The Relation Between Polyculturalism and Intergroup Attitudes Among Racially and Ethnically Diverse Adults

Lisa Rosenthal and Sheri R. Levy
Stony Brook University

Research on intergroup ideologies (colorblindness, multiculturalism) has increased our understanding of intergroup attitudes. This article reports empirical tests of the relation between a newly studied ideology, polyculturalism (ideology focusing on interactions and connections among racial/ethnic groups), and intergroup attitudes. Across four studies (with racially/ethnically diverse U.S. undergraduates, and Black and White American adults), greater endorsement of polyculturalism was related to greater equality beliefs; appreciation for and comfort with diversity; willingness for intergroup contact; and endorsement of liberal immigration and affirmative action policies. Polyculturalism explained unique variance after controlling for colorblindness, multiculturalism, assimilation ideology, social dominance orientation, and right-wing authoritarianism. Implications and future directions of studying polyculturalism are discussed.

Keywords: colorblind, diversity, intergroup attitudes, multiculturalism, polyculturalism

Intergroup conflict continues to be a pressing social problem in racially and ethnically diverse societies such as Canada, England, the Netherlands, South Africa, and the United States (e.g., Esses & Gardner, 1996; Zárate, 2009; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004). Abundant research has shown how a greater understanding of intergroup attitudes and behaviors can be obtained by studying belief systems such as social dominance orientation (SDO; belief in social hierarchy and inequality), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; beliefs in authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism), colorblindness (belief that group memberships like race and ethnicity should be ignored), and multiculturalism (belief that racial and ethnic differences are important and should be recognized and celebrated; e.g., Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007; Verkuyten, 2005; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006; Zirkel, 2008). In this article, we report empirical tests of an intergroup belief system or ideology that may hold great promise in providing a fuller understanding of intergroup attitudes and relations (Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001, 2003; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). We examine the relation between endorsement of polyculturalism (that focuses attention on past and present interactions and connections among different racial and ethnic groups; Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001) and established measures relevant to intergroup relations. To determine whether polyculturalism makes a unique contribution to the understanding of intergroup attitudes, we also measure and control for the contributions of other pertinent intergroup ideologies (colorblindness and multiculturalism each measured in multiple ways) as well as other long-standing intergroup-relevant belief systems (SDO and RWA). Studying polyculturalism addresses recent interdisciplinary calls to better understand people's dynamic representations of cultures and racial and ethnic identities as complex processes in an increasingly globalized and diverse world (e.g., Banks, 2004; Chiu & Hong, 2006, 2007; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Kelley, 1999; Mahalingam, 2006, 2008; Prashad, 2001; Zárate & Shaw, 2010; Zirkel, 2008).

Intergroup Ideologies

As background, we first provide a brief review of past work on colorblindness and multiculturalism, the two intergroup ideologies that have been well-studied and to which polyculturalism has been compared (e.g., Prashad, 2001; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Then we elaborate on polyculturalism and give an overview of the four studies aimed at testing the links that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes.

Colorblindness

People who endorse the colorblind ideology essentially believe that group categories (e.g., race) should be de-emphasized, which presumably fosters reduced prejudice because groups and group memberships are therefore not highlighted in getting to know or judging others (Ryan et al., 2007; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). Colorblind ideology can take different forms (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). For one, people can focus on the similarities across groups of people ("we are all members of X nationality"); indeed, focusing on people's common ingroup identity ("we"), which transcends intergroup distinctions ("us" vs. "them"), can improve intergroup attitudes (see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). A focus on cross-group "similarities" could be taken to

Lisa Rosenthal and Sheri R. Levy, Department of Psychology, Stoney Brook University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa Rosenthal, Yale University, 135 College Street, Suite 200, New Haven, CT 06510. E-mail: lisa.rosenthal@yale.edu

an extreme—often referred to as the assimilation ideology, which is captured by the "melting pot" notion (e.g., see Allport, 1954; Zárate & Shaw, 2010) that people from diverse backgrounds should adopt the same ways of the mainstream, dominant culture (see Neville et al., 2000). While there is debate over whether assimilation ideology is a form of colorblindness or a distinct ideology (see support for distinction in Ryan et al., 2010), both the similarities form of colorblindness and assimilation ideology have been criticized for being less suited to or desirable for members of marginalized groups. Downplaying group distinctions in a society still wrought with racism can lead one not to notice or care about persistent racism and lead to the marginalization of nondominant cultures (Neville et al., 2000; Nieto, 1996; Prashad, 2001; Schofield, 1986; Zirkel, 2008). Furthermore, assimilation in particular is not necessarily successful or desirable for members of nondominant groups, particularly those who have strong ethnic identities (e.g., Garcia & Hurtado, 1995; Gonzales & Cauce, 1995; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998; Zárate & Shaw, 2010).

In addition, people can be colorblind by focusing their attention on individual differences (e.g., "each person is unique"), as captured by the popular saying: "You can't judge a book by its cover" (see Ryan et al., 2007; Schofield, 1986). Focusing on people's individual differences has been related to reduced prejudice (e.g., Brewer & Miller, 1984). Nonetheless, this "uniqueness" form of colorblindness has been criticized as being too cognitively taxing for people to realistically use in their day-to-day lives (e.g., Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). All forms of colorblindness have been criticized for directing attention away from the valued identity of members of marginalized racial and ethnic groups and for working against people's needs for affiliation (e.g., see Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and to divide their world into distinct social categories (e.g., Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Richer, & Wetherell, 1987; also see Brewer, 1991).

Multiculturalism

In contrast to the colorblind ideology, people who endorse the multicultural ideology think it is important to pay attention to and be knowledgeable about people's group memberships such as their race and ethnicity; presumably prejudice is reduced for people who hold this ideology and have developed sufficient knowledge about and understanding of other groups' rich histories and current customs (Banks, 2004; Sleeter, 1991; Zirkel, 2008). Like colorblindness, multiculturalism has taken different forms (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). In a popular version of the multicultural ideology, people focus their attention on learning about different racial and ethnic groups, including their customs and traditions, as a way to obtain a better understanding of the lives, experiences, and perspectives of diverse others (e.g., Ryan et al., 2007, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000, 2006). Endorsement of multiculturalism may also take the form of learning to appreciate and value different groups' positive contributions to a diverse society ("appreciate contributions" form; e.g., Ryan et al., 2007, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000, 2006). Additionally, people who endorse multiculturalism may focus their attention on groups maintaining their own cultures and traditions, such as for immigrants in a new country or society, or for nondominant groups in relation to the dominant culture ("maintain cultures" form; e.g., Berry & Kalin, 1995),

which is in opposition to the assimilation ideology (e.g., Zárate & Shaw, 2010).

Yet, noting concerns with all three forms of multiculturalism, critics suggest that if people emphasize the distinctness of racial/ethnic groups within a diverse society, even if casting those differences in a positive light, they are focusing on how cultures are separate, bounded, and unchanging entities, which is an inaccurate portrayal and can inadvertently increase their stereotyping and discrimination (e.g., Bigler, 1999; Prashad, 2001). Critics have also argued that endorsement of multiculturalism (especially in its "important differences" form, but possibly also in other forms) can support nationalism and racism by promoting the use of cultural explanations to legitimize beliefs about the differences between racial and ethnic groups, as a replacement for the biological explanations that were used in the past and have been scientifically invalidated (e.g., Prashad, 2003).

Colorblindness versus Multiculturalism

Studies that have directly compared colorblindness and multiculturalism have produced somewhat mixed results (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Multiculturalism has generally been related to more positive intergroup attitudes than colorblindness, although both ideologies, consistent with criticisms, are associated with some negative intergroup attitudes. As examples, multiculturalism has been related to lower ingroup bias and ethnocentrism (e.g., Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Verkuyten, 2005; Vorauer et al., 2009), greater willingness for intergroup contact and prodiversity views regarding affirmative action and immigration policies (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2006), and improved self-esteem for members of marginalized groups (e.g., Verkuyten, 2009), but also more stereotyping (e.g., Ryan et al., 2007, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000). Colorblindness has been related to lower ingroup bias and ethnocentrism in some samples (e.g., Correll et al., 2008; Wolsko et al., 2000), but also greater ethnocentrism and stereotyping compared with multiculturalism, in other samples, or with implicit measures (e.g., Correll et al., 2008; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Ryan et al., 2007; Vorauer et al., 2009). Additionally, some of the associations these ideologies have with intergroup attitudes vary by respondents' race/ethnicity or social group status, or by the social context or circumstances (e.g., Correll et al., 2008; Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Ryan et al., 2007; Verkuyten, 2005, 2009; Vorauer et al., 2009; see also Zárate & Shaw, 2010).

