that when an organization was racially homogeneous, anti-egalitarians broadened their conception of diversity to include occupational diversity in a manner that allowed them to legitimize their opposition to affirmative action. However, when the organization was racially heterogeneous, anti-egalitarians restricted their conception

of diversity to the domain of race. In contrast, egalitarian individuals showed the opposite pattern: They did not include occupational diversity in their conception of diversity when racial heterogeneity was low, but they did include it when the organization was already racially heterogeneous. Thus, egalitarians also altered their conception of diversity—in a way that legitimized support for diversity policies such as affirmative action.

In another set of studies, Unzueta and Binning (2012) examined conceptions of diversity as numerical representation (i.e., representation of traditionally underrepresented minorities in the organization) and hierarchical representation (i.e., representation at certain levels of the organization). In particular, they wanted to know whether concern about protecting the in-group would motivate individuals to adopt a different view of organizational diversity. For majority-group members (i.e., Whites) with a strong motivation to protect the in-group (operationalized as racial identity centrality), an organization appeared diverse if it had either numerical or hierarchical representation.[1] For African Americans with strong racial identity centrality, however, an organization only appeared diverse if it had both numerical and hierarchical representation. These two sets of studies demonstrated that the definition of diversity can be manipulated depending on one's motivations. Individuals perceived diversity in dramatically different ways depending on their motivations to maintain the hierarchy or protect the in-group. Moreover, racial minorities—particularly those who identified with their racial groups—adopted different conceptions of diversity than racial majority group members.

WHO IS ASSOCIATED WITH DIVERSITY

Just as conceptions of diversity can shift, so too can conceptions of whom the term *diversity* includes or excludes. In this section, we review research on which groups are typically associated with diversity, the invisibility that can result from common conceptions of diversity, the ways that multiracial selves challenge conceptions of diversity, and the role of intersectional identities in diversity.

Diversity = Minority?

As we have described, diversity often gets cast as a general concept but is often experienced through the lens of race (Banks, 2009; Bell & Hartmann, 2007). Research has suggested that diversity often gets defined as relating to racial minorities and not to majority groups (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008; Unzueta & Binning, 2010). In one study, researchers asked students, "When you think about the concept of 'diversity,' to what extent do you think about the following groups?" (Unzueta & Binning, 2010, p. 444), after which they listed the groups Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Latinos. Consistent with the expectation that racial minorities—but not Whites—are seen as being diverse, White, Black, Latino, and Asian respondents associated Whites less with diversity than they did the three racial minority groups. In addition, Whites, Blacks, and Latinos saw Asians as less associated with diversity than Blacks and Latinos. Interestingly, each racial minority group saw diversity as more relevant to their group than to other racial minority out-groups. As noted by the researchers, these tendencies could affect perceptions of whether a setting is diverse, for example in evaluating the attractiveness of a potential employer by racial minority employees (see also Avery, 2003).

Majority group members' perceptions of diversity often hinge on perceptions of inclusion or exclusion of their own group. For example, Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, and Sanchez-Burks (2011) found that Whites associated diversity (multiculturalism) with exclusion and were less likely to associate

[1]The equation of racial identity centrality (possessing a strong link between the self and the racial in-group) with a motivation to protect the in-group is consistent with theorizing by other identity scholars. According to Leach et al. (2008), the more central the in-group, the more an individual will defend the in-group against threat. It also builds on Lowery, Unzueta, Knowles, and Goff's (2006) finding that racial identity centrality moderates Whites' responses to different framings of affirmative action. When framed as a loss for Whites—but not when framed as a gain for Blacks or as not affecting Whites—racial identification was associated with less support for the policy. The findings, according to these authors, "cannot be entirely explained by group-neutral motives" (p. 970). Other research has also found racial identity centrality to be related to attitudes consistent with a desire to protect the in-group (see Unzueta & Binning, 2012). Of course, in the absence of further data, we can only make a strong inference that such effects are tied to an in-group protection motive.

multiculturalism with the self than racial minorities and were also slower to do so. Echoing the research on motivated conceptions of diversity described earlier, Whites high in racial identification feel particularly threatened by multiculturalism (Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010). Morrison and Chung (2011) found that Whites supported diversity less and felt less close to ethnic minorities when referred to as White than when referred to as European American. To be clear, this research does not suggest that a nation-of-minorities approach to diversity should be adopted, that diversity should ignore inequality, or that there should be no special place for historically excluded groups in conceptions of diversity. Rather, it turns the lens on how conceptions of diversity affect majority group members' responses to diversity, a topic we return to in the What to Do With Diversity section.

Invisibility and Shifting Inclusion

As a result of a lack of a single definition of diversity, and of racial diversity in particular, some categories and groups that could and should be included in discussions of diversity are often overlooked or ignored. For example, because the dominant images of American Indians that circulate in society often characterize them as fictional or historical characters (e.g., Pocahontas, Chief Illiniwek), American Indians are often rendered invisible and excluded from discussions of diversity (Fryberg, Markus, Oyserman, & Stone, 2008). Depending on the domain under consideration, other racial groups can be either included or excluded from diversity-related efforts. In displays of cultural diversity in the United States (e.g., food, language, traditions), Asian cultures are often prominently represented, in part because of perceptions that these cultural traditions are exotic and unique (Prasso, 2005; Said, 1978). However, when defining diversity in the context of educational outcomes, Asian Americans are often seen as no longer contributing to diversity because of their "overrepresentation" (J. Johnson & Oliver, 1994)—a term that is reserved primarily for Asian Americans and is rarely applied to Whites when they, too, are represented at higher proportions than would be expected from the general population. More broadly, when thinking about diversity, racial and to some extent gender diversity are often most prominent, and other important categories can be rendered secondary, such as socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion, and disability (Banks, 2009). Who is considered diverse can thus shift depending on the groups and contexts under consideration.

Even with a specific focus on the prominent category of race, there is tremendous variation within racial categories, a reality that is often neglected. One source of variation arises from differences in the extent to which individuals identify with their racial group. For example, Lee (2008) reported that in the 2006 Latino National Survey, whereas 62.6% identified strongly as Latino, this number decreased to 38.3% when the option to identify with a national origin (e.g., Cuban) was also presented (see also Lien, Conway, & Wong, 2003, for a similar finding among Asian Americans). Differences in identification have implications for how much discrimination minorities face. For instance, African Americans who are highly identified with their racial group report and face more discrimination than those who are less identified (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). A second source of variation within racial categories emerges when one considers that these groups include a range of ethnic groups, each with their own historical and economic circumstances. Although 12.6% of Asian Americans lived under the poverty line in 2000, disparities between groups are large (from 6.3% of Filipinos to 37.8% of Hmong; Reeves & Bennett, 2004). Similarly, those of Taiwanese descent have a 74% college degree rate and those of Indian descent, a 71% rate, whereas Laotians, Cambodians, and Hmong have college degree rates of 14% or lower (Ogunwole, Drewery, Malcolm, & Rios-Vargas, 2012). Broader racial categories such as Latino and Asian American exist in large part because of political and social circumstances (Espiritu, 1992), yet these categories can also make it difficult to observe or remember the great variability that exists within racial categories.

Multiracial Selves

Adding further nuance to the discussion of diversity has been the dramatic increase in the number of multiracial individuals, or individuals who can

claim membership in multiple racial groups. According to the Pew Research Center (2010), marriages between spouses of different races or ethnicities made up approximately 15% of all new marriages in the United States in 2010 (Wang, 2012) Moreover, this number had more than doubled since 1980 when only 6.7% of new marriages were mixed. Accordingly, the number of multiracial and multiethnic Americans has also grown. The number of those who identified as two or more races increased by at least 32% between 2000 and 2010 (and because of overestimates in 2000, the percentage increase is likely higher; Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). Individuals with multiracial backgrounds challenge previous monolithic conceptions of race (Binning, Unzueta, Huo, & Molina, 2009; Ho, Sidanius, Levin, & Banaji, 2011; Shih & Sanchez, 2005), as illustrated by the difficulty with how best to categorize them on the U.S. Census. Until recently, multiracial individuals were forced to choose between their identities to fit within the traditional racial categories in U.S. society (e.g., White, Black, Asian, American Indian) on the U.S. Census as well as in school registration, health care, and employment.

How people categorize multiracial individuals—as well as how multiracial individuals construct their own racial identity—is a matter that continues to gain attention in the media (e.g., the debate over President Obama's racial identity) and in psychological research. Several factors influence the construction of racial identity for multiracial individuals, some of which depend on how others view their identity and the ways in which their identity can be expressed. Multiracial people—who, by definition, are a blending of monoracial categories such as Asian and White—are often seen as ambiguous by monoracial people (e.g., Chen & Hamilton, 2012; Eberhardt, Dasgupta, & Banaszynski, 2003; Pauker et al., 2009) and are miscategorized with respect to their multiracial identity (Chen & Hamilton, 2012). Even when multiracial individuals are identified as such, they still encounter monoracial categorizations (Halberstadt, Sherman, & Sherman, 2011; Ho et al., 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008; Shih & Sanchez, 2005). Moreover, monoracial categorization of multiracial people is tied to conceptions of race: People who classified Barack Obama (the son of a White American and a Black Kenyan) as Black during the 2008 presidential election tended to implicitly perceive race as more categorical than those who labeled him as multiracial (Malahy, Sedlins, Plaks, & Shoda, 2010).

