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Abstract

The present research identifies a novel measure of perceived intentionality of societal discrimination and demonstrates its value in predicting individuals' preference for and the effectiveness of different approaches to improving intergroup relations. Study 1 creates and validates a measure of perceived intentionality of societal discrimination, the extent to which an individual believes discrimination in society as a whole is generally caused by intentional actions. Individuals' responses on this measure are associated with their preferences for an approach to intergroup relations that advocates looking beyond differences, rather than recognizing differences. Studies 2 and 3 use experimental designs to investigate perceived intentionality of societal bias as a moderator of the effect of these approaches on attitudes toward interracial interactions and on comfort with conversations about race. Across the studies, the greater the extent to which participants perceive discrimination in society to be intentional, the more an approach advocating looking beyond differences is preferred and effective.
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1 | Introduction

Intentionality is a critical concept with important implications that have been studied across many domains. Often, the perceived intentionality of an action influences preferred remedies. In the present work, I introduce the construct of perceived intentionality of societal bias and discrimination, develop a scale to measure it, and demonstrate its value in predicting preference for and effectiveness of approaches to improving intergroup relations, both in general and in reference to specific situations.

1.1 Intentionality

The intentionality behind an action often influences perceptions of that action, both in the law and in everyday judgments. A legal distinction is drawn between different crimes, based on the court’s determination of the defendant’s intentionality. Inferred intentionality is used to determine whether a death is murder or manslaughter, and within these, various degrees, or voluntary or involuntary. In other domains, too, perceptions of intentionality can be vital. In the classic “trolley problem” and its variants, a series of ethics thought experiments, an individual must decide whether to allow a train to continue down its present track and kill five people, or intervene and direct the train onto another track, where it will kill one person. Though there is no one “correct” resolution to this dilemma, our moral judgment of the individual depends highly on whether or not they take intentional action. Even for identical actions, a perception that it is intentional may make the consequences seem more harmful. For example, Ames & Fiske (2013) find that people assign more blame to a nursing home employee who gave residents inappropriate medications when they are perceived to have done so intentionally, rather than accidentally.

Whether strict legal definitions or lay theories, it is clear that the intentionality behind an individual’s action matters to us, even when the consequences of that ac-
tion are the same. We can extend this logic to judgments of the intentionality behind actions in society in general. Because judgments of individual intentionality influence preferred remedies—actions that the individual should take to correct the wrong—we can expect that judgments of societal intentionality will influence preferred "societal remedies," that is, how we think society should act in order to correct a societal wrong. Such societal-level intentionality could depend on the sum of individual actions, or might include the way in which society and its institutions are structured and maintained. In the present research, I examine the perceived intentionality of societal discrimination, and its influence on preferences for, and effectiveness of, approaches society could take to improve intergroup relations.

1.2 Intentionality of Societal Discrimination

By intentionality of societal discrimination, I refer to the extent to which discrimination in society is perceived to be deliberate and intentional, rather than accidental and unintentional. Perceived intentionality of societal bias reflects the understanding an individual holds about the way the world operates, and represents their perceptions of the qualitative nature of societal bias and discrimination: their beliefs about the form that discrimination generally takes in society as a whole.

1.2.1 Worldviews

Researchers have identified numerous constructs that seek to capture elements of individuals' lay beliefs about the way the world works. Many of these relate to bias and discrimination. However, the perceived intentionality of societal bias is a measure of the perceived nature and form that discrimination takes, in comparison to other measures that relate to the amount or inevitability of discrimination.

A collection of other worldviews and beliefs about society relate to how outcomes are determined and why differential outcomes may exist. For example, Protestant Work Ethic is the belief that hard work is what leads to good outcomes, and laziness to poor outcomes (Weber 1905 via Furnham, 1990). Belief in meritocracy is the belief
that everyone has the opportunity for their competence to lead to advancement, and similarly Belief in a Just World is the belief that the world’s systems are already just and fair (Lerner, 1980). Broadly, beliefs about procedural justice (Folger, 1977) can capture whether an individual believes that the processes by which outcomes are determined are fair to all people. Individuals who highly endorse Protestant Work Ethic, have a strong belief in meritocracy and belief in a just world, and who believe that procedural justice is generally high tend to take the view that that differences in outcomes are individually deserved, due to differences in character or behavior. This implicitly suggests that society is fair and without bias, and thus that there is relatively less discrimination in the world. Therefore, individual differences in these constructs will tend to influence the perceived amount of discrimination, rather than its perceived intentionality.