Polyculturalism

Given the aforementioned theoretical concerns and mixed findings, scholars have called for shifts in the study of intergroup ideologies (e.g., Banks, 2004; Ryan et al., 2010; Zárate & Shaw, 2010; Zirkel, 2008). We suggest that a particularly promising ideology relevant to racial and ethnic relations is polyculturalism, which was first described by historians Kelley (1999) and Prashad (2001, 2003). People who endorse polyculturalism focus their attention on how cultures have interacted, influenced, and shared ideas and practices with each other throughout history, and how they continue to do so today. Thus, individuals who endorse polyculturalism view people of all racial and ethnic groups as deeply connected to one another through their past and current

interactions and mutual influences on each other's cultures (Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2003). Moreover, individuals who endorse polyculturalism do not view cultures as static, unchanging entities that belong to only one group or divide up different groups of people. Accordingly, polyculturalism may foster more positive intergroup attitudes by making people feel more connected to members of different groups, similar to the goals of other related, but distinct lines of significant work on intergroup contact and mutual interdependence models (e.g., Common Ingroup Model: Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model: Hewstone & Brown, 1986; also see, Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999; Brown & Wade, 1987; Deschamps & Brown, 1983; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). However, polyculturalism is distinct from these models because individuals who endorse polyculturalism are focused on the ways that the cultures of all racial and ethnic groups around the world have always been and continue to be influenced by each other and are not, by definition or by extension, focused on developing a superordinate identity or common goals with other groups. In addition, endorsing polyculturalism does not mean that one needs to have had or seek out intergroup contact; instead the polycultural ideology focuses people's attention on the outcomes and products of past and current contact between racial and ethnic groups and cultures. Nonetheless, polyculturalism likely fosters increased interest and comfort with intergroup contact.

Endorsement of polyculturalism, like endorsement of multiculturalism, involves recognizing people's racial and ethnic backgrounds. However, rather than focusing on differences or distinctions between groups, people who endorse polyculturalism focus on the many connections among groups. These "interconnections" are not the same as the cross-group similarities that can be the focus of the colorblind ideology (e.g., all being American). Instead, endorsement of polyculturalism focuses people's attention on connections among racial/ethnic groups through their shared past and current interactions and exchanges that have actually greatly influenced different cultures, such as with ideas, customs, or behaviors. Kelley (1999) conveys the polycultural ideology in the following quote: "All of us, and I mean ALL of us, are the inheritors of European, African, Native American, and even Asian pasts, even if we can't exactly trace our blood lines to all of these continents" (p. 81). Others endorsing a polycultural ideology might point out as examples that salsa music and dance derive from the influences of African, European, and Indigenous American cultures, that African and Asian (among other) cultures mutually influenced Kung Fu (see Prashad, 2001), and that the combined Zulu and Indian influences on health and medical practices are readily apparent in contemporary South Africa (see Flint, 2006).

Taken together, polyculturalism should be related to greater appreciation for and more positive attitudes toward all racial and ethnic groups. Yet, the relationship that polyculturalism has with racial and ethnic attitudes has yet to be empirically tested, which was the main goal of the current studies.

We hypothesized that endorsement of polyculturalism would relate to a wide variety of markers of positive intergroup attitudes. Because people who endorse polyculturalism focus on the mutual influences and interactions (historical and current) among different racial and ethnic groups, they should view groups on a more level playing field with each other, thereby opposing social hierarchies

or inequality (e.g., lower social dominance beliefs; Pratto et al., 1994) and be more supportive of social policies that undermine the social hierarchy and promote greater equality, such as naturalizing all immigrants in the United States and increasing representation and diversity in educational and work settings (affirmative action). Moreover, the focus of polyculturalism on these mutual influences and interactions among all groups (including their ingroups), likely results in seeing greater connections between themselves and other groups such they are more comfortable with people of many backgrounds (e.g., greater comfort with differences; Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000). Furthermore, because people who endorse polyculturalism more give greater recognition to the contributions of all groups to all other groups (including ingroups) and society at large, greater endorsement of polyculturalism should foster greater interest in getting to know people from and learning about other racial and ethnic groups' cultures (e.g., greater interest in diversity and greater appreciation for differences; Fuertes et al., 2000; greater desired intergroup contact; Esses & Dovidio, 2002).

Overview of the Current Investigation

In the present investigation, we studied polyculturalism among undergraduate and adult community participants from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds because studying a wide range of racial and ethnic groups is needed to uncover whether ideologies operate the same or differently for different racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Shelton, 2000; Zárate & Shaw, 2010; Zárate, 2009). In four studies, we tested the relation between endorsement of polyculturalism and the aforementioned established indicators of intergroup attitudes, including support for social inequality, interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity, willingness for intergroup contact, and attitudes toward immigration and affirmative action policies. Because polyculturalism is a newly empirically studied ideology, another important goal of the present investigation was to test whether polyculturalism has unique associations with intergroup attitudes while controlling for relevant and well-established predictors of those same attitudes. Accordingly, across studies we also assessed the two ideologies discussed as most pertinent to polyculturalism–multiculturalism, colorblindness (including multiple measures of these two ideologies, as well as the assimilation ideology that is often discussed in the intergroup ideology literature), and two well-established predictors of individual differences in intergroup attitudes—RWA and SDO.

Across studies, we used factor analyses to test the hypothesis that polyculturalism is a distinct ideology from the other intergroup ideologies. We used regression analyses to test the hypothesis that polyculturalism has unique associations with intergroup attitudes while taking into account the contributions of other intergroup ideologies and predictors of intergroup attitudes. In addition, we used multivariate analyses of variance (all studies), tests of interactions (Studies 2 and 3), and separate regression analyses (Study 1) to test the hypothesis that polyculturalism can be relevant to all groups such that there are not racial/ethnic differences in endorsement of polyculturalism nor the relationships that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes.

Study 1

In Study 1, we examined the relationships between polyculturalism and established intergroup measures among a large sample of racially and ethnically diverse undergraduates. Our measure of polyculturalism was developed beforehand through a series of pilot studies with racially and ethnically diverse undergraduate students. The polyculturalism scale was designed to measure a neutral form of polyculturalism, focusing generally on intergroup interactions, influences, and connections with no mention of positive or negative interactions between groups, to make it free of confounding valence issues (see Appendix for all items). We also set out to compare polyculturalism to multiculturalism and colorblindness, and thus developed and simultaneously piloted measures of these ideologies, which were also designed to be free of confounding valence issues. Our multiculturalism measure focuses on the popular form of recognizing important differences between racial and ethnic groups, and our colorblindness measure focuses on the two most popular forms, combining a focus on the unique individuality of people and commonalities across groups of people (Rosenthal, Levy, & Moss, 2011). To foreshadow, in Study 4, we also use other measures of colorblindness and multiculturalism, namely Ryan et al.'s (2007, 2010) and Wolsko et al.'s (2006) ideological measures, which were not yet published when we conducted Studies 1 through 3.

Method

Participants.   In total, 694 (445 women; mean age = 19.72, SD = 2.95) undergraduates (253 White American, 217 Asian American, 69 Black American, 68 Latino American, and 87 Other or Mixed) at Stony Brook University completed a survey for course credit in their Psychology courses. Because these ideologies have culturally bound meanings, for this study and the other three studies, we only included participants living in the United States six or more years (following Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004, inclusion criteria). In Study 1, data was collected in two waves, with 445 participants completing the same survey, and the 249 remaining completing a slightly longer survey with two additional measures (see below).

For all four studies in the present investigation, participants were told that the study involved completing questions about their own beliefs, that their data would be kept completely confidential, and that their participation was voluntary. All participants gave informed consent before being given the surveys to complete. All four studies were conducted in compliance with the university's Internal Review Board.

Measures.

Polyculturalism.   Participants completed a 5-item measure of polyculturalism in a neutral form (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; α = .88; see Appendix; also see use in Rosenthal et al., 2011).

Multiculturalism.   Participants completed a 5-item measure of multiculturalism in a form focused on recognizing important differences between racial and ethnic groups (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; α = .80; see Appendix; also see use in Rosenthal et al., 2011).

Colorblindness.   Participants completed a 5-item measure of colorblindness in a combined form focused on the unique qualities of individuals as well as commonalities across groups (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; α = .86; see Appendix; also see use in Rosenthal et al., 2011).

Social dominance orientation (SDO).   Participants completed the 16-item SDO scale (Pratto et al., 1994; e.g., "It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others"; −3 = Very Negative, 3 = Very Positive; α = .92).

Universal-diverse orientation.   Participants completed the 15-item Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (MGUDS; Fuertes et al., 2000; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree) with three subscales: Diversity of Contact (e.g., "I would like to attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds"; α = .84); Relativistic Appreciation (e.g., "Knowing how a person differs from me would greatly enhance our friendship"; α = 78); Comfort with Differences (reverse-scored; e.g., "I would only be at ease with people of my race"; α = .79).

Willingness for intergroup contact.   As a measure of willingness for intergroup contact, the 249 participants with a longer survey also completed the 12-item Behavioral Intentions Scale (Esses & Dovidio, 2002), with items referring to any outgroup ("If given the opportunity, how willing would you be to have a person from a racial/ethnic group other than your own as a neighbor?"; 1 = Not at all willing, 7 = Extremely willing; α = .77).

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA).   The 249 participants with a longer survey also completed the 22-item RWA scale (Altemeyer, 2006; −4 = Very Strongly Disagree, 4 = Very Strongly Agree; α = .94).