Although all multiracial individuals do not necessarily identify with each of their component identities, the limitation of choice, in and of itself, can lead to negative psychological outcomes (Barreto & Ellemers, 2002; Cheryan & Monin, 2005) and alienates those individuals who do identify as being multiracial. Because individuals are motivated to have their social identities seen by others as they see themselves (Swann, 1983), any discrepancy can be threatening. Townsend, Markus, and Bergsieker (2009), for instance, found that multiracial people felt that their identities were miscategorized in a variety of situations—most commonly because of their physical appearance being misperceived by others in social interactions—and that compelling multiracial people to choose a single racial identity resulted in decreased self-esteem, motivation, performance, and efficacy.

The blurring of traditional racial lines has often left multiracial people excluded, as they are not seen as prototypical members of their component identity groups (Pauker et al., 2009). Moreover, how multiracial individuals are labeled as in- versus out-group members changes between racial groups—for example, Blacks and the one-drop rule (Omi & Winant, 1986) and Native Americans and the blood quantum rule (Wilson, 1992)—as well as across contexts. In comparison with monoracial individuals who hold more rigid notions of race, multiracial individuals who identify with several racial categories see race as being more fluid, with more expansive definitions of membership in the in-group (Pauker & Ambady, 2009). In sum, although increasing attention has been paid to the classification of multiracial people, these individuals still face relatively monolithic conceptions of race, which could leave them relatively excluded from definitions of diversity.

Intersectional Approaches to Diversity

Conceptualizations of diversity often treat the many dimensions along which individuals can vary

(e.g., religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status) as discrete and unitary concepts (Crenshaw, 1991). Even race and gender—gaining prominence as topics of study within many disciplines—are typically examined separately rather than considering the intersection of these social identities (Reskin, 2003; Settles, 2006), particularly in psychology (Goff, Thomas, & Jackson, 2008). Intersectional approaches to diversity, however, treat multiple dimensions of identity as mutually constituted and as a central identity, in and of itself (Glenn, 1999; McCall, 2005). Understanding the lived experience of a Black woman, for example, cannot simply be gleaned from research on gender or from studies on race.

Taking an intersectional approach to diversity affords the opportunity of focusing specifically on the unique and dynamic positions inhabited by individuals as a result of their combined identities (e.g., Latino men, Black lesbians), which are distinct from the sum of their constituent identities (Steinbugler, Press, & Dias, 2006). Such an approach is quite different from an assumption in psychology—specifically research on person perception—that race, gender, and age are basic perceptual categories (Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Goff et al. (2008) found that Black women were more often miscategorized by gender than White women, suggesting that the perception of race and gender might not be separate processes as previously assumed, a finding supported by recent research demonstrating that individual perceptions of race are gendered (K. L. Johnson, Freeman, & Pauker, 2012; see also Galinsky, Hall, & Cuddy, 2013).

Intersectionality recognizes that individuals can simultaneously experience membership in different categories. Individuals may place importance on their component identities (e.g., Black and woman), but they can also create a combined identity unifying the aspects of who they are (e.g., Black–woman identity; Settles, 2006), opening up the definition of what constitutes diversity even further. However, people with multiple subordinate group identities often experience intersectional invisibility (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

WHAT TO DO WITH DIVERSITY

In this section, we review literature on conceptions of what to do with diversity, namely whether to ignore intergroup differences or acknowledge them. Because the bulk of the social psychological literature has focused on multiculturalism and color-blindness, we focus most of our attention on these common ideologies (for other reviews, see Plaut, 2010b; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). For each, we describe patterns and potential sources as well as correlates and outcomes, including sometimes unintended or paradoxical consequences for intergroup relations.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism, one conception of what to do with diversity that arose in part in reaction to assimilationism, has enjoyed varying degrees of popularity in several Western nations. Though multiculturalism has been defined in many different ways, at its heart lies the notion that minority group cultures should be acknowledged and respected (Berry, 1984; Fowers & Richardson, 1996; Taylor, 1994). As with diversity, however, a great deal of ambiguity arises from this construct. It has variously been used to describe an approach to cultural diversity or simply to refer to the presence of a variety of demographic groups. Moreover, the cultures included in multiculturalism range widely from, for example, ethnicity to race, national origin, and religion (Song, 2009). At the same time, multiculturalism has been criticized for not adequately addressing power relations or racial subordination (e.g., Gordon & Newfield, 1996).

Differences also appear in the operationalization of multiculturalism in the social psychological literature. Some social psychologists in the United States have focused their multiculturalism measures and stimuli on the promise of multiculturalism for improving harmonious intergroup relations (e.g., Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000)—what they term *multicultural ideology*. The goal, therefore, is a harmonious society with cultural maintenance, learning, and appreciation as a path to achieving that goal. Yet other measures of

multicultural attitudes (especially those used in Canada and Europe) have focused primarily (though not exclusively) on the rights of minorities to practice their culture as desirable or undesirable (e.g., Berry & Kalin, 1995; Verkuyten, 2009). Research conceptualizing multiculturalism as a cultural model of diversity has used measures that tap into individuals' support for racial and ethnic diversity in their organizational or university environments (e.g., Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Plaut et al., 2011). Notwithstanding these differences, here we review research on mean group differences in endorsement of multiculturalism and possible sources of multicultural attitudes, correlates and outcomes of multicultural attitudes, and a range of unintended negative effects associated with multiculturalism.

Patterns and sources. Group membership (e.g., being from a racial or ethnic minority group) moderates attitudes toward multiculturalism. For example, in studies of ethnic majority (Dutch) and minority (Turkish or Moroccan) secondary school and university students in the Netherlands, the ethnic minority group consistently endorsed multiculturalism more than did the ethnic majority group (Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). Studies of university students, community samples, and representative adult samples in the United States have shown similar patterns, with Blacks, Latinos, and, more generally, ethnic minorities endorsing multiculturalism more than do Whites (Ryan et al., 2007; Wolsko et al., 2006).

What could motivate support for or opposition to multiculturalism? Though research has not pointed to a causal mechanism, several studies have found a relationship between ethnic identification and support for multiculturalism. For example, studies by Verkuyten (2005; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006) conducted in the Netherlands have found a positive relationship between in-group identification and endorsement of multiculturalism for minority group members but a negative relationship for majority group members. However, Wolsko et al. (2006) found multicultural attitudes to be related to ethnic identification for ethnic minorities but not for Whites in the United States.[2]

Velasco González, Verkuyten, Weesie, and Poppe (2008) have also examined the relationship between threat and multiculturalism (see also Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009), finding that support for multiculturalism and minority rights among adolescent Dutch nationals negatively predicted perceived out-group threat (assessed in one study by a combination of items assessing symbolic threat and safety threat and in the other by items assessing both symbolic threat and realistic economic threat). Consistent with these findings, a study of a random sample of New Zealand adults found that individuals' endorsement of multicultural ideology predicted lower perceptions of out-group threat, which in turn predicted more favorable attitudes toward immigrants (Ward & Masgoret, 2006). We further examine the link between threat and multiculturalism below. Both symbolic threat and out-group stereotypes mediate the previously discussed relationship between in-group identification and multiculturalism (Velasco González et al., 2008).

Correlates and outcomes. The picture of multiculturalism with respect to stereotyping is mixed. Some studies have suggested that majority group individuals who endorse multiculturalism stereotype an out-group less (Velasco González et al., 2008). Ryan et al. (2007) found that greater endorsement of multiculturalism (relative to color-blindness) predicted weaker perceived group dispersion among White participants (a marginally significant result) but stronger stereotypes and perceived group dispersion among Black participants. These results for Blacks comport with Wolsko et al.'s (2000) findings for Whites that exposure to a multicultural message prompted the expression of stronger stereotypes about an ethnic out-group. However, Wolsko et al. found that the increased stereotyping prompted by multiculturalism does not preclude positive regard

[2]Different measures of ethnic identification may have contributed to differences in results. Although Wolsko et al. (2006) used the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, Verkuyten (2005) used only items similar to the Identity and Membership subscales of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale. However, Verkuyten did not find a significant negative relationship for majority group members in Study 3. Another possible reason for the inconsistency is that the identification measures do not account for differences in identity form (see Goren & Plaut, 2012).

for an ethnic out-group (Study 1) and that multiculturalism can promote a reliance on both ethnic and individuating information about a person (Study 3).

Does the increased group differentiation prompted by a multicultural approach to diversity lead to increased prejudice? Wolsko et al. (2006) found a relationship between endorsement of multiculturalism and category differentiation (i.e., seeing more differences between groups), at least among ethnic minority respondents. Although a tradition of research has suggested that the heightened category differentiation—for example, fostered by multiculturalism—lays the basis for prejudice, other research has suggested this may not necessarily be the case (see Park & Judd, 2005). According to experimental research by Deffenbacher, Park, Judd, and Correll (2009), making a group difference salient does not necessarily increase intergroup bias. Other research on intergroup exposure and prejudice with Jewish and Arab children has suggested that making children aware of ethnic categories contributed to reducing essentialist bias (Deeb, Segall, Birnbaum, Ben-Eliyahu, & Diesendruck, 2011).

In fact, correlational research has suggested that support for multiculturalism is correlated with lower evaluative bias or ethnocentrism (i.e., evaluating the in-group more positively than the out-group) among White (Wolsko et al., 2006) and White and Black (see Ryan et al., 2007, Study 1) U.S. college students and more warmth toward the in-group than the out-group among White and Latino adults (Ryan et al., 2010). Experimental studies have suggested a similar pattern. For example, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004) found that exposing White American students to a multicultural message diminished implicit and explicit in-group bias relative to a color-blind condition. Similarly, in correlational and experimental research with secondary school and university students, multiculturalism was associated with out-group evaluation for the majority group (Dutch) and with in-group evaluation for the minority group (Turks; Verkuyten, 2005).