These beliefs about how outcomes are determined can be compared to other measures of an individual’s worldview that pertain to the nature of differences between groups, for example, Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), the belief that groups should exist in a hierarchy, and race essentialism (Hong, Chao, & No, 2009), the belief that racial groups are inherently and biologically separate. Individuals who endorse these measures take the view that differences in group outcomes are inevitable and justified based on inherent differences between those groups. When it comes to how to improve intergroup relations, there may be a main effect of endorsement of these measures, in that individuals high in these measures may believe that intergroup relations do not need to be improved or that efforts to change existing inequities may be pointless because those differences are inherent to group characteristics. Individual differences in these constructs will tend to influence the perceived inevitability or justifiability of discrimination.

Perceptions of the amount of discrimination that exists, and whether it is inevitable that it exists are important in understanding how to improve intergroup relations. Yet, the perceived nature and form of discrimination no doubt also impacts judgments of effectiveness of approaches that might be used to remedy it. The perceived intentionality of societal bias and discrimination reflects such a belief about
what form bias and discrimination typically take.

1.2.2 Personal attitudes

Perceived intentionality of bias and discrimination in society varies across individuals, but is distinct from personal bias or attitudes toward outgroups. There are many components of personal attitudes toward outgroups, and toward intergroup interaction. Constructs that measure these kinds of personal attitudes include modern racism (McConahay, 1986) and symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), which seek to reveal masked racist beliefs, in a society where overt, "old-fashioned" racism is condemned. On the other hand, research has drawn a distinction between implicit and explicit bias (Nosek, 2007). Explicit bias, such as old-fashioned, modern, and symbolic racism, is that which is consciously expressed, whereas implicit bias refers to uncontrollable processes and associations. However, they all represent personal beliefs about outgroups and how one should treat outgroup members, rather than about how society as a whole treats members of different groups.

Other individual attitudes relate to individuals’ participation in interracial interaction, such as interracial anxiety (Plant & Devine, 2003), avoidance of mentioning race (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008), and avoidance focus in interracial interactions (Plant & Butz, 2006). Additionally, researchers have distinguished between internal and external motivation to avoid prejudice (Plant & Devine, 1998). Scores on these measures may affect how an individual thinks about interracial interaction and how they will behave in such an interaction.

These constructs vary as an individual difference, and measure one dimensions of an individual’s perception of intergroup relations: attitude toward outgroup members, and attitude about one’s personal interactions with them. Intentionality of societal bias represents another individual difference in how intergroup relations are perceived in general, but reflects an individual’s beliefs about discrimination in society as a whole, rather than measuring their personally-held attitudes toward outgroups or behaviors in intergroup interactions.

Overall, while some worldviews measure the amount of discrimination individuals
perceive, and many individual difference constructs measure the amount and type of bias held by individuals, the perceived intentionality of societal bias indicates an individual’s belief about the form that discrimination generally takes in society. Beliefs about the form that discrimination takes should influence ideas about how best to reduce such discrimination; different forms of discrimination call for different solutions. In particular, the perceived intentionality of societal bias may predict preferences for potential remedies as well as the effectiveness of different approaches in improving intergroup relations.

1.3 Approaches to improving intergroup relations

Researchers have long wrestled with the goal of improving intergroup, and specifically interracial, relations. Many approaches to improving intergroup relations have been proposed, including various instantiations of colorblindness, assimilationism, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism (see Plaut, 2010, for a review). Within the United States, the popularity of these approaches has waxed and waned over time. A broad historical trend in the U.S. over the past century has seen a shift from a generally colorblind attitude toward a more multicultural approach. The Civil Rights movement in the mid-1900s often promoted colorblindness as the path to equality. However, race-conscious policies that were introduced later, such as affirmative action, explicitly deny colorblindness (Plaut, 2010). However, the swing away from colorblindness toward multiculturalism is not necessarily indicative of one-way change: a recent survey finds that Millenials express high rates of support for equality and support colorblindness, endorsing statements such as not seeing racial minority groups any differently than white people (MTV & David Binder Research Millenials and Bias study, 2014). This colorblind approach is seen in classrooms across the country as children are taught about America’s “melting pot” approach, a phrase commonly used in children’s textbooks to refer to the assimilation of new immigrants to a common American identity. Figure 1 shows how the popularity of this phrase has waxed and waned over the last century.
We can also see variation in these approaches across countries. Though in many respects their cultures are similar, the United States and Canada in general take different approaches to the variety of groups that make up the whole. In contrast to the "melting pot" of the United States, in which individual group identities are explicitly melded together into an overarching American identity, Canada is perceived to have a "mosaic" culture, in which group identities are preserved, but fit together harmoniously to make up Canadian society (e.g. Gibbon, 1938). This principle is codified in Canada's 1971 Official Multiculturalism Act.