Results

We conducted a factor analysis (principal components extraction) with all of the items from the polyculturalism, multiculturalism, and colorblindness scales to test that these scales represent three distinct ideologies. Examination of eigenvalues and a scree plot suggested extraction of three expected factors. The three unrotated factors accounted for 64% of the variance. The eigenvalues for these three factors in order (polyculturalism, colorblindness, multiculturalism) were 4.65, 3.25, and 1.74, and the percentages of variance accounted for by each were 31, 22, and 12%. Varimax-rotated factor loadings for all items were .71 or greater on their intended factor, and below .26 for the other two factors.

Table 1 displays means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all study measures with all participants together for Studies 1, 2, and 3. Table 2 displays means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all Study 1 measures separately for Asian, Black, Latino, and White American participants. Overall, participants strongly agreed with polyculturalism and multiculturalism but disagreed slightly with colorblindness. Polyculturalism and multiculturalism were significantly positively correlated, illustrating their shared emphasis on acknowledging groups, and multiculturalism and colorblindness were significantly negatively correlated (although weakly). Polyculturalism was significantly correlated with every outcome measure in the predicted directions, indicating associations with positive intergroup attitudes. Multiculturalism was significantly correlated with all outcomes except for willingness for intergroup contact, also indicating associations with positive intergroup attitudes. Colorblindness was only signif-

Table 1

Bivariate Correlations, Means, and SDs of Study Variables for Study 1 (N = 694, Except Correlations With Willingness for Intergroup Contact and RWA Are With 249), Study 2 (N = 132), and Study 3 (N = 101)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Polyculturalism											
2. Multiculturalism											
Study 1	.40**	—									
Study 2	.40**	—									
Study 3	.36**	—									
3. Colorblindness											
Study 1	−.06	−.17**	—								
Study 2	.07	−.04	—								
Study 3	−.05	−.18†	—								
4. Social dominance orientation											
Study 1	−.28**	−.09*	−.07	—							
Study 2	−.44**	−.20*	−.11	—							
Study 3	−.32**	−.24*	.11	—							
5. Interest in diversity											
Study 1	.30**	.13**	.01	−.37**	—						
Study 2	.43**	.20*	.04	−.29**	—						
Study 3	.11	−.11	−.12	−.00	—						
6. Appreciation for diversity											
Study 1	.36**	.25**	−.10*	−.31**	.61**	—					
Study 2	.40**	.21**	.05	−.29**	.67**	—					
Study 3	.24*	.06	−.11	.01	.16†	—					
7. Comfort with differences											
Study 1	.33**	.11**	−.07	−.38**	.29**	.23**	—				
Study 2	.42**	.14	−.09	−.35**	.46**	.35**	—				
Study 3	.24*	.00	−.09	−.17†	.05	.01	—				
8. Willingness for intergroup contact											
Study 1 (N = 249)	.30**	−.06	.06	−.37**	.40**	.28**	.46**	—			
9. RWA											
Study 1 (N = 249)	−.24**	.03	−.03	.40**	−.21**	−.18**	−.31**	−.38**	—		
10. Affirmative action											
Study 3	.16†	−.08	−.08	−.08	.27**	.18†	.14	—	—	—	
11. Legalizing immigrants											
Study 3	.10	−.15	−.15	−.04	.24*	.16†	−.04	—	—	.29**	—
Study 1: Means	5.80	5.40	3.40	−1.84	4.57	4.71	4.90	6.21	−1.92	—	—
Study 1: SDs	0.89	0.94	1.38	0.98	0.92	0.76	0.84	0.94	1.40	—	—
Study 2: Means	5.70	5.36	3.84	−1.65	4.56	4.62	4.87	—	—	—	—
Study 2: SDs	1.14	1.06	1.44	1.16	1.02	0.91	0.89	—	—	—	—
Study 3[a]: Means	4.42	4.34	3.44	1.92	3.19	2.77	3.55	—	—	2.26	2.17
Study 3[a]: SDs	0.86	1.08	1.58	1.06	0.76	1.11	0.84	—	—	1.06	1.16

[a] Response scales for Study 3 were shortened for telephone survey: 1–5 for intergroup ideologies and 1–4 for all other items.
† $p < .10$.   * $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

icantly correlated with less appreciation for diversity (although weakly).

Testing the unique associations of polyculturalism with intergroup attitudes. Next, we conducted regression analyses with colorblindness and multiculturalism controlled for in the first step, polyculturalism by itself in the second step, and SDO and the three MGUDS subscales as the four outcomes for all 694 participants, plus willingness for intergroup contact was an additional outcome for the subset of 249 participants (see Table 3). In short, polyculturalism was significantly related to all outcomes (i.e., lower SDO, greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity, and greater willingness for intergroup contact) even when controlling for multiculturalism and colorblindness, indicating a unique and consistent association with more positive intergroup attitudes. Consistent with past work showing that multiculturalism has positive intergroup associations, multiculturalism was significantly related to lower SDO, greater interest in diversity,

and greater comfort with differences in Step 1 of those regressions, but these relationships became nonsignificant in Step 2 when polyculturalism was also included. Multiculturalism was significantly associated with greater appreciation for diversity in both steps, and was not associated with willingness to have intergroup contact in Step 1 but became significantly associated with less willingness for intergroup contact in Step 2. In addition, consistent with past work showing the associations that colorblindness has with some positive intergroup outcomes, colorblindness was significantly related to lower SDO in both steps.

Although SDO was used as an outcome measure, it is also an established individual difference construct related to negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., Pratto et al., 1994). Thus, with all 694 participants, we conducted regression analyses with the contribution of SDO controlled for by being entered along with colorblindness and multiculturalism as another predictor in Step 1, and polyculturalism in Step 2 for predicting the MGUDS subscales.

Table 2

Bivariate Correlations, Means, and SDs of Study Variables for Study 1 for Asian (N = 217), Black (N = 69), Latino (N = 68), and White (N = 253) Americans (Except Correlations With Willingness for Intergroup Contact and RWA With Smaller Samples)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Polyculturalism	—	.49** (.41**)	.13 (−.16*)	−.41** (−.22**)	.36** (.20*)	.49** (.22**)	.36** (.31**)	.57** (.16†)	−.33 (−.20*)
2. Multiculturalism	.40** (.31*)	—	.13 (−.19***)	−.34** (−.05)	.26* (−.01)	.34* (.10)	.29* (.12†)	.28 (−.12)	−.22 (.01)
3. Colorblindness	−.04 (−.01)	−.14* (−.29*)	—	−.04 (−.11†)	.11 (.10)	.03 (−.03)	−.02 (−.16*)	.15 (−.01)	−.10 (.01)
4. Social dominance orientation	−.26** (−.30*)	.01 (−.22†)	−.09 (.00)	—	−.52** (−.34**)	−.39** (−.21**)	−.35** (−.46**)	−.34† (−.34**)	.26 (.47**)
5. Interest in diversity	.29** (.61**)	.17 (.34*)	.02 (−.13)	−.31** (−.50**)	—	.57** (.73**)	.44** (.25**)	.42† (.41**)	−.19 (−.30***)
6. Appreciation for diversity	.41** (.55**)	.32** (.46**)	−.10 (−.18)	−.28** (−.51**)	.57** (.73**)	—	.35** (.10†)	.45* (.23†)	−.03 (−.26**)
7. Comfort with differences	.32** (.39**)	.10 (.08)	−.05 (−.01)	−.27** (−.25*)	.32** (.27*)	.30** (.34**)	—	.52* (.32**)	−.40* (−.31**)
8. Willingness for intergroup contact	.42** (.63**)	−.13 (.33)	.13 (−.07)	−.39** (−.34†)	.45** (.38†)	.37** (.45*)	.51** (.78**)	—	−.37† (−.26***)
9. RWA	−.47** (−.16)	−.11 (.22)	.03 (−.15)	.32* (.48*)	−.20 (−.39*)	−.26* (−.42*)	−.30* (−.13)	−.53** (−.25)	—
Means (and SDs) Asian Americans	5.72 (0.89)	5.55 (0.91)	3.35 (1.36)	−1.71 (0.94)	4.52 (0.84)	4.72 (0.74)	4.65 (0.85)	5.90 (0.95)	−1.29 (1.21)
Means (and SDs) Black Americans	6.03 (0.89)	5.59 (1.01)	3.30 (1.54)	−2.24 (0.81)	4.89 (0.92)	4.98 (0.76)	5.03 (0.86)	6.29 (0.85)	−1.30 (1.36)
Means (and SDs) Latino Americans	5.82 (0.95)	5.24 (0.88)	3.26 (1.36)	−1.93 (1.06)	4.73 (0.86)	4.65 (0.70)	5.09 (0.68)	6.40 (0.65)	−2.03 (1.22)
Means (and SDs) White Americans	5.79 (0.87)	5.28 (0.95)	3.46 (1.31)	−1.83 (1.01)	4.43 (0.98)	4.63 (0.80)	5.02 (0.81)	6.29 (1.04)	−2.42 (1.35)

Note. Correlations on the left side of the diagonal are for Asian Americans (and Black Americans in parentheses); Correlations on the right side of the diagonal are for Latino Americans (and White Americans in parentheses).
Correlations, means, and SDs for willingness for intergroup contact and RWA are with 65 Asian, 26 Black, 25 Latino, and 105 White Americans.
† $p < .10$.   * $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

Controlling for SDO did not change the results of any of the regressions for polyculturalism. Additionally, with the subset of 249 participants that completed a slightly longer survey, we conducted regressions controlling for both SDO and RWA (only RWA with SDO as the outcome) in Step 1 along with multiculturalism and colorblindness, and again found no changes in the results for polyculturalism, suggesting polyculturalism contributes to all of these intergroup outcomes over and above the contributions of SDO, RWA, and the other ideologies.