Moreover, among White U.S. college students, multiculturalism correlated negatively with both social dominance orientation and general prejudice against racial minority groups (Levin et al., 2012). A link between multiculturalism and lower bias also appears in work suggesting that White employees' multicultural attitudes are correlated with racial minority coworkers' psychological engagement and that this relationship is mediated in part by the racial minorities' perceptions of lower bias in their work environment (Plaut et al., 2009). Independent of prejudice (as measured by the Modern Racism Scale), endorsement of multiculturalism also predicts pro-diversity public policy preferences (e.g., immigration, affirmative action; Wolsko et al., 2006).

A growing number of studies have suggested that being exposed to a multicultural ideology increases the perceiver's perspective taking and outward focus. For example, priming multiculturalism facilitates perspective taking, and the effect is bidirectional: Perspective taking boosts multicultural attitudes (Todd & Galinsky, 2012). Vorauer et al. (2009) found similar outcomes of multicultural ideology in intergroup interactions. In their study, reading a multicultural ideological prompt led White and Aboriginal Canadians to adopt a more outward focus (as measured by the total number of words used to describe their impressions of their partner), which in turn increased the amount of positive other-directed comments they made to their other-race interaction partner.

Multicultural experiences have been linked to increases in creativity—enhancing the ability to solve problems, retain and access unconventional knowledge, and expand the idea pool by recruiting and adapting ideas from other cultures (Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008). These positive changes not only have been found among those individuals who had experiences living abroad (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009) but were also evoked through exposure to cultural cues in a laboratory setting (Leung & Chiu, 2010).

Multiculturalism backfiring. Multiculturalism ideology can also contribute to negative outcomes for majority and minority group members. Efforts to acknowledge and respect the differences between groups can backfire if these efforts are invoked in a way that pigeonholes people—especially racial minorities—into a certain mold or pressures them to fit within prescribed category boundaries rather

than allowing them to being seen as individuals (Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). For instance, Gutiérrez and Unzueta (2010) found that priming participants with multiculturalism caused them to express greater dislike for African Americans and Latinos who deviated from stereotypes of their group (e.g., an African American who liked surfing and country dancing). Multiculturalism may thus be problematic because it restricts behaviors of minorities by removing their freedom to deviate from limiting stereotypes of their groups.

Multicultural ideology can also backfire by causing backlash among majority group members. One line of studies has pointed to the role of feelings of inclusion and exclusion in majority group members' reactions to multiculturalism. Plaut et al. (2011) found that multiculturalism was implicitly associated with exclusion among Whites and that Whites had a harder time associating multiculturalism with the self than did racial minorities. Notably, associating multiculturalism with the self-concept not only predicted students' support for diversity at the university but also mediated the relationship between majority and minority group membership and support for diversity. Moreover, in a conceptual replication, feeling included in organizational definitions of diversity also mediated the relationship between minority and majority group membership and support for diversity in the workplace.

Other research on multiculturalism has directly implicated threat. Multiculturalism has been found to be a source of threat or anxiety for majority group members (Ginges & Cairns, 2000; Verkuyten, 2005). Multiculturalism can also invoke hostility, especially under conditions of conflict or threat (Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008; Vorauer & Sasaki, 2011). In experiments by Correll et al. (2008), under high conflict (e.g., competition for classes), White U.S. college students showed—at least initially—greater expression of racial prejudice after being exposed to a passage about multiculturalism than to one about color-blindness. Taking this research a step further, Vorauer and Sasaki (2011) showed that under threat (e.g., disagreement with or rejection by an out-group partner), White Canadian students exposed to multiculturalism showed heightened hostile behavior toward an out-group interaction partner. They found that multiculturalism increased hostility toward a threatening out-group member not because it heightened group-level thinking or a focus on differences, but rather because it promoted a learning orientation in which they engaged in deep cognitive processing of the partner's challenging behavior. In other words, for the same reason that multiculturalism can have positive effects on nonthreatening social interaction (e.g., Vorauer et al., 2009), it can also have negative effects under threat.

Consistent with a motivated cognition story, research has also suggested different reactions to multiculturalism by individuals with differing in-group protection motives (assuming that racial identity is tied to these motives). For example, multiculturalism increases perceptions of threat and support for inequality among White Americans with high ethnic identification (Morrison et al., 2010). The downstream consequences of threat on out-group attitudes have been documented by other research (see Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006, for a meta-analytic review). Though further research is needed on what kinds of threats are evoked by multiculturalism, research has suggested that symbolic threat may be particularly relevant because it implies a threat to core cultural identity and values (Mukherjee, Molina & Adams, 2012; Yogeeswaran, 2013).[3]

If threat moderates reactions to multiculturalism, it should come as no surprise that prejudice does as well. Prejudice, as measured by the Modern Racism Scale, moderates the effects of exposure to a multicultural message: High-prejudice individuals are more disturbed by cultural differences after a multicultural message, and low-prejudice individuals are less disturbed (Vorauer & Sasaki, 2010). In this study with White Canadian students, the difference was also seen in participants' behaviors toward an anticipated Aboriginal Canadian interaction partner: After reading a multicultural message, high-prejudice individuals showed less warmth than did low-prejudice

[3]Other types of perceived threat are also relevant to the presence of other groups, such as immigrants. Two of these are realistic threats—threat to resources (e.g., Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, & Martin, 2005; Zárate, Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004) and threat of disease (e.g., Huang, Sedlovskaya, Ackerman, & Bargh, 2011).

individuals toward their interaction partners (i.e., as measured by conveyed liking for their partner, intimacy and breadth in the personal information they disclosed, and total number of words in their answers).

Multiculturalism may also backfire if efforts to acknowledge cultural differences subject minorities to being inappropriately characterized. Rather than feeling valued or appreciated, minorities can respond negatively to questions about their cultural identity when those questions deny them another identity that is important to them. For instance, Asian Americans who were asked about their cultural identities in a way that cast doubt on their American identities (e.g., "Where are you really from?") expressed more negative emotions and derogated the questioner more than Asian Americans who were not asked about their identities in this manner (Cheryan & Monin, 2005). Similarly, multiculturalism in the form of positive stereotypes (e.g., "Blacks are good athletes") can be problematic for minorities for several reasons. First, they can communicate high expectations that can cause targets to choke under pressure (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000). Second, they can render those group members who do not fit the stereotypes invisible (Fryberg et al., 2008). Third, positive stereotypes may be particularly problematic in U.S. and other independent contexts in which people seek to be recognized for their individual traits and merits rather than being seen through the lens of their group memberships (Siy & Cheryan, 2013). When multiculturalism involves the imposition of an identity that is unwarranted or inappropriate, targets respond negatively, preferring instead that these comments be unstated (Czopp, 2008).

Color-Blindness

Color-blindness is an approach to diversity that has gained prominence in the United States (for reviews, see Apfelbaum, Norton, & Sommers, 2012; Plaut, 2010b) and resonates in other liberal democracies (e.g., with France's concept of republicanism). At its base, color-blindness represents an approach to diversity that minimizes the use and significance of racial group membership—that race should not and does not matter in how people are treated. Yet the shifts color-blindness has taken, both historically and in the psychological literature, render a systematic review of its sources, correlates, and outcomes somewhat challenging.

A glance at the literature reveals important differences in the construct's operationalization. Items used in some research have centered on color-blindness as a repudiation of contemporary preoccupation with race—that racial labels and obsession with race obscure individual uniqueness (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009; Morrison et al., 2010). Other items have stressed that racial and ethnic membership is simply not important to who people are (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012). Yet another measure implicates national identity and citizenship, with items stressing the importance of seeing Americans as individuals, not as members of racial or other groups (Levin et al., 2012). Another measure focuses on whether individuals perceive certain strategies, such as judging people as individuals and seeing them as the same and as created equally, as improving intergroup relations (Ryan et al., 2007; see also Wolsko et al., 2000). A commonly used color-blindness essay prime offers perhaps the broadest conceptualization, emphasizing the following: that Americans are all created equal, that they are all human beings and citizens of the United States, that they should see people as both individuals and part of the larger group, Americans, and that they should look beyond skin color and emphasize sameness (Wolsko et al., 2000). Notably, this essay also portrayed color-blindness as a way to achieve the goal of avoiding or overcoming ethnic conflict. Color-blindness has also sometimes stressed similarity and assimilation because asking minority groups to be part of a whole without regard to race (e.g., Americans) often implies asking them to shed their racial and ethnic accoutrements (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000; Plaut et al., 2009). Other research has operationalized color-blindness not as attitudes or ideology but as a norm or behavior of strategically avoiding race, for example in interracial interaction (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006). Finally, research in counseling psychology has suggested yet another conceptualization—individuals' lack of awareness of the role that race and racism play in contemporary society.

For example, the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et al., 2000) measures the denial of Whites' racial privilege, a lack of awareness of institutional discrimination, and the belief that racism is not a problem.

Patterns and sources. Studies that report mean group differences in endorsement of color-blindness have suggested that on the whole Whites endorse color-blindness more strongly than do racial minorities (Neville et al., 2000; Ryan et al., 2007; Tynes & Markoe, 2010; but see Rosenthal & Levy, 2012, who found no difference) and more strongly than they endorse multiculturalism (Ryan et al., 2007). Ryan et al. (2007) also found that Blacks endorse color-blindness significantly less than multiculturalism.