Although all these approaches are aimed at increasing intergroup harmony, clearly there is heterogeneity. They differ along one main dimension: how they recommend treating group differences, and specifically, the extent to which they encourage individuals to either look beyond or recognize group differences. Empirical evidence comparing approaches has been mixed, and current theories about why one approach is better do not take into account variation in the cause of inequities or the current intergroup climate. They take the situation as given and look for ways in which one approach is inherently better or worse, or more or less effective. Instead, it may be that whether it is better to look beyond or recognize differences depends on the intentionality of societal bias, and that one's opinion on this matter depends on the perceived intentionality of societal bias.

1.3.1 When bias is unintentional

Unintentional societal discrimination could be the result of individual actions, driven by implicit bias or other unconscious processes. Or, it could stem from institutions or statistical discrimination (Phelps, 1972). If the problem is that discrimination is unintentional and people are unaware of it, then looking beyond differences may simply allow people to continue to ignore existing inequities. A priority may instead be to draw attention to inequalities, and therefore, differences between groups. Evidence suggests that in this case, looking beyond differences has negative consequences. A colorblind approach, relative to a multicultural approach, leads to greater implicit and explicit racial bias among White college students, leads people to pretend they do not
“see” race, even when it is costly to do so, and decreases the likelihood of recognizing overt racial discrimination (Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010). Colorblindness has even been labeled as a form of racism because it allows for the denial and therefore persistence of existing inequalities (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Indeed, endorsement of colorblind racial attitudes correlates with a belief that the world is already just and fair (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). Thus, looking beyond differences most often fails in its goals when it allows people to overlook existing discrimination. As such, when discrimination is not obvious, we may expect that recognizing differences becomes the better strategy.

When discrimination is unintentional, interactions are already on some surface level equal (or at least more so than when it is intentional), so this may present an opportunity to focus on positive aspects of intergroup interactions, a strength of approaches that recognize differences. Overall, recognizing differences has been shown to be beneficial when interactions between group members are already present, are somewhat positive, and can be emphasized. For example, endorsement of multiculturalism among white employees predicts increased engagement and decreased perception of bias among their minority coworkers (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Further, endorsement of multiculturalism predicts less ethnocentrism (Ryan et al., 2007). Endorsement of polyculturalism—focusing on interactions and connections among racial and ethnic groups—correlates with greater equality beliefs and appreciation for diversity among Americans (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012).

White Americans find it particularly threatening to be accused of racism (Frantz, Cuddy, Burnett, Ray, & Hart, 2004). Saying that bias is usually intentional allows people to pass the blame to “bad apples,” others who discriminate intentionally (Sommers & Norton, 2006; Plaut, 2010), whereas admitting that bias and discrimination are often committed unintentionally or without awareness may leave open the possibility that they themselves are complicit. If describing discrimination as unintentional is threatening, it may be best to avoid colorblindness, since the exact definition of colorblindness can be malleable, and individuals can shape its meaning to align with their
motivations. For instance, colorblindness can be interpreted to mean that inequalities in outcomes should be reduced, or that treatment of members of all groups should be alike, even if that perpetuates existing inequalities. When people feel threatened, they may shift their interpretation of colorblindness to the latter to fit their social motivations (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009). Since this interpretation of colorblindness is particularly damaging, it may be especially beneficial to avoid looking beyond differences when people feel threatened, for instance if people feel some blame for inequitable outcomes may be shifted to their shoulders.

1.3.2 When bias is intentional

When bias and discrimination are highly intentional, then individuals are consciously basing these decisions on stereotypes of outgroup members, and thus hold and act upon the idea that outgroup members are substantially different from, and inferior to, ingroup members. Thus, it should be a priority to reduce these bases for discrimination. One way to lessen the idea that outgroup and ingroup members are substantially different would simply be to emphasize the ways in which they are similar instead. Looking beyond differences could allow people to improve intergroup attitudes by emphasizing similarities (see Common Ingroup Identity Model, Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Similarly, looking beyond differences can reduce the salience of category membership—the basis for discriminatory behavior (see Decategorization Model, Brewer & Miller, 1984). Increasing self-other overlap can also reduce prejudice (Inzlicht, Gutsell, & Legault, 2012). In sum, looking beyond differences may be helpful when groups are highly fractionated and outgroup members are seen as very separate—perhaps exactly the case when discrimination is intentional.

Another way to reduce bases for intentional discrimination would be to reduce stereotyping about outgroups, or at least avoid increasing stereotyping. There is some evidence that multicultural messages advocating recognizing differences may