Testing for racial/ethnic differences. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) testing for differences in endorsement of the three ideologies by race/ethnicity (Asian, Black, Latino, and White American) was significant overall ($p = .001$). There was only a significant difference by race/ethnicity in endorsement of multiculturalism ($p = .006$), with Black and Asian Americans endorsing it ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.01$ for Black Americans, $M = 5.55$, $SD = 0.91$ for Asian Americans) to a greater extent than did Latino and White Americans ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 095$ for White Americans, $M = 5.24$, $SD = 0.88$ for Latino Americans).

Because of our fairly large samples of different racial/ethnic groups in this study and the continued importance of race/ethnicity to intergroup attitudes and relations (e.g., Zárate, 2009; Zirkel, 2005), we were then able to conduct the regression analyses with SDO and MGUDS as the outcomes (i.e., the four outcomes with the full sample and therefore large enough numbers across all racial/ethnic groups) separately for the four racial/ethnic groups to test whether within groups, the relationships between polyculturalism and intergroup outcomes were the same as when testing everyone together. Polyculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO, greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity and differences for all groups. Colorblindness was significantly associated with lower SDO for only White Americans, and also marginally significantly associated with less comfort with differences for White Americans ($p = .070$). Multiculturalism was marginally significantly associated with greater interest in diversity for White Americans ($p = .052$), and significantly greater appreciation for diversity among Asian and Black Americans.

Discussion

Polyculturalism was consistently associated with positive intergroup attitudes, was endorsed across racial and ethnic groups, and had similar positive relations with intergroup attitudes across those groups. Consistent with past work, multiculturalism and colorblindness also demonstrated some associations with positive intergroup attitudes, but not consistently across measures or racial/ethnic groups.

Study 2

Study 2 was intended to extend Study 1's findings to a community sample of adults, focusing on Black and White Americans because of their historically strained relations.

Method

Participants. In total, 132 (73 women; mean age = 35.07, $SD = 15.78$) adults (97 White American, 35 Black American) in

Table 3
Regression Analyses for Study 1 (N = 694 For SDO, and All Subscales of MGUDS, But 249 for Willingness for Intergroup Contact)

	Social dominance orientation		Interest in diversity		Appreciation for diversity		Comfort with differences		Willingness for intergroup contact (N = 249)	
	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b
Step 1	.02**		.02**		.07**		.02**		.01	
Colorblindness		−.09*		.03		−.05		−.06		.05
Multiculturalism		−.10**		.14**		.24**		.10**		−.05
Step 2	.07**		.07**		.08**		.10**		.12**	
Colorblindness		−.09*		.03		−.05		−.06		.06
Multiculturalism		.02		.02		.12**		−.04		−.16*
Polyculturalism		−.29**		.30**		.32**		.34**		.36**

* $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

New York completed a survey in public places (e.g., train stations, parks, bus stops), and were offered a candy bar in exchange for participation.

Measures. The measures were the same as those used in Study 1: polyculturalism (α = .89), multiculturalism (α = .74), colorblindness (α = .76), SDO (α = .91), and MGUDS (αs = .82 for Diversity of Contact, .75 for Relativistic Appreciation, .71 for Comfort with Differences).

Results

Consistent with Study 1, we conducted a factor analysis (principal components extraction) with all of the items from the polyculturalism, multiculturalism, and colorblindness scales to test that these scales represent three distinct ideologies. Examination of eigenvalues and a scree plot suggested extraction of three factors, as expected and consistent with Study 1. The three unrotated factors accounted for 59% of the variance. The eigenvalues for these three factors in order (polyculturalism, multiculturalism, colorblindness) were 4.42, 2.65, and 1.76, and the percentages of variance accounted for by each were 29, 18, and 12%. Varimax-

rotated factor loadings for all items were .55 or greater on their intended factor, and below .35 for the other two factors.

As seen in Table 1 and consistent with Study 1, participants strongly agreed with polyculturalism and multiculturalism and slightly disagreed with colorblindness. Polyculturalism and multiculturalism were again significantly positively correlated. Polyculturalism was again significantly correlated with each outcome measure in the predicted directions. Multiculturalism was also significantly correlated with each outcome measure except comfort with differences. Colorblindness was not significantly correlated with any outcomes.

Testing the unique associations of polyculturalism with intergroup attitudes. Similar to Study 1, we conducted regression analyses with SDO and the MGUDS subscales as outcomes; because there were only two racial/ethnic groups in this sample, race was included as a dichotomous predictor and the interactions between race and the three ideologies were tested. For all analyses, race and the three ideologies were entered into Step 1, and the products of race by each of the three ideologies (i.e., three interaction terms) were entered into Step 2 (see Table 4). Only poly-

Table 4
Regression Analyses for Study 2 (N = 132)

	Social dominance orientation		Interest in diversity		Appreciation for diversity		Comfort with differences	
	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b
Step 1	.20**		.23**		.20**		.21**	
Race (White)		−.01		−.23**		−.20*		.14†
Polyculturalism		−.42**		.40**		.37**		.46**
Multiculturalism		−.04		−.01		.02		−.02
Colorblindness		−.09		−.01		.00		−.11
Step 2	.01		.04†		.05†		.01	
Race (White)		−.02		−.28**		−.25**		.11
Polyculturalism		−.61**		.02		.02		.56**
Multiculturalism		−.02		−.07		−.11		−.29
Colorblindness		−.03		−.11		−.02		−.17
Polyculturalism by race		.21		.42*		.39†		−.11
Multiculturalism by race		−.01		.08		.15		.29
Colorblindness by race		−.08		.09		−.01		.06

† $p < .10$.   * $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

culturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO in either step. Polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater interest in diversity, and race was significant, with White Americans reporting significantly lower interest in diversity than did Black Americans. However, in Step 2, the effect of polyculturalism became nonsignificant because the interaction between race and polyculturalism was significant. Follow-up regression analyses ran separately for Black and White Americans revealed polyculturalism as a significant predictor of interest in diversity for White ($b = .48$, $p < .001$) but not Black Americans ($b = .02$, $p = .926$). Polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater appreciation for diversity, and race was significant, with White Americans reporting significantly lower appreciation for diversity than did Black Americans. However, in Step 2, the effect of polyculturalism became nonsignificant because the interaction between race and polyculturalism was marginally significant. Follow-up regression analyses ran separately for Black and White Americans revealed polyculturalism as a significant predictor of appreciation for diversity for White ($b = .46$, $p < .001$) but not Black Americans ($b = .02$, $p = .917$). Polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater comfort with differences, and White Americans reported marginally significantly greater comfort with differences than Black Americans in Step 1. Multiculturalism and colorblindness were not significant predictors of any outcomes in these regression analyses.

As in Study 1, results from regression analyses predicting the MGUDS subscales while additionally controlling for SDO were unchanged, replicating the finding that polyculturalism contributes to diversity attitudes independent of SDO and the other ideologies.

Testing for racial/ethnic differences.   A MANOVA testing for differences between Black and White Americans' endorsement of the three ideologies was marginally significant overall ($p = .070$). Results revealed significant differences in only multiculturalism ($p = .022$), with Black Americans ($M = 5.71$, $SD = 0.93$) endorsing multiculturalism more than did White Americans ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.09$).

Discussion

Results from Study 2 with a sample of community adults replicate the associations that polyculturalism had with positive intergroup attitudes found in Study 1 with undergraduate students. Two of the findings for polyculturalism were not significant for Black Americans, suggesting that polyculturalism may be a more relevant predictor of some intergroup attitudes (such as those relating to attitudes toward diversity) for White than Black Americans. Multiculturalism had some significant correlations with positive intergroup measures, which did not remain significant when tested in regression analyses with other predictor variables, and colorblindness did not have any significant associations in this sample (see Ryan et al., 2010, for similar null findings with colorblindness).

Study 3

We next sought to replicate the findings of Studies 1 and 2 among adults living in different regions in the United States, to increase the generalizability of the findings (see Wolsko et al., 2006, for national samples). Study 3 was a brief telephone survey

of Black and White American adults across the United States. Because of the brief nature of the telephone survey, for this study we included single items taken from the larger measures used in Studies 1 and 2, as well as single items to assess attitudes toward immigration and affirmative action policies, which are relevant to racial/ethnic attitudes and have been examined in relation to intergroup ideologies in past work (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2006).