What motivates support for or opposition to color-blindness? Egalitarian-minded Whites may view color-blindness as a principle of distributive justice (a way to decrease inequality), whereas Whites high in social dominance orientation may view it as a procedural justice mechanism (a way to legitimize inequality), especially when threatened (Knowles et al., 2009). Moreover, individuals in high-status groups are motivated to maintain a focus on commonality (Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009). Identity and self-presentation concerns may also motivate adherence to color-blindness. For example, White male job-seeking students high in the need to belong (but not those low in the need to belong) are more attracted to an organization that espouses color-blindness than to one that embraces multiculturalism (Plaut et al., 2011). Maintaining an egalitarian self-image may also play a role, as suggested by work on aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Schofield, 1986). For example, external motivation to control prejudice predicts Whites' adherence to a color-blind norm in interracial interaction (Apfelbaum et al., 2008). Though some racial minorities may endorse color-blindness and view it as a mechanism for combating stigmatization (see Purdie-Vaughns & Ditlmann, 2010), they may also view color-blind rhetoric as disingenuous, particularly in contexts with low numerical representation of minorities (Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008). Other research has suggested that for Blacks, high endorsement of color-blind racial attitudes is related to false consciousness, including social dominance orientation (Neville, Coleman, Falconer, & Holmes, 2005).

Correlates and outcomes. Research in social and counseling psychology has largely borne out the claim made by sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) that color-blindness supports social stratification. Color-blind racial attitudes as measured by the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale predict scores on the Belief in a Just World scale, the Quick Discrimination Index, and the Modern Racism Scale (Neville et al., 2000). These attitudes are also associated with less empathy and greater attribution of responsibility for the cause of problems among counselors (Burkard & Knox, 2004). Color-blind racial attitudes have also been linked to apathy toward racially themed party images on social networking sites (Tynes & Markoe, 2010), disagreement with a university's decision to discontinue a controversial racialized university mascot (Neville, Yeung, Todd, Spanierman, & Reed, 2011), and affirmative action policy attitudes (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005).

Social psychological research has further suggested a relationship between color-blindness and stereotyping and prejudice outcomes (but see Levin et al., 2012).[4] For example, individuals who endorse color-blind ideology (over multicultural ideology) hold stronger stereotypes (Ryan et al., 2007). In fact, directly asking people to ignore race increases rather than decreases stereotype accessibility (Payne, Lambert, & Jacoby, 2002). Those who endorse color-blind ideology (over multicultural ideology) also exhibit less internal motivation to control prejudice (Ryan et al., 2007). Moreover, experimental exposure to a color-blind ideology essay prime (Wolsko et al., 2000) increases implicit and explicit bias (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004) and behavioral prejudice (Holoien & Shelton, 2012) among White students. In one study, non-Black participants who conducted an unstructured interview with a Black

[4]Levin et al. (2012) found a negative correlation of their color-blindness measure with social dominance orientation and with generalized prejudice. The discrepancy between these results and those of other studies may be attributable to differences in the measure.

confederate under an instruction to not think about race placed themselves at a greater distance from another Black interviewee in a subsequent interview than those given an identity-conscious instruction (Madera & Hebl, 2013).

Research has suggested that although prejudice may initially decrease under the influence of a color-blindness prime (even in a high-conflict situation), it soon rebounds (Correll et al., 2008). Why is this? Although suppression of bias can mask bias in the short term, when vigilance declines, prejudice will reappear. Moreover, the prevention orientation and preoccupation with ignoring differences fostered by color-blindness results in ironic effects in interracial interaction (Vorauer et al., 2009; Vorauer & Sasaki, 2010; but see Vorauer & Sasaki, 2011). Consistent with these findings, the strategic use of color-blindness (i.e., purposefully evading race) can lead to executive function impairment during interracial interaction (see also Richeson et al., 2003; Richeson & Trawalter, 2005), causes Whites to act less friendly toward Black interaction partners, and also makes them appear more, rather than less, prejudiced (Apfelbaum et al., 2008). Moreover, Whites exposed to color-blind (as opposed to multicultural) ideology behave in ways that produce greater cognitive depletion in their Black interaction partners—even in the absence of differential impairment of their own executive function (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). This sheds light on the finding that minority coworkers of Whites who espouse color-blindness detect more bias and are less psychologically engaged than those whose White coworkers show less support for color-blindness (Plaut et al., 2009).

PERCEIVED CONSEQUENCES OF DIVERSITY

In addition to what diversity is, with whom it is associated, and what to do with it, diversity is also constructed by its perceived consequences. In this section, we describe the perceived consequences of addressing diversity and inequality, particularly among Whites.

One increasingly common perception among Whites is that addressing diversity and racial inequality have had negative consequences for the in-group. For example, as we noted, diversity may appear exclusive to Whites (Morrison & Chung, 2011; Plaut et al., 2011; Unzueta & Binning, 2010). Another study has suggested that White Americans now perceive that bias against Whites has been increasing as bias against Blacks has been decreasing, such that the former has eclipsed the latter (Norton & Sommers, 2011). The authors of this study suggest that White Americans are engaged in zero-sum thinking: that discrimination against one group increases as discrimination against another group decreases. The Black Americans they surveyed, however, did not show this pattern.

Another line of research has suggested that Whites and ethnic minorities use different reference points for assessing racial progress: Whites are more likely to assess current conditions of racial equality through comparisons with the past, whereas ethnic minorities are more likely to use comparisons with an ideal (Eibach & Ehrlinger, 2006). Suggesting the relevance of motivation to these findings, another study found that emphasizing Whites' losses increased the gap between Blacks' and Whites' perceptions of racial progress and that loss aversion had a greater effect on Whites high in social dominance orientation, those with the greatest interest in preserving the hierarchy (Eibach & Keegan, 2006).

Framing that suggests progress or loss also helps to mold policy preferences with regard to race. For example, under a loss framing, Whites express less support for affirmative action than under a commitment to racial equality framing (Eibach & Purdie-Vaughns, 2011). Further suggesting the role of motivation, other studies have found that when affirmative action is framed as a loss for Whites, White participants' racial identity negatively predicts support for the policy; however, when the policy is framed as a gain for Blacks or even as neutral for Whites, racial identity does not predict policy preference (Lowery et al., 2006).

Whether perceptions of societal discrimination and diversity-relevant policy attitudes stem from a sense of exclusion, a sense of losing the zero-sum discrimination game, or a sense of loss of racial privilege, all of these explanations contribute to the understanding of how majority group members view the consequences of diversity. This understanding is

important given the wide divergence in opinion that still exists in Whites' and non-Whites' perceptions of discrimination against both White and non-White groups. For example, according to a 2010 report from the Pew Research Center, 43% of Blacks say Blacks face a lot of discrimination, whereas only 13% of Whites perceive a lot of anti-Black bias. Moreover, 81% of Blacks say that the country needs to make more changes to give Blacks equal rights with Whites, contrasted with only 36% of Whites (54% of Whites say the country has done enough). The percentage of Latinos perceiving a lot of anti-Black discrimination views falls between Whites and Blacks at 47%. In a poll conducted by the Associated Press and Univision (GfK Roper Public Affairs and Media, 2010), 55% of Latinos and only 24% of non-Latinos responded that there was a lot of discrimination against Latinos in the United States.

In sum, the ways in which people understand the consequences of attending to diversity and form opinions about race-relevant policies are often tied to motivations such as belonging needs, concern for the in-group, or hierarchy maintenance. At the same time that people of color perceive discrimination against their groups, many Whites not only fail to see discrimination against people of color but also have a heightened sense of victimization of their own group. This perceptual segregation has important implications for intergroup relations and for attempts to redress discrimination (see Robinson, 2008).

APPLICATIONS AND SOLUTIONS

Findings of the psychological science of diversity—perceptions of what it is, who is associated with it, what to do with it, and what the consequences are—have implicated a variety of contexts. Here we focus our discussion on law, organizations, and education.

Law

Perceptions of how to treat diversity (i.e., what to do with it) have in many ways shaped the design of legal institutions. Color-blindness was a common theme during the U.S. civil rights era, figuring prominently in arguments favoring civil rights legislation and in Supreme Court jurisprudence on equality (e.g., *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). Understandings of diversity in U.S. Supreme Court jurisprudence have increasingly trended toward color-blindness over the past several decades (see Plaut, 2010b). However, the newer color-blindness departs significantly in function (how it is used) and form (its basic structure) from that used to promote civil rights in the middle of the 20th century. In terms of function, color-blindness has been used primarily to condemn race-conscious remedies for discrimination (e.g., affirmative action) in reverse-racism cases (e.g., *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 1995; *Parents Involved in Cmty. Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 2007). In terms of form, whereas the color-blind argument in *Brown* stressed distributive justice, the more recent color-blind argument has focused on procedural justice (Knowles et al., 2009). Additionally, whereas striking down the use of race previously involved both antisubordination and anticlassification principles (i.e., that the use of race implicated group subordination), the newer form of color-blindness simply relies on anticlassification—that any use of racial classification in government action is unconstitutional. As Justice Roberts stated in *Parents Involved* (2007), a case about the constitutionality of the use of race in school assignment, "the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race."

Relatedly, notions of discrimination—perceptions of the consequences of diversity—also figure prominently in law. For example, the 2009 Supreme Court decision in *Ricci v. DeStefano* (the New Haven firefighter case) echoed research suggesting that Whites see discrimination as a zero-sum game in which less victimization of Blacks means more victimization of Whites (Norton & Sommers, 2011). In *Ricci,* the court held that New Haven's discarding of the promotion test results of a primarily White group of firefighters was unconstitutional because it violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. The court essentially argued that the disparate treatment experienced by the White firefighters was in direct tension with (and of greater concern than) the disparate impact on racial minorities' promotion caused by the test.[5]

[5]Disparate treatment is discrimination on the basis of some protected characteristic such as race, whereas disparate impact is the adverse effect of an institutional practice or policy on members of a protected class.