Method

Participants.   In total, 101 (57 women; mean age = 34.20, $SD = 6.02$) adults (56 White American, 45 Black American) across the United States completed a telephone interview by the Survey Research Center at Stony Brook University (that uses GENESYS).

Measures.   Single-item versions of Study 1's measures were administered (first items for polyculturalism and multiculturalism, and fifth item for colorblindness listed in Appendix). Policy items were "How strongly would you favor or oppose the government legalizing the status of those immigrants now in the country illegally?" and "How strongly do you favor or oppose some racial groups getting preference for hiring, promotions, or college entry so that the workforce or college population has the same racial makeup as its community?" (1 = Oppose Strongly, 4 = Favor Strongly).

Results

As shown in Table 1, participants again strongly endorsed polyculturalism and multiculturalism but not colorblindness, and polyculturalism and multiculturalism were significantly positively correlated. Polyculturalism was significantly associated with the outcome variables in the predicted directions, except for a marginally significant association with more comfort with differences and nonsignificant correlations with greater interest in diversity and favoring affirmative action. Consistent with correlations in Studies 1 and 2, multiculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO, but it was also marginally significantly associated with less support for affirmative action. Colorblindness was marginally significantly associated with less interest in and appreciation for diversity.

Testing the unique associations of polyculturalism with intergroup attitudes.   We conducted the same regression analyses as in Study 2, but added the immigration and affirmative action questions as additional outcomes (see Table 5). Consistent with the results from Study 2, only polyculturalism was associated with significantly lower SDO. In Step 1, polyculturalism was significantly associated, and multiculturalism was marginally significantly associated with greater interest in diversity; colorblindness was significantly associated with less interest in diversity; and race was significant, with White Americans reporting significantly less interest in diversity than did Black Americans. However, in Step 2, the effects of polyculturalism, multiculturalism, and colorblindness became nonsignificant while the interaction between race and polyculturalism was significant, the same as in Study 2. Follow-up regression analyses ran separately for Black and White Americans revealed polyculturalism as a significant predictor of interest in diversity for White ($b = .38$, $p = .010$) but not Black Americans ($b = .07$, $p = .701$). Polyculturalism was significantly associated

Table 5
Regression Analyses for Study 3 (N = 101)

	Social dominance orientation		Interest in diversity		Appreciation for diversity		Comfort with differences		Affirmative action		Legalizing immigrants	
	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b
Step 1	.12*		.14**		.06		.10*		.21**		.10*	
Race (White)		.02		−.28**		−.08		.09		−.35**		−.17†
Polyculturalism		−.27**		.20*		.22*		.29**		.23*		.26*
Multiculturalism		−.13		−.17†		−.06		0.11		−.21*		−.14
Colorblindness		.07		−.14		−.11		−.10		−.17†		−.10
Step 2	.00		.06†		.01		.04		.02		.03	
Race (White)		.02		−.28**		−.08		.10		−.35**		−.17†
Polyculturalism		−.26*		.05		.21†		.39**		.23*		.20
Multiculturalism		−.14		−.17		−.02		−.04		−.33*		−.02
Colorblindness		.06		.04		−.05		−.12		−.13		.07
Polyculturalism by race		−.02		.25*		−.03		−.22†		−.02		.01
Multiculturalism by race		.02		.02		−.05		−.09		.19		−.15
Colorblindness by race		.01		−.15		−.10		−.06		−.05		−.23

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

with greater and colorblindness was significantly associated with less appreciation for diversity in Step 1. Only polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater comfort with differences in either step. Polyculturalism was significantly associated with more support for affirmative action policies to increase representation/diversity in schools and the workforce, while multiculturalism was significantly associated with less support for that policy, and colorblindness was marginally significantly associated with less support for that policy; White Americans showed significantly less support for this policy than did Black Americans. Polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater support for legalizing the status of undocumented U.S. immigrants, and White Americans showed marginally significantly less support for this policy than did Black Americans.

As in previous studies, regression analyses controlling for the influence of SDO did not change any results for polyculturalism. Thus, polyculturalism contributes positively to diversity and policy attitudes independent of SDO and the other ideologies.

Testing for racial/ethnic differences. The overall MANOVA testing for differences between Black and White Americans in endorsement of the three ideologies was not significant, nor were the individual effects.

Discussion

Study 3 replicated previous findings and extended them to important social policies, overall showing the positive associations of polyculturalism even among a U.S.-wide sample of Black and White Americans. Consistent with Study 2, polyculturalism was significantly associated with greater interest in diversity for White Americans, but this association was nonsignificant for Black Americans, suggesting that polyculturalism may be a more important predictor of particular intergroup attitudes for White than Black Americans. Again consistent with past mixed results, multiculturalism showed some associations with positive intergroup attitudes, somewhat inconsistently, and also showed some associations with negative intergroup attitudes.

Study 4

As noted earlier, endorsement of multiculturalism or colorblindness can take different forms, and thus these ideologies have been defined and operationalized in various ways throughout their long-standing investigation (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). In our work, we designed measures of these ideologies to be free of valence issues and to fit with what we thought were promising aspects of multiculturalism (recognizing important differences between racial and ethnic groups) and colorblindness (focusing on individuals' uniqueness and cross-group commonalities) in the literature. After Studies 1 through 3 were already underway, two groups of researchers published novel studies with measures that captured various forms of colorblindness and multiculturalism from the literature, which were related to both positive and negative intergroup attitudes (Ryan et al., 2007, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006). Thus, in Study 4, to provide a fuller examination of polyculturalism in comparison to these long-standing ideologies, we sought to test whether associations that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes would still stand while statistically controlling for these other conceptualizations and measurements of multiculturalism and colorblindness, as well as measures of the assimilation ideology, which has often been studied in relation to colorblindness (e.g., see Ryan et al., 2010).

Method

Participants. In total, 500 (282 women; mean age = 19.64, *SD* = 2.52) Stony Brook University undergraduates from a wide range of classes, such as business, chemistry, history, economics, statistics, and psychology (217 White American, 187 Asian American, 34 Latino American, 31 Black American, and 31 Other or Mixed) completed surveys in classrooms for course credit.

Measures. Participants completed the same measures as those used in Studies 1 and 2: polyculturalism (α = .85), SDO (α = .93), and MGUDS (αs = .87 for Diversity of Contact, .81 for Relativistic Appreciation, .80 for Comfort with Differences).

Multiculturalism. Participants completed three measures of multiculturalism. The first was a 6-item measure created and used by Wolsko et al. (2006; e.g., "In order to live in a cooperative society, everyone must learn the unique histories and cultural experiences of different ethnic groups"; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .84$), which taps into several forms of multiculturalism, including recognizing important differences among racial/ethnic groups, appreciating the contributions of different racial/ethnic groups, as well as emphasizing the maintenance of customs and traditions from people's cultures. The second was a 5-item measure created and used by Ryan et al. (2007, 2010; e.g., "Recognizing that there are differences between groups"; 1 = Not at all likely to improve interethnic relations in the United States, 7 = Very Likely to improve interethnic relations in the United States; $\alpha = .83$), which taps into the recognizing important differences and appreciating the contributions of different racial/ethnic groups forms of multiculturalism. The third was a 5-item measure that Ryan et al. (2010) adapted from a measure created by Berry and Kalin (1995; e.g., "Ethnic minorities should be helped to preserve their cultural heritage in the U.S."; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .79$), which taps into the recognizing important differences, appreciation contributions, and maintenance of cultures forms of multiculturalism.

Colorblindness. Participants completed a 5-item measure of colorblindness created and used by Ryan et al. (2007, 2010; e.g., "Recognizing that all people are basically the same regardless of their ethnicity"; 1 = Not at all likely to improve interethnic relations in the United States, 7 = Very Likely to improve interethnic relations in the United States; $\alpha = .79$), which taps into the uniqueness of individuals and commonalities across groups forms of colorblindness.

Assimilation. Additionally, participants completed two measures of the assimilation ideology, which has been associated with colorblindness by some researchers, and thought of in contrast to multiculturalism (e.g., Zárate & Shaw, 2010). The first was a 6-item measure created and used by Wolsko et al. (2006; e.g., "Children from all ethnic groups should be taught to adopt mainstream American values from an early age"; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .84$), and the second was a 4-item measure that Ryan et al. (2010) adapted from a multiculturalism measure created by Berry and Kalin (1995; e.g., "It is best for the U.S. if people forget their different cultural backgrounds as soon as possible"; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .77$).

Evaluative bias. Participants also completed a 6-item measure of evaluative bias or social distance created and used by Wolsko et al., (2006; e.g., "I would prefer to live in a neighborhood with people of my same ethnic origin"; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; $\alpha = .85$), which is similar to the willingness for intergroup contact (behavioral intentions) measure used in Study 1.