Meanwhile, racial minorities have had a difficult time proving racial discrimination in the courts. Disparate impact claims make up an increasingly small proportion of discrimination suits that are won by discrimination claimants. They have also experienced difficulty proving disparate treatment. Part of this difficulty comes from the plaintiff's burden to prove malicious intent (Krieger, 1995). Using the malice test developed in 1979, the Supreme Court has never found modern discrimination against non-Whites (Haney-López, 2012). If Whites see anti-White discrimination as more frequent than discrimination against racial minorities (Norton & Sommers, 2011), this could make it even more difficult for minorities to prevail (see Plaut, 2011).

Together, the Supreme Court's attack on race-conscious remedies to discrimination and the difficulty of proving discrimination are cause for concern, especially because this closing of the valve appears to map societal perceptions of discrimination (see Plaut, 2011) and marks an intentional blindness to the history and persistence of discrimination (Haney-López, 2012). If the courts have become an ineffective tool for fighting antiminority discrimination and have become an instrument for dismantling protections against disparate impact, then new avenues are needed.

Organizations

Nebulous and slippery conceptualizations of diversity and discrimination have also impeded antidiscrimination efforts in organizations. For example, key terms—perhaps most important, *discrimination* and *affirmative action*—were not defined in antidiscrimination legislation such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 (Edelman, 1990; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998; Stryker, 1996). Illustrative of the United States' "weak" federal state (Dobbin, Sutton, Meyer, & Scott, 1993; Hirsh, 2009), they contained no prescriptions for what ought to be considered discrimination or what constitutes appropriate levels of diversity, either in the workplace or in colleges and universities. The legal ambiguity surrounding diversity and discrimination allowed room for interpretation and enactment of these laws by the legislative branch and, quite interestingly, one of the main targets intended for legal oversight—corporations (Dobbin et al., 1993; Edelman, 1992; Edelman, Uggen, & Erlanger, 1999).

Corporate actors used the broad guidelines provided by the federal government, specifically in equal employment opportunity laws, to construct internal policies and practices with hopes of eschewing infringement of organizational power (Anderson, 2004; Edelman, 1990) and legal intervention (Bisom-Rapp, 1998; Dobbin, 2009). In developing internal compliance policies and practices, corporations, in effect, defined what was illegal as judges often looked to the best practices of major firms (Dobbin, 2009; Edelman, Krieger, Eliason, Albiston, & Mellema, 2011). Resulting partially from judicial deference to institutionalized organizational practices, corporations played a major role in shaping equality of opportunity both inside and outside of the workplace. Research has demonstrated the many ways in which internal workplace conditions, such as personnel policies and the organization of work, affect the extent to which patterns of inequality found in society at large are replicated and maintained at work (e.g., Baron, Davis-Blake, & Bielby, 1986; Dobbin et al., 1993; Kalev, 2009). Even seemingly innocuous structures, such as job ladders, sustain the traditional power hierarchy within a diverse workforce in organizations, particularly in instances of turnover (Anderson, 2004; Baron et al., 1986).

As conceptualizations of diversity continue to shift, organizational and legal actors need to acknowledge these demographic changes. For example, Best, Edelman, Krieger, and Eliason (2011) recently found that equal employment opportunity laws are not equipped to handle cases in which discrimination claims are based on intersecting bases of discrimination (e.g., race and gender). More specifically, Best et al. found that non-White women had the lowest predicted probability of full victory in litigation based on intersectional claims and were half as likely as White male and female plaintiffs to have full victory. Especially because judges often defer to the policies and practices erected by organizations in discrimination cases, organizations must attend to the complexity of discrimination, particularly as the workforce continues to increase in diversity.

Despite being vetted by the courts, the effectiveness of widespread organizational policies and practices promoting diversity and equality of opportunity has not been established (Bisom-Rapp, 1998; Krawiec, 2003). In fact, recent research has suggested that the mere presence of diversity structures in an organization can create an illusory sense of fairness among high-status group members, such that they become less sensitive to discrimination experienced by disadvantaged group members (Kaiser et al., 2013). Moreover, policies, by themselves, are not sufficient to promote diversity in organizations (Bielby, 2008), especially in those organizations making symbolic efforts without accountability (Edelman, 1992; Edelman et al., 1999; Suchman & Edelman, 1996). Only recently was there a systematic audit of the common corporate diversity programs examining the seven common best practices in diversity management (e.g., Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Kalev et al. (2006) found that organizational programs establishing accountability—for instance, affirmative action plans, diversity committees, diversity staff positions—were more broadly effective in promoting diversity in management than those that addressed managerial bias (e.g., diversity training, diversity evaluations) or social isolation (e.g., networking, mentoring programs) among women and Blacks. Additionally, Kalev (2009) demonstrated that moving away from rigid and narrow divisions of labor to restructuring work around cross-functional teamwork with weaker job boundaries can improve the proportions of women and minorities in managerial positions.

Aside from structural approaches to managing diversity, employee perceptions of a pro-diversity organizational climate—conceptualized as perceptions that an organization makes an effort to implement fair employment practices and policies (Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998)—are associated with lower turnover intentions among Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites (McKay et al., 2007), as well as increased job satisfaction and lower job stress (Walsh, Russell, Tuller, Parks, & McDonald, 2010). Regardless of the identities to which individuals subscribe, organizations promoting inclusion have the potential to create an environment in which employees, from a variety of backgrounds, feel valued and respected (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Stevens et al., 2008). For example, Plaut et al. (2011) found that explicitly including dominant groups (e.g., White men) in conceptualizations of diversity—referred to as *all-inclusive multiculturalism*—mitigated their automatic association of multiculturalism with exclusion. In their integration-and-learning perspective, Ely and Thomas (2001) identified an organization in which all individuals in the diverse workforce felt included, equal, fully respected, and open to learning from one another, which provided opportunities for cross-cultural learning and enhanced work performance. Fostering a climate of inclusion can help reduce the challenges associated with the color-blind and multicultural approaches to diversity by focusing on the value of every employee—including members of the dominant group.

Education

Conceptions of diversity have important implications for educational environments. Schools are one of the first places children and young adults engage with different group members and establish the social skills they will be using in the world at large. Early ethnographic research on color-blindness in an integrated middle school revealed pernicious consequences of treating race as an invisible characteristic or as a taboo topic and of minimizing the significance of intergroup processes (Schofield, 1986). For example, color-blindness can prevent exposure of problematic classroom and school policies that result in differential outcomes for White and minority students and can increase teachers' and administrators' freedom to act in ways that may otherwise appear less acceptable. An experiment conducted in public elementary schools also suggested downsides of color-blindness in schools. Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, and Ambady (2010) examined the effect of framing discussions of diversity (e.g., color-blindness vs. value diversity) on young students' (ages 8–11 years) perceptions of discrimination. Students exposed to color-blindness were less likely to perceive discrimination even when presented with scenarios containing explicit racial bias. Moreover, teachers who viewed the children's

videotaped descriptions of the scenarios were less likely to see the need for intervention if the child was in the color-blind condition. This suggests that, contrary to Justice Roberts' pronouncement in *Parents Involved,* adopting a color-blind perspective to promote racial equality in educational settings might have the opposite effect—causing perceivers to turn a blind eye to racial bias.

Alternative methods have been proposed to address issues of racial inequity in the classroom. One method, proposed by Markus, Steele, and Steele (2000), is the identity safety model, which stresses the need to acknowledge in-group differences in experiences and to accept them as a basis for establishing mutual respect and understanding among students (see also Purdie-Vaughns & Walton, 2011). This model includes recognizing the "downward social constitution" experienced by certain groups in settings in which one's group is potentially subject to devaluing representations, historical narratives, expectations, and interactions (Thomas, 1992). When identity safety practices are implemented correctly, minority students are assured that their group identity will not be used to paint them as problematic but will be used to incorporate their views into the overall setting. By affirming that the identity is valuable not only to minority group members but to society as a whole, one can establish a classroom setting safe from identity threat.

More generally, social psychological research has shown that educational environments that communicate a sense of exclusion or otherwise signal to students that they would be judged negatively because of their group memberships prevent students from entering and reaching their full potential (Steele & Aronson, 1995). However, designing educational environments in such a way as to communicate a sense of inclusion and belonging can improve the outcomes of minorities and reduce achievement gaps (Walton & Cohen, 2011).

How does one design educational environments that promote inclusion? First, consider removing the negative messages, both explicit and implicit, that are sent by people in an educational environment. People can blatantly (e.g., through direct statements) or subtly (e.g., through body language) communicate that they hold negative stereotypes of a group and subsequently cause members of that group to underperform (Logel et al., 2009; Wout, Shih, Jackson, & Sellers, 2009). The people in a group need not hold negative attitudes to evoke such a threat to a target's identity. Even just having one's social group underrepresented in a domain can be threatening to members of that group because it signals to them that they would not be valued there (Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007; Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2003). Representation can lead to better performance in the domain (Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2003) and a greater desire to participate in the domain (Murphy et al., 2007). Moreover, research has suggested that racial minority students who may otherwise be particularly sensitive to rejection on the basis of race feel greater belonging to their university on days after attending ethnic events, which provide opportunities for engagement with racial minority peers (Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002).

Second, the design of educational environments—even in the absence of any people in the environment—can signal to students whether they should enter and can be successful there. For instance, when computer science classrooms were set up in such a way that fit current masculine stereotypes of the field (e.g., science fiction objects, videogames), undergraduate women expressed significantly less interest in pursuing computer science than when the same classroom was set up in a manner that did not fit current stereotypes (e.g., general books, art; Cheryan, Plaut, Davies, & Steele, 2009). In another study, exposing non-Christian students to small Christmas displays lowered their well-being and feelings of inclusion at their university (Schmitt, Davies, Hung, & Wright, 2010). Although this research does not suggest that displays of religious or other identities be banned, it does suggest that considering whether there are signals of exclusion in educational environments may help to level the playing field and encourage a wider set of students to enter and persist in domains in which they are currently underrepresented.

In addition to minimizing discriminatory or exclusionary signals, other strategies can also be used to promote diversity in educational

environments. Providing social connections—in the form of friendships or role models with whom one can relate—improves educational performance and attitudes toward the domain (Marx & Roman, 2002; Stout, Dasgupta, Hunsinger, & McManus, 2011; Walton & Cohen, 2007). Furthermore, allowing students to express a value they find personally important (e.g., relationships with friends and family) can affirm the self and improve the grades of members of negatively stereotyped groups (Cohen, Garcia, Apfel, & Master, 2006). Finally, allowing students to bring other aspects of themselves into the classroom besides the negatively stereotyped identity—such as individuating traits (Ambady, Paik, Steele, Owen-Smith, & Mitchell, 2004) and their other identities (Rydell, McConnell, & Beilock, 2009)—can alleviate threat and improve performance.

Promoting classroom diversity and diverse interactions has multiple benefits for students. More frequent interracial interaction can decrease the physiological stress that is normally experienced in such interactions (e.g., Page-Gould, Mendes, & Major, 2010; Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, & Tropp, 2008) and decrease prejudice (e.g., Shook & Fazio, 2008). College students with more experiences with diversity have different learning and democracy outcomes, including higher civic engagement and a greater ability to see difference as compatible with unity (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Hurtado, 2005). Moreover, students' interaction with racially diverse peers predicts cognitive outcomes such as analytical problem skills and integrative complexity and sociocognitive outcomes such as perspective taking (Antonio et al., 2004; Hurtado, 2005). The benefits of diversity also extend to individuals performing in groups. Diverse groups increase the cognitive complexity of individual group members (Sommers, Warp, & Mahoney, 2008) and can improve group performance (Phillips, Northcraft, & Neale, 2006; Sommers, 2006).

CONCLUSION

A new wave of research in social psychology has illuminated a constellation of processes related to diversity. This research has suggested that conceptions of diversity are relatively ambiguous, allowing individuals to use them in a variety of ways that suit their motivations or perspectives, often in a way that ignores power relations. Research has revealed that some groups get associated with diversity more than others, but also that certain groups remain invisible in diversity discussions. A burgeoning literature on approaches to diversity—such as identity-blind and identity-conscious approaches—has suggested that these approaches are not only differentially valued by groups who hold different positions in society but also that they can have divergent and sometimes unintended negative effects on intergroup relations. Different perspectives also emerge on the consequences of addressing diversity, with a growing sense among Whites that efforts to diversify society and address inequality spell exclusion or loss for their in-group. Finally, this new frontier of diversity research has revealed that these diversity conceptions, associations, approaches, and consequences have important implications for law, organizations, and education. Not only have they shaped the current design of these institutions, but they also point to potential mechanisms for creating more equitable environments for living, working, and learning.

References

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña, 515 U.S. 200 (1995).

Ambady, N., Paik, S. K., Steele, J., Owen-Smith, A., & Mitchell, J. P. (2004). Deflecting negative self-relevant stereotype activation: The effects of individuation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40,* 401–408. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.08.003

Anderson, T. H. (2004). *The pursuit of fairness: A history of affirmative action.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science, 15*, 507–510. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00710.x

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21,* 205–209. doi:10.1177/0963721411434980

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2010). In blind pursuit of racial equality? *Psychological Science, 21,* 1587–1592. doi:10.1177/0956797610384741

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95,* 918–932. doi:10.1037/a0011990

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (n.d.). *Making excellence inclusive*. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/compass/inclusive_excellence.cfm

Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising—are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 672–679. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.672

Awad, G. H., Cokley, K., & Ravitch, J. (2005). Attitudes toward affirmative action: A comparison of colorblind versus modern racist attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 1384–1399. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02175.x

Banks, K. H. (2009). A qualitative investigation of White students' perceptions of diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*, 149–155. doi:10.1037/a0016292

Baron, J. N., Davis-Blake, A., & Bielby, W. T. (1986). The structure of opportunity: How promotion ladders vary within and among organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 248–273. doi:10.2307/2392790

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect versus neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 629–639. doi:10.1177/0146167202288007

Bell, J. M., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Diversity in everyday discourse: The cultural ambiguities and consequences of "happy talk." *American Sociological Review, 72,* 895–914. doi:10.1177/000312240707200603

Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In M. B. Brewer & N. Miller (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 11–17). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement, 27*, 301–320. doi:10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301

Best, R. K., Edelman, L. B., Krieger, L. H., & Eliason, S. R. (2011). Multiple disadvantages: An empirical test of intersectionality theory in EEO litigation. *Law and Society Review, 45,* 991–1025. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00463.x

Bielby, W. T. (2008). Promoting racial diversity at work: Challenges and solutions. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 53–86). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511753725.005

Binning, K. R., Unzueta, M. M., Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2009). The interpretation of multiracial status and its relation to social engagement and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Issues, 65,* 35–49. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01586.x

Bisom-Rapp, S. (1998). Bulletproofing the workplace: Symbol and substance in employment discrimination law practice. *Florida State University Law Review, 26*, 959–1049.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Colorblind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (2nd ed.). Plymouth, England: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brewer, M. B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In T. K. Srull & R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Eds.), *Advances in social cognition* (pp. 1–36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Burkard, A. W., & Knox, S. (2004). Effect of therapist color-blindness on empathy and attributions in cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,* 387–397. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.387

Chen, J. M., & Hamilton, D. L. (2012). Natural ambiguities: Racial categorization of multiracial individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 152–164. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.005

Cheryan, S., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). When positive stereotypes threaten intellectual performance: The psychological hazards of "model minority" status. *Psychological Science, 11,* 399–402. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00277

Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). "Where are you really from?": Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 717–730. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.5.717

Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 1045–1060. doi:10.1037/a0016239

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241.

Cohen, G. L., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., & Master, A. (2006). Reducing the racial achievement gap: A social-psychological intervention. *Science, 313,* 1307–1310. doi:10.1126/science.1128317

The Coca-Cola Company. (n.d.). *Global diversity mission*. Retrieved from http://www.coca-colacompany.com/our-company/diversity/global-diversity-mission

Correll, J., Park, B., & Smith, J. A. (2008). Colorblind and multicultural prejudice reduction strategies in high-conflict situations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 11,* 471–491. doi:10.1177/1368430208095401

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43,* 1241–1299. doi:10.2307/1229039

Czopp, A. M. (2008). When is a compliment not a compliment? Evaluating expressions of positive stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,* 413–420. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.12.007

Deeb, I., Segall, G., Birnbaum, D., Ben-Eliyahu, A., & Diesendruck, G. (2011). Seeing isn't believing: The effect of intergroup exposure on children's essentialist beliefs about ethnic categories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 1139–1156. doi:10.1037/a0026107

Deffenbacher, D. M., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Correll, J. (2009). Category boundaries can be accentuated without increasing intergroup bias. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 12,* 175–193. doi:10.1177/1368430208101055

Diversity. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diversity

Diversity (business). (n.d.). In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.* Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diversity_%28business%29

Diversity (cultural). (n.d.). In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.* Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/cultural_diversity

Diversity (politics). (n.d.). In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.* Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diversity_%28politics%29

Dobbin, F. (2009). *Inventing equal opportunity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dobbin, F., Sutton, J. R., Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1993). Equal opportunity law and the construction of internal labor markets. *American Journal of Sociology, 99,* 396–427. doi:10.1086/230269

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 36, pp. 1–51). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Eberhardt, J. L., Dasgupta, N., & Banaszynski, T. L. (2003). Believing is seeing: The effects of racial labels and implicit beliefs on face perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 360–370. doi:10.1177/0146167202250215

Edelman, L. B. (1990). Legal environments and organizational governance: The expansion of due process in the American workplace. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*, 1401–1440. doi:10.1086/229459

Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology, 97*, 1531–1576. doi:10.1086/229939

Edelman, L. B., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Drita, I. (2001). Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology, 106,* 1589–1641. doi:10.1086/321303

Edelman, L. B., Krieger, L. H., Eliason, S. R., Albiston, C. R., & Mellema, V. (2011). When organizations rule: Judicial deference to institutionalized employment structures. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*, 888–954. doi:10.1086/661984

Edelman, L. B., Uggen, C., & Erlanger, H. S. (1999). The endogeneity of legal regulation: Grievance procedures as rational myth. *American Journal of Sociology, 105,* 406–454. doi:10.1086/210316

Eibach, R. P., & Ehrlinger, J. (2006). "Keep your eyes on the prize": Reference points and racial differences in assessing progress toward equality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32,* 66–77. doi:10.1177/0146167205279585

Eibach, R. P., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and White and Black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 453–467. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453

Eibach, R. P., & Purdie-Vaughns, V. (2011). How to keep on keeping on: Framing civil rights accomplishments to bolster support for egalitarian policies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47,* 274–277. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.005

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 229–279. doi:10.2307/2667087