Results

Bivariate correlations, means, and standard deviations for all study variables for all participants together can be found in Table 6, and separately by race/ethnicity of participant can be found in Table 7. We conducted an exploratory factor analysis (principal components extraction) with all of the included measures of all four ideologies (polyculturalism, multiculturalism, colorblindness,

assimilation) to test whether polyculturalism is a distinct ideology from the other ideologies. A secondary goal of the factor analysis was to examine whether the different measures that are intended to measure a single ideology (e.g., for multiculturalism and assimilation) seem to constitute a single construct representing that one ideology and thus could be combined in subsequent planned regression analyses. Examination of eigenvalues and a scree plot suggested extraction of four expected factors representing each of the four ideologies. The four unrotated factors accounted for 50% of the variance. The eigenvalues for these four factors in order were 9.48, 4.04, 2.39, and 2.13, and the percentages of variance accounted for were 26, 11, 7, and 6%. Varimax-rotated factor loadings on the four factors are shown in Table 8. The first factor had high loadings on all of the items from all three measures of multiculturalism. The second factor had high loadings on both measures of assimilation. The third factor had high loadings on all of the items from our polyculturalism scale. The fourth factor had high loadings on all of the items from Ryan et al.'s (2010) colorblindness scale. This factor analysis, combined with the factor analyses from Studies 1 through 3, confirmed that polyculturalism is indeed a distinct factor from measures of multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilation tested across these studies. It also suggests that multiple measures of the same ideology do constitute the same factor and therefore could be combined for later analyses (see regression analyses section). As well, these findings suggest that consistent with past findings, assimilation is a distinct ideology from colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2010).

Overall, participants again strongly endorsed polyculturalism and multiculturalism in all its forms of measurement. Participants also endorsed Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness. Participants did not endorse assimilation ideology either way that it was measured. Polyculturalism as well as all the measures of multiculturalism and Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness were significantly correlated with lower SDO, greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity and differences, and lower evaluative bias. Both measures of assimilation were significantly correlated with greater SDO, less interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity, and greater evaluative bias.

Testing the unique associations of polyculturalism with intergroup attitudes. Similar to Studies 1, 2, and 3, we sought to test polyculturalism's unique associations with intergroup attitudes while controlling for other intergroup ideologies, but in this study, we compared polyculturalism to other established measures of intergroup ideologies, which were developed after the first three studies were already underway. Based on the results of the factor analysis, to simplify the regression analyses, we created composite measures of multiculturalism (a mean of the items from all three measures of multiculturalism included) and assimilation (a mean of the items from both measures of assimilation included). These composite measures demonstrated good internal reliability (αs = .91 for multiculturalism and .85 for assimilation). We conducted a series of regression analyses in which Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness and the composite scales of multiculturalism and assimilation were entered into Step 1 of the regressions; our measure of polyculturalism was entered in Step 2, with SDO, the three subscales of MGUDS, and the measure of evaluative bias as the five outcomes (see Table 9). In line with findings from Studies 1 through 3, polyculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO, greater appreciation for and comfort with diversity

Table 6
Bivariate Correlations, Means, and SDs of Study Variables for Study 4 (N = 500)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Polyculturalism	—											
2. Multiculturalism (Wolsko et al., 2006)	.46**	—										
3. Multiculturalism (Ryan et al., 2010)	.40**	.59**	—									
4. Multiculturalism (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ryan et al., 2010)	.35**	.68**	.52**	—								
5. Colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2010)	.24**	.30**	.46**	.27**	—							
6. Assimilation (Wolsko et al., 2006)	−.09*	−.19**	−.14**	−.30**	−.02	—						
7. Assimilation (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ryan et al., 2010)	−.26**	−.37**	−.25**	−.38**	−.02	.49**	—					
8. Social dominance orientation	−.35**	−.50**	−.41**	−.52**	−.40**	.32**	.43**	—				
9. Interest in diversity	.32**	.44**	.32**	.48**	.14**	−.29**	−.36**	−.40**	—			
10. Appreciation for diversity	.42**	.45**	.43**	.43**	.21**	−.15**	−.17**	−.37**	.62**	—		
11. Comfort with differences	.43**	.35**	.29**	.28**	.21**	−.19**	−.38**	−.50**	.35**	.31**	—	
12. Evaluative bias	−.28**	−.28**	−.16**	−.24**	−.18**	.24**	.31**	.39**	−.43**	−.24**	−.57**	—
Means	5.70	5.36	5.47	5.21	5.01	4.14	3.39	−1.61	4.40	4.61	4.73	3.31
SDs	0.88	1.01	1.13	1.01	1.29	1.25	1.27	1.07	1.03	0.82	0.86	1.30

$* p < .05.$ $** p < .01.$

and differences, as well as lower evaluative bias, even while controlling for the other three ideologies, although the relationship with greater interest in diversity became nonsignificant. Replicating past work demonstrating some positive intergroup implications of multiculturalism, the composite scale of multiculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO, and greater interest in and appreciation for diversity. Consistent with results from Study 1 and some positive intergroup implications of colorblindness, Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness was significantly associated with lower SDO, greater comfort with differences, and lower evaluative bias. Consistent with past work demonstrating negative implications of assimilation ideology, the composite assimilation measure was significantly associated with greater SDO, less interest in and comfort with diversity, and greater evaluative bias.

As in previous studies, regression analyses controlling for the influence of SDO did not change any results for polyculturalism. Thus, polyculturalism contributes to greater appreciation for and comfort with differences and diversity, as well as lower evaluative bias, independent of SDO, and the colorblind, multicultural, and assimilation ideologies.

Testing for racial/ethnic differences. The overall MANOVA testing for racial/ethnic differences in endorsement of the ideologies (including polyculturalism, Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness, and the composite measures of multiculturalism and assimilation) was significant, ($p < .001$). In this sample, there were significant differences by race/ethnicity in endorsement of all four ideologies (ps = .028 for polyculturalism, .016 for colorblindness, <.001 for multiculturalism, and .007 for assimilation). Black Americans tended to endorse polyculturalism as well as Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness to the greatest extent. Consistent with past work, White Americans tended to endorse the composite measure of multiculturalism less than did all other groups. Also consistent with past work, White and Asian Americans endorsed the composite measure of assimilation to a greater extent than did Latino and Black Americans.

General Discussion

Across four studies with different racial/ethnic groups, both college and community samples, and a variety of established indicators of intergroup attitudes, greater endorsement of polyculturalism was consistently associated with more positive intergroup attitudes. Moreover, polyculturalism accounted for a unique amount of variance in these intergroup variables, even after controlling for the contributions of other relevant ideologies (colorblind, multicultural, and assimilation ideologies, each measured in multiple ways), and long-standing intergroup-relevant variables (SDO and RWA). Factor analyses in each study also support that polyculturalism is a distinct ideology from multicultural, colorblind, and assimilation ideologies. Taken together, consistent findings across studies suggest that polyculturalism is a unique belief with potentially far-reaching implications for general beliefs about social inequality and diversity, willingness to have contact with diverse groups members, and social policies across diverse individuals.

Limitations and Future Directions

Overall, findings suggest that endorsement of polyculturalism is associated with positive intergroup attitudes for both dominant and marginalized groups. However, in Studies 2 and 3 with the adult community samples, polyculturalism had a nonsignificant relationship with interest in diversity for Black Americans, while having a significant positive relationship for White Americans. It seems possible that for particular intergroup attitudes, particularly feelings toward diversity, polyculturalism may be more relevant or important for White Americans, while it does not matter as much to these attitudes for Black Americans. To increase our understanding of polyculturalism and its generalizability, future work should continue to study the relationship that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes across diverse samples in different parts of the United States and the world.

The current studies were all correlational, limiting causal conclusions. In this study, we were able to control for the confounding

Table 7

Bivariate Correlations, Means, and SDs of Study Variables for Study 4 for Asian (N = 187), Black (N = 31), Latino (N = 34), and White (N = 217) Americans