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (n.d.). *Diversity strategic plan*. Retrieved from http://www.fdic.gov/about/diversity/StrPlan.html

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 1–74). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60317-2

Fowers, B. J., & Richardson, F. C. (1996). Why is multiculturalism good? *American Psychologist, 51,* 609–621. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.6.609

Fryberg, S., Markus, H. R., Oyserman, D., & Stone, J. M. (2008). Of warrior chiefs and Indian princesses: The psychological consequences of American Indian mascots on American Indians. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 208–218. doi:10.1080/01973530802375003

Galinsky, A. D., Hall, E. V., & Cuddy, A. J. (2013). Gendered races: Implications for interracial

marriage, leadership selection, and athletic participation. *Psychological Science, 24,* 498–506. doi:10.1177/0956797612457783

GfK Roper Public Affairs & Media. (2010). *AP-Univision Poll.* Retrieved from http://surveys.ap.org/data%5CGfK%5CAP-Univision%20Poll%20May%202010%20Hispanic%20Topline_ALL_updated.pdf

Ginges, J., & Cairns, D. (2000). Social representations of multiculturalism: A faceted analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30,* 1345–1370. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02524.x

Glenn, E. N. (1999). The social construction and institutionalization of gender and race: An integrative framework. In M. M. Feree, J. Lorber, & B. B. Hess (Eds.), *Revisioning gender* (pp. 3–43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goff, P. A., Thomas, M. A., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). "Ain't I a woman?": Towards an intersectional approach to person perception and group-based harms. *Sex Roles, 59*, 392–403. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9505-4

Gordon, A., & Newfield, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Mapping multiculturalism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Goren, M. J., & Plaut, V. C. (2012). Identity form matters: White racial identity and inter-group attitudes. *Self and Identity, 11,* 237–254. doi:10.1080/15298868.2011.556804

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72,* 330–366.

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 17–34. doi:10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00097.x

Gutiérrez, A. S., & Unzueta, M. M. (2010). The effect of interethnic ideologies on the likability of stereotypic vs. counterstereotypic minority targets. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 775–784. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.03.010

Halberstadt, J., Sherman, S. J., & Sherman, J. W. (2011). Why Barack Obama is Black: A cognitive account of hypodescent. *Psychological Science, 22*, 29–33. doi:10.1177/0956797610390383

Haney-López, I. (2012). Intentional blindness. *New York University Law Review, 87*, 1779–1887.

Hewlett-Packard. (n.d.). *The meaning behind the words*. Retrieved from http://www8.hp.com/us/en/hp-information/about-hp/diversity/meaning.html

Hirsh, C. E. (2009). The strength of weak enforcement: The impact of discrimination charges on sex and race segregation in the workplace. *American Sociological Review, 74,* 245–271. doi:10.1177/000312240907400205

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Levin, D. T., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Evidence for hypodescent and racial hierarchy in the categorization and perception of biracial individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100,* 492–506. doi:10.1037/a0021562

Holoien, D. S., & Shelton, N. J. (2012). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48,* 562–565. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.010

Huang, J. Y., Sedlovskaya, A., Ackerman, J. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2011). Immunizing against prejudice: Effects of disease protection on attitudes toward out-groups. *Psychological Science, 22,* 1550–1556. doi:10.1177/0956797611417261

Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010 census briefs* (C2010BR-02). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf

Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues, 61,* 595–610. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00422.x

IBM. (n.d.). *Diversity: Integrating the workplace & marketplace*. Retrieved from http://www-07.ibm.com/in/isl/diversity/diversity_iwam.html

Inzlicht, M., & Ben-Zeev, T. (2000). A threatening intellectual environment: Why females are susceptible to experiencing problem-solving deficits in the presence of males. *Psychological Science, 11,* 365–371. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00272

Johnson, J., & Oliver, M. (1994). The "overrepresentation" of Asian Americans: Red herrings and yellow peril. In F. L. Pincus & H. J. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Race and ethnic conflict: Contending views on prejudice, discrimination, and ethnoviolence* (pp. 314–325). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Johnson, K. L., Freeman, J. B., & Pauker, K. (2012). Race is gendered: How covarying phenotypes and stereotypes bias sex categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102,* 116–131. doi:10.1037/a0025335

Johnston, W. B., & Packer, A. H. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 504–519.

Kaiser, C. R., & Pratt-Hyatt, J. S. (2009). Distributing prejudice unequally: Do Whites direct their prejudice toward strongly identified minorities? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 432–445. doi:10.1037/a0012877

Kalev, A. (2009). Cracking the glass cages? Restructuring and ascriptive inequality at work. *American Journal of Sociology, 114,* 1591–1643. doi:10.1086/597175

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of

corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71*, 589–617. doi:10.1177/000312240607100404

Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41,* 960–984. doi:10.1177/0002764298041007008

Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: Motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 857–869. doi:10.1037/a0013595

Krawiec, K. D. (2003). Cosmetic compliance and the failure of negotiated governance. *Washington University Law Quarterly, 81*, 487–544.

Krieger, L. H. (1995). The content of our categories: A cognitive bias approach to discrimination and equal employment opportunity. *Stanford Law Review, 47*, 1161–1248. doi:10.2307/1229191

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 480–498. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., . . . Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 144–165. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

Lee, T. (2008). Race, immigration, and the identity-to-politics link. *Annual Review of Political Science, 11*, 457–478. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.051707.122615

Leung, A. K.-Y., & Chiu, C.-Y. (2010). Multicultural experience, idea receptiveness, and creativity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*, 723–741. doi:10.1177/0022022110361707

Leung, A. K.-Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C.-Y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how. *American Psychologist, 63,* 169–181. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.169

Levin, S., Matthews, M., Guimond, S., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Kteily, N., . . . Dover, T. (2012). Assimilation, multiculturalism, and colorblindness: Mediated and moderated relationships between social dominance order and prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 207–212. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.019

Lien, P.-T., Conway, M. M., & Wong, J. (2003). The contours and sources of ethnic identity choices among Asian Americans. *Social Science Quarterly, 84,* 461–481. doi:10.1111/1540-6237.8402015

Linnehan, F., & Konrad, A. M. (1999). Diluting diversity: Implications for intergroup inequality in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8,* 399–414. doi:10.1177/105649269984009

Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. (2009). Interacting with sexist men triggers social identity threat among female engineers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1089–1103. doi:10.1037/a0015703

Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Goff, P. A. (2006). Concern for the in-group and opposition to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 961–974. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.6.961

Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 1047–1061. doi:10.1037/a0014861

Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2013). "Don't stigmatize": The ironic effects of equal opportunity guidelines in interviews. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 123–130. doi:10.1080/01973533.2012.746601

Malahy, L. W., Sedlins, M., Plaks, J., & Shoda, Y. (2010). Black and White, or shades of gray? Racial labeling of Barack Obama predicts implicit race perception. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 10*, 207–222. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2010.01213.x

Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. *Daedalus, 129,* 233–259.

Marx, D. M., & Roman, J. S. (2002). Female role models: Protecting women's math test performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 1183–1193. doi:10.1177/01461672022812004

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*, 1771–1800. doi:10.1086/426800

McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Morris, M. A., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2007). Racial differences in employee retention: Are diversity climate perceptions the key? *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 35–62. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00064.x

Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 896–918. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.896

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34,* 82–104. doi:10.1177/0021886398341006

Morrison, K. R., & Chung, A. H. (2011). "White" or "European American"? Self-identifying labels influence majority group members' interethnic attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 165–170. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.07.019

Morrison, K. R., Plaut, V. C., & Ybarra, O. (2010). Predicting whether multiculturalism positively or negatively influences White Americans' intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36,* 1648–1661. doi:10.1177/0146167210386118

Mukherjee, S., Molina, L. E., & Adams, G. (2012). National identity and immigration policy: Concern for legality or ethnocentric exclusion? *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 12*, 21–32. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01257.x

Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings. *Psychological Science, 18,* 879–885. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01995.x

Neville, H. A., Coleman, M. N., Falconer, J. W., & Holmes, D. (2005). The relations between color-blind racial ideology and psychological false consciousness among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology, 31*, 27–45. doi:10.1177/0095798404268287

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 59–70. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Neville, H. A., Yeung, J. G., Todd, N. R., Spanierman, L. B., & Reed, T. D. (2011). Color-blind racial ideology and beliefs about a racialized university mascot. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4,* 236–249. doi:10.1037/a0024334

Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6,* 215–218. doi:10.1177/1745691611406922

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., Apfelbaum, E. P., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color blindness and interracial interaction: Playing the political correctness game. *Psychological Science, 17*, 949–953. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01810.x

Ogunwole, S. U., Drewery, J., Malcolm, P., & Rios-Vargas, M. (2012). *The population with a bachelor's degree or higher by race and Hispanic origin: 2006–2010* (American Community Surveys Brief). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/acsbr10-19.pdf

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Page-Gould, E., Mendes, W. B., & Major, B. (2010). Intergroup contact facilitates physiological recovery following stressful intergroup interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 854–858. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.04.006

Page-Gould, E., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). With a little help from my cross-group friend: Reducing anxiety in intergroup contexts through cross-group friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95,* 1080–1094. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1080

Parents Involved in Cmty. Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1, 551 U.S. 701 (2007).

Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within the social cognition perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9,* 108–130. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0902_2

Pauker, K., & Ambady, N. (2009). Multiracial faces: How categorization affects memory at the boundaries of race. *Journal of Social Issues, 65,* 69–86. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01588.x

Pauker, K., Weisbuch, M., Ambady, N., Sommers, S. R., Adams, R. B., Jr., & Ivcevic, Z. (2009). Not so black and white: Memory for ambiguous group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 795–810. doi:10.1037/a0013265

Payne, B. K., Lambert, A. J., & Jacoby, L. L. (2002). Best laid plans: Effects of goals on accessibility bias and cognitive control in race-based misperceptions of weapons. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38,* 384–396. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00006-9

Peery, D., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2008). Black + White = Black: Hypodescent in reflexive categorization of racially ambiguous faces. *Psychological Science, 19,* 973–977. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02185.x

Pew Research Center. (2010). *Blacks upbeat about Black progress, prospects, a year after Obama's election, October 28–November 30, 2009.* Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/01/12/blacks-upbeat-about-black-progress-prospects

Phillips, K. W., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (2006). Surface-level diversity and decision-making in groups: When does deep-level similarity help? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 9,* 467–482. doi:10.1177/1368430206067557

Plaut, V. C. (2010a). Diversity science: Who needs it? *Psychological Inquiry, 21,* 168–174. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2010.492753

Plaut, V. C. (2010b). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry, 21*, 77–99. doi:10.1080/10478401003676501

Plaut, V. C. (2011). Law and the zero-sum game of discrimination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6,* 219–221. doi:10.1177/1745691611406929

Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101,* 337–353. doi:10.1037/a0022832

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for

minorities? *Psychological Science, 20,* 444–446. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x

Prasso, S. (2005). *The Asian mystique: Dragon ladies, geisha girls, and our fantasies of the exotic orient.* New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Ditlmann, R. (2010). Reflection on diversity science in social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry, 21,* 153–159. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2010.486758

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59*, 377–391. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94,* 615–630. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Is multiculturalism bad for African Americans? Redefining inclusion through the lens of identity safety. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.), *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations* (pp. 159–177). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ragins, B. R., & Gonzalez, J. A. (2003). Understanding diversity in organizations: Getting a grip on a slippery construct. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 125–163). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 12–21. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1892

Reeves, T. J., & Bennett, C. E. (2004). *We the people: Asians in the United States.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/censr-17.pdf

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Reskin, B. F. (2003). Presidential address: Including mechanisms in our models of ascriptive inequality. *American Sociological Review, 68,* 1–21. doi:10.2307/3088900

Ricci v. DeStefano, 129 S. Ct. 2658 (2009).

Richeson, J. A., Baird, A. A., Gordon, H. L., Heatherton, T. F., Wyland, C. L., Trawalter, S., & Shelton, N. J. (2003). An fMRI investigation of the impact of interracial contact on executive function. *Nature Neuroscience, 6,* 1323–1328. doi:10.1038/nn1156

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40,* 417–423. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002

Richeson, J. A., & Trawalter, S. (2005). Why do interracial interactions impair executive function? A resource depletion account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 934–947. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.934

Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and out-group attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 336–353. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4

Robinson, R. K. (2008). Perceptual segregation. *Columbia Law Review, 108*, 1093–1180.

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2012). The relationship between polyculturalism and intergroup attitudes among racially and ethnically diverse adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*, 1–16. doi:10.1037/a0026490

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 66,* 29–44. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01631.x

Ryan, C. S., Hunt, J. S., Weible, J. A., Peterson, C. R., & Casas, J. F. (2007). Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentricism among Black and White Americans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10,* 617–637. doi:10.1177/1368430207084105

Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Multiple social identities and stereotype threat: Imbalance, accessibility, and working memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 949–966. doi:10.1037/a0014846

Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science, 20,* 114–121. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western representations of the Orient.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Schmitt, M. T., Davies, K., Hung, M., & Wright, S. C. (2010). Identity moderates the effects of Christmas displays on mood, self-esteem, and inclusion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 1017–1022. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.026

Schofield, J. W. (1986). Black-White contact in desegregated schools. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social psychology and society* (pp. 79–92). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Sekaquaptewa, D., & Thompson, M. (2003). Solo status, stereotype threat, and performance expectancies: Their effects on women's performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39,* 68–74. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00508-5

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, N. J. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84, 1079–1092. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1079

Settles, I. H. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand Black women's racial and gender identities. *Sex Roles, 54,* 589–601. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9029-8

Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin, 131,* 569–591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.569

Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2008). Interracial roommate relationships: An experimental field test of the contact hypothesis. *Psychological Science, 19,* 717–723. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02147.x

Siy, J. O., & Cheryan, S. (2013). When compliments fail to flatter: American individualism and responses to positive stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 87–102. doi:10.1037/a0030183

Society for Human Resource Management. (2010). *Workplace diversity practices: How has diversity and inclusion changed over time? A comparative examination: 2010 and 2005.* Retrieved from http://www.shrm.org/Research/SurveyFindings/Articles/Pages/WorkplaceDiversityPractices.aspx

Sommers, S. R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 597–612. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.597

Sommers, S. R., Warp, L. S., & Mahoney, C. C. (2008). Cognitive effects of racial diversity: White individuals' information processing in heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,* 1129–1136. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.01.003

Song, S. (2009). The subject of multiculturalism: Culture, religion, language, ethnicity, nationality, and race? In B. de Bruin & C. F. Zurn (Eds.), *New waves in political philosophy* (pp. 177–197). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 797–811. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797

Steinbugler, A. C., Press, J. E., & Dias, J. J. (2006). Gender, race, and affirmative action: Operationalizing intersectionality in survey research. *Gender and Society, 20,* 805–825. doi:10.1177/0891243206293299

Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 1–19. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.04.011

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44,* 116–133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460

Stout, J. G., Dasgupta, N., Hunsinger, M., & McManus, M. A. (2011). STEMing the tide: Using in-group experts to inoculate women's self-concept in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 255–270. doi:10.1037/a0021385

Stryker, R. (1996). Beyond history versus theory: Strategic narrative and sociological explanation. *Sociological Methods and Research, 24*, 304–352. doi:10.1177/0049124196024003003

Suchman, M. C., & Edelman, L. B. (1996). Legal rational myths: The new institutionalism and the law and society tradition. *Law and Social Inquiry, 21*, 903–941. doi:10.1111/j.1747-4469.1996.tb00100.x

Swann, W. B., Jr. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 33–66). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Target. (n.d.). *Diversity & inclusion*. Retrieved from https://corporate.target.com/corporate-responsibility/team-members/diversity-inclusion

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, L. (1992). Moral deference. *Philosophical Forum, 24*, 233–250.

Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). The reciprocal link between multiculturalism and perspective-taking: How ideological and self-regulatory approaches to managing diversity reinforce each other. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 1394–1398. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.007

Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2009). My choice, your categories: The denial of multiracial identities. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 185–204. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01594.x

Tynes, B. M., & Markoe, S. L. (2010). The role of color-blind racial attitudes in reactions to racial discrimination on social network sites. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3,* 1–13. doi:10.1037/a0018683

Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2010). Which racial groups are associated with diversity? *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16,* 443–446. doi:10.1037/a0019723

Unzueta, M. M., & Binning, K. R. (2012). Diversity is in the eye of the beholder: How concern for the in-group affects perceptions of racial diversity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38,* 26–38. doi:10.1177/0146167211418528

Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Ho, G. C. (2012). Diversity is what you want it to be: How social-dominance motives affect construals of diversity. *Psychological Science, 23,* 303–309. doi:10.1177/0956797611426727

U.S. Army. (n.d.). *About diversity*. Retrieved from http://www.armydiversity.army.mil/adoAbout/index.html

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2011). Government-wide diversity and inclusion strategic plan. Retrieved from http://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/diversity-and-inclusion/reports/governmentwidedistrategicplan.pdf

Velasco González, K. V., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47,* 667–685. doi:10.1348/014466608X284443

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 121–138. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121

Verkuyten, M. (2009). Support for multiculturalism and minority rights: The role of national identification and out-group threat. *Social Justice Research*, *22,* 31–52. doi:10.1007/s11211-008-0087-7

Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30,* 1–18. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.05.015

Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science, 20,* 838–845. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02369.x

Vorauer, J. D., & Sasaki, S. J. (2010). In need of liberation or constraint? How intergroup attitudes moderate the behavioral implications of intergroup ideologies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 133–138. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.08.013

Vorauer, J. D., & Sasaki, S. J. (2011). In the worst rather than the best of times: Effects of salient intergroup ideology in threatening intergroup interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101,* 307–320. doi:10.1037/a0023152

Walsh, B. M., Russell, A., Tuller, M. D., Parks, K. M., & McDonald, D. P. (2010). A multilevel model of the effects of equal opportunity climate on job satisfaction in the military. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*, 191–207. doi:10.1037/a0018756

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 82–96. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science, 331*, 1447–1451. doi:10.1126/science.1198364

Wang, W. (2012). The rise of intermarriage: Rates, characteristics vary by race and gender. *Pew Social and Demographic Trends.* Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2012/02/SDT-Intermarriage-II.pdf

Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). An integrative model of attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30,* 671–682. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.06.002

Wilson, T. P. (1992). Blood quantum: Native American mixed bloods. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 108–125). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the Tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research, 19,* 277–306. doi:10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 635–654. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635

Wout, D. A., Shih, M. J., Jackson, J. S., & Sellers, R. M. (2009). Targets as perceivers: How people determine when they will be negatively stereotyped. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 349–362. doi:10.1037/a0012880

Yogeeswaran, K. (2013). *The devil's in the details: Abstract vs. concrete construals of multiculturalism have differential effects on attitudes and behavioral intentions toward ethnic minority groups.* Unpublished manuscript.

Zárate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 99–105. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00067-2