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Polyculturalism	—	.71** (.47**)	.67** (.42**)	.59** (.42**)	.55** (.25**)	-.15 (-.09)	-.52** (-.25**)	-.31† (-.33**)	.45** (.34**)	.47** (.46**)	.45** (.49**)	-.42** (-.27**)
2. Multiculturalism (Wolsko et al., 2006)	.47** (.56**)	—	.65** (.56**)	.75** (.69**)	.34* (.29**)	-.19 (-.19**)	-.63** (-.47**)	-.50** (-.48**)	.58** (.43**)	.58** (.36**)	.38** (.56**)	-.52** (-.37**)
3. Multiculturalism (Ryan et al., 2010)	.38** (.54**)	.65** (.27)	—	.43* (.52**)	.48** (.42**)	-.10 (-.18**)	-.53** (-.35**)	-.24 (-.36**)	.24 (.38**)	.40* (.45**)	.37* (.40**)	-.26 (-.26**)
4. Multiculturalism (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ryan et al., 2010)	.33** (.51**)	.59** (.64**)	.52** (.38*)	—	.28 (.32*)	-.17 (-.37**)	-.56** (-.54**)	-.33† (-.59**)	.42* (.54**)	.55** (.42**)	.09 (.54**)	-.18 (-.46**)
5. Colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2010)	.12 (.38**)	.38** (.08)	.48** (.62**)	.26** (.25)	—	-.15 (-.15*)	-.13 (-.12†)	-.05 (-.45**)	.24 (.28**)	.46** (.21**)	.32† (.26**)	-.21 (-.26**)
6. Assimilation (Wolsko et al., 2006)	-.10 (-.06)	-.12 (.20)	-.00 (-.20)	-.15* (.07)	.20** (.04)	—	.27 (.51**)	.06 (.36**)	-.12 (-.39**)	-.16 (-.13†)	-.05 (-.25**)	-.01 (-.26**)
7. Assimilation (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ryan et al., 2010)	-.25* (-.00)	-.29** (.02)	-.14† (.09)	-.16* (.02)	.10 (.11)	.46** (.65**)	—	.51** (.53**)	-.40* (-.39**)	-.27 (-.15*)	-.38* (-.47**)	.29† (.43**)
8. Social dominance orientation	-.40** (-.21)	-.55** (-.34†)	-.49** (.01)	-.46** (-.25)	-.39* (.05)	.25** (-.02)	.31** (.06)	—	-.51** (-.40**)	-.31† (-.27**)	-.31† (-.64**)	.41* (.50**)
9. Interest in diversity	.27** (.55**)	.37* (.65**)	.24* (.16)	.35* (.40*)	-.06 (.06)	-.16* (.07)	-.31* (-.11)	-.31* (-.44*)	—	.67** (.56**)	.41* (.43**)	-.50** (-.58**)
10. Appreciation for diversity	.36** (.61**)	.52** (.62**)	.45** (.20)	.41** (.37†)	.20** (.08)	-.19* (.07)	-.22** (.02)	-.48** (-.51**)	.67** (.82**)	—	.30** (.47**)	-.30† (-.34**)
11. Comfort with differences	.34** (.24)	.22** (.13)	.25** (-.21)	.11 (-.06)	.11 (-.16)	-.16* (-.32†)	-.35** (-.05)	-.39† (-.61**)	.27* (.31†)	.30** (.47**)	—	-.56** (-.62**)
12. Evaluative bias	-.22** (-.39*)	-.10 (-.27)	-.01 (.10)	.05 (-.01)	-.03 (.02)	.01 (.45**)	.11 (.30)	.14† (.40*)	-.13† (-.38*)	-.06 (-.53**)	-.49** (-.61**)	—
Means (and Standard Deviations) Asian Americans	5.59 (0.88)	5.52 (0.90)	5.54 (1.08)	5.35 (0.88)	4.80 (1.27)	3.92 (1.16)	3.49 (1.24)	-1.56 (0.95)	4.43 (0.92)	4.66 (0.82)	4.53 (0.84)	3.50 (1.16)
Means (and SDs) Black Americans	5.93 (0.69)	5.52 (0.87)	5.80 (1.12)	5.54 (0.89)	5.45 (1.12)	3.67 (1.12)	2.73 (1.23)	-2.07 (0.79)	4.85 (0.77)	4.55 (0.88)	4.88 (0.96)	2.83 (1.26)
Means (and SDs) Latino Americans	5.51 (0.97)	5.41 (0.99)	5.55 (1.06)	5.33 (0.97)	5.11 (1.15)	3.84 (0.87)	3.14 (1.00)	-1.97 (0.85)	4.66 (0.74)	4.59 (0.70)	4.84 (0.75)	2.56 (1.04)
Means (and SDs) White Americans	5.77 (0.86)	5.17 (1.08)	5.34 (1.18)	4.99 (1.09)	5.11 (1.32)	4.43 (1.32)	3.45 (1.29)	-1.54 (1.17)	4.21 (1.17)	4.56 (0.83)	4.83 (0.85)	3.41 (1.39)

Note. Correlations on the left side of the diagonal are for Asian Americans (and Black Americans in parentheses); Correlations on the right side of the diagonal are for Latino Americans (and White Americans in parentheses).
† $p < .10.$ * $p < .05.$ ** $p < .01.$

Table 8

Study 4 Factor Analysis With Varimax Rotation for 4 Factors (N = 500)

	1	2	3	4
Rosenthal and Levy (2010) polyculturalism				
Item 1	.13	−.03	.65	.06
Item 2	.19	−.06	.79	.08
Item 3	.23	−.07	.79	.11
Item 4	.25	−.05	.80	.08
Item 5	.20	−.05	.80	.07
Wolsko et al. (2006) multiculturalism				
Item 1	.60	−.03	.30	.10
Item 2	.73	−.05	.21	.07
Item 3	.70	−.02	.05	−.03
Item 4	.71	.04	.07	−.03
Item 5	.64	−.23	.21	.13
Item 6	.60	−.24	.25	.09
Ryan et al. (2010) multiculturalism				
Item 1	.51	−.22	.17	.41
Item 2	.52	.03	.17	.24
Item 3	.57	−.08	.13	.39
Item 4	.51	.06	.13	.32
Item 5	.62	−.02	.16	.33
Ryan et al. (2010) adaptation of Berry and Kalin (1995) multiculturalism				
Item 1	.63	−.09	.14	.05
Item 2	.64	−.18	.30	.17
Item 3	.67	−.29	−.06	−.01
Item 4	.51	−.14	.13	.08
Item 5	.47	−.24	.02	.02
Ryan et al. (2010) colorblindness				
Item 1	.20	−.07	.26	.57
Item 2	.18	−.00	.10	.74
Item 3	.32	−.07	.16	.68
Item 4	.04	.08	.02	.72
Item 5	−.01	.11	−.11	.70
Wolsko et al. (2006) assimilation				
Item 1	.25	.55	.09	−.15
Item 2	−.17	.63	.08	−.01
Item 3	.08	.65	.14	.05
Item 4	−.14	.82	−.03	.02
Item 5	−.14	.81	−.07	−.09
Item 6	−.04	.78	−.06	−.02
Ryan et al. (2010) adaptation of Berry and Kalin (1995) assimilation				
Item 1	−.28	.43	−.21	.18
Item 2	−.22	.57	−.19	.08
Item 3	−.23	.61	−.23	.05
Item 4	−.14	.49	−.10	.02

role of several variables, including SDO and RWA, and in other work (Rosenthal et al., 2011), the relationship that polyculturalism has with other forms of prejudice has been examined while controlling for SDO, conservatism, and ethnic identity. Future work should continue to control for confounding variables in examining the relationship between polyculturalism and intergroup attitudes, as well as experimentally test for the direction of effects. Experimental work will also be essential to understanding if and how polyculturalism can potentially be used to improve intergroup attitudes.

While findings in this article consistently supported that polyculturalism is related to positive intergroup attitudes, polyculturalism could also have unintended negative consequences. For

example, it is possible that if someone greatly values and takes pride in an element of their culture that they associate with only their ingroup, the focus of polyculturalism on the influences that other groups may have had on such a product could make that person people feel defensive or angry. In this vein, future work should explore issues of ethnic identification in relation to polyculturalism and the other ideologies (e.g., see Morrison et al., 2010; Ryan et al., 2010; Verkuyten, 2009; Zárate & Shaw, 2010). As already mentioned, in some other work (Rosenthal, Levy, & Militano, under review; Rosenthal et al., 2011), the relationships that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes have been tested while controlling for ethnic identification, and this work has found polyculturalism to be unrelated to ethnic identification. At the same time, some findings suggest that ethnic identification could be a moderator of some of the relationships that polyculturalism has with intergroup attitudes (Rosenthal et al., under review; Rosenthal et al., 2011), suggesting this is an important variable to continue to study in future work on polyculturalism with diverse participants. As well, the interactions that different groups have had throughout history have not always been positive, and a focus on such negative interactions (e.g., slavery, colonization) may result in intergroup hostility and resentment. It is also possible that endorsement of polyculturalism could have negative consequences for intergroup relations if people are thinking about the possibility of all cultures becoming too similar to each other or indistinguishable because of widespread mutual influence, which may be a contemporary concern with increased globalization. These and other possible weaknesses or pitfalls of polyculturalism require attention (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Still, to date, findings across these and other studies have not found polyculturalism to be associated with any negative intergroup attitudes (also see Rosenthal et al., 2011).

Because work on other relevant ideologies such as multiculturalism and colorblindness have used a wide variety of measures, it might be worthwhile in future work to examine other measures of polyculturalism. In the present investigation we have used a neutral or valence-free measure of polyculturalism (also see Rosenthal et al., 2011). Some people who endorse polyculturalism may almost exclusively focus on positive interactions among groups, which might foster more positive intergroup attitudes than a more neutral endorsement of polyculturalism; at the same time, a focus only on positive interactions and connections might ultimately have rebound effects because it is essentially a superficial or sugar-coated view of intergroup interactions. Moreover, some people who endorse polyculturalism may focus their attention on the negative interactions among groups, which would highlight instances of prejudice and discrimination, possibly resulting in greater intergroup hostility. Consistent with past work on multiculturalism and colorblindness, which have been shown to have different forms and been measured in multiple ways, it is important for future work to explore which elements or forms of polyculturalism have positive versus negative implications for intergroup attitudes (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010).

It seems important also to consider the potential reach of endorsement of polyculturalism to other forms of prejudice and attitudes. For example, future work may also want to continue to explore the implications of polyculturalism for improving attitudes across numerous social categories, including gender, social class,

Table 9
Regression Analyses for Study 4 (N = 500)

	Social dominance orientation		Interest in diversity		Appreciation for diversity		Comfort with differences		Evaluative bias	
	ΔR^2	*b*	ΔR^2	*b*	ΔR^2	*b*	ΔR^2	*b*	ΔR^2	*b*
Step 1	.41**		.27**		.26**		.17**		.10**	
Multiculturalism composite		−.33**		.41**		.49**		.23**		−.11*
Colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2007)		−.25**		−.03		.02		.11*		−.11*
Assimilation composite		.32**		−.22**		−.02		−.21**		.23**
Step 2	.01*		.00		.02**		.08**		.02**	
Multiculturalism composite		−.29**		.39**		.42**		.09†		−.04
Colorblindness (Ryan et al., 2007)		−.24**		−.03		.01		.09*		−.10*
Assimilation composite		.32**		−.22		−.01		−.21**		.23**
Polyculturalism		−.10*		.05		.16**		.31**		−.16**

† $p < .10$.   * $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

sexual orientation, or physical ability (e.g., Banks, 2004; Prashad, 2001; Zirkel, 2008). Indeed, some work has found that endorsement polyculturalism is associated with less prejudice toward gay men and lesbians (Rosenthal et al., 2011) as well as less sexist attitudes (Rosenthal et al., under review), suggesting exploring the connection between polyculturalism and other forms of prejudice is a fruitful line of inquiry.

Conclusion

The results of the current investigation represent an exciting first step toward showing the promise of polyculturalism as an ideology that has unique associations with positive intergroup attitudes, beyond the contributions of other well-studied ideologies and relevant variables. At the same time, we do not envision polyculturalism as "replacing" colorblindness and multiculturalism, nor do we think a line of inquiry suggesting that is desirable. Instead, we think findings from the present investigation, along with past findings, converge to suggest that no single ideology is likely ideal in all contexts, societies, and for all people, and that each ideology may make a unique contribution to intergroup attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Rosenthal & Levy, 2010; Ryan et al., 2007; Verkuyten, 2006; Wolsko et al., 2000; Zárate & Shaw, 2010). As well, our work along with other work (e.g., Ryan et al., 2007) suggests that these ideologies do not necessarily oppose each other, and can even be positively associated with each other, as people likely see merit in and simultaneously endorse multiple ideologies. And, while each ideology has some strengths and weaknesses, it is possible that endorsement of a combined or hybrid ideology that incorporates the strengths of polyculturalism, multiculturalism, and colorblindness may actually be ideal (for a review, see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). We look forward to future work on intergroup ideologies involving the study of polyculturalism, in the hopes that research on intergroup ideologies can continue contributing to a greater understanding of intergroup attitudes and relations in our diverse world.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley.

Altemeyer, B. (2006). *The authoritarians.* Retrieved from http://members.shaw.ca/jeanaltemeyer/drbob/TheAuthoritarians.pdf

Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical developments, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research in multicultural education* (pp. 3–30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Berry, J., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 27,* 301–320. doi:10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301

Bigler, R. S. (1999). The use of multicultural curricula and materials to counter racism in children. *Journal of Social Issues, 55,* 687–705. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00142

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis. Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281–302). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17,* 475–482. doi:10.1177/0146167291175001

Brown, R., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29,* 741–764. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199908/09)29:5/6<741::AID-EJSP972>3.0.CO;2-8

Brown, R., & Wade, G. (1987). Superordinate goals and intergroup behaviour: The effect of role ambiguity and status on intergroup attitudes and task performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17,* 131–142. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420170202

Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (2006). *The social psychology of culture.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (2007). Cultural processes: Basic principles. In E. T. Higgins & A. E. Kruglanski (Eds.), Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

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

Deschamps, J.-C., & Brown, R. (1983). Superordinate goals and intergroup conflict. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 22,* 189–195. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1983.tb00583.x

Esses, V. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 1202–1214. doi:10.1177/01461672022812006

Esses, V. M., & Gardner, R. C. (1996). Multiculturalism in Canada: Context and current status. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 28,* 145–152. doi:10.1037/h0084934 doi:10.1037/h0084934

Fiske, S. T., Lin, M., & Neuberg, S. L. (1999). The continuum model: Ten years later. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp. 231–254). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Flint, K. (2006). Indian-African encounters: Polyculturalism and African therapeutics in Natal, South Africa, 1886-1950s. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 32,* 367–385. doi10.1080/03057070600656382

Fuertes, J. N., Miville, M. L., Mohr, J. J., Sedlacek, W. E., & Gretchen, D. (2000). Factor structure and short form of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33,* 157–169.

Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model.* Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Garcia, E. E., & Hurtado, A. (1995). Becoming American: A review of current research on the development of racial and ethnic identity in children. In W. D. Hawley & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 163–184). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gonzales, N. A., & Cauce, A. M. (1995). Ethnic identity and multicultural competence: Dilemmas and challenges for minority youth. In W. D. Hawley & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 131–162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the "contact hypothesis." In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1–44). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., & Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000), Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55,* 709–720. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 143–156.

Kelley, R. D. G. (1999). The people in me. *Utne Reader, 95,* 79–81.

Mahalingam, R. (2006). Cultural psychology of immigrants: An introduction. In R. Mahalingam (Ed.), *Cultural psychology of immigrants* (pp. 1–14). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Mahalingam, R. (2008). Power, social marginality, and the cultural psychology of identities at the cultural contact zones. *Human Development, 51,* 368–373. doi:10.1159/000170898

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

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. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 59–70. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

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

Prashad, V. (2001). *Everybody was Kung Fu fighting: Afro-Asian connections and the myth of cultural purity.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Prashad, V. (2003). Bruce Lee and the anti-imperialism of Kung Fu: A polycultural adventure. *Positions, 11,* 51–89.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 741–763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

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

Rosenthal, L., Levy, S. R., & Militano, M. (under review). Polyculturalism and sexist attitudes.

Rosenthal, L., Levy, S. R., & Moss, I. (2011). Polyculturalism and openness about criticizing one's culture: Implications for sexual prejudice. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations.* Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1368430211412801

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 4,* 215–246.

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., Kelly-Vance, L., Ryalls, B. O., & Nero, C. (2010). Parent involvement and views of school success: The role of parents' Latino and White American cultural orientations. *Psychology in the Schools, 47,* 391–405.

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 ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10,* 617–637. doi:10.1177/1368430207084105

Schofield, J. W. (1986). Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 231–254). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 374–390.

Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 995–1013.

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. (2006). Multicultural recognition and ethnic minority rights: A social identity perspective. In W. Stoebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 148–184). London: Wiley.

Verkuyten, M. (2009). Self-esteem and multiculturalism: An examination among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43,* 419–427. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.013

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

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,* 536–654. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.635

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

Zárate, M. A., & Shaw, M. P. (2010). The role of cultural inertia in reactions to immigration on the U. S./Mexico border. *Journal of Social Issues, 66,* 45–57. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01632.x

Zárate, M. A. (2009). Racism in the 21st century. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 387–406). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Zirkel, S., & Cantor, N. (2004). 50 Years after Brown v. Board of Education: The

Promise and Challenge of Multicultural Education. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 1–16. doi:10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00096.x

Zirkel, S. (2008). Creating more effective multiethnic schools. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 2,* 187–241.

Zirkel, S. (2005) Ongoing issues of racial and ethnic stigma in education 50 years after Brown v Board The Urban Review. *Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 37,* 107–126. doi:10.1007/s11256-005-0004-4

Appendix

Intergroup Ideologies Measures

Polyculturalism Items

1. Different cultural groups impact one another, even if members of those groups are not completely aware of the impact.

2. Although ethnic groups may seem to have some clear distinguishing qualities, ethnic groups have interacted with one another and thus have influenced each other in ways that may not be readily apparent or discussed.

3. There are many connections between different cultures.

4. Different cultures and ethnic groups probably share some traditions and perspectives because these groups have impacted each other to some extent over the years.

5. Different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups influence each other.

Multiculturalism Items

1. All cultures have their own distinct traditions and perspectives.

2. There are boundaries between different ethnic groups because of the differences between cultures.

3. There are differences between racial and ethnic groups, which are important to recognize.

4. Each ethnic group has its own strengths that can be identified.

5. Each racial and ethnic group has important distinguishing characteristics.

Colorblindness Items

1. Ethnic and cultural group categories are not very important for understanding or making decisions about people.

2. It is really not necessary to pay attention to people's racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds because it doesn't tell you much about who they are.

3. At our core, all human beings are really all the same, so racial and ethnic categories do not matter.

4. Racial and ethnic group memberships do not matter very much to who we are.

5. All human beings are individuals, and therefore race and ethnicity are not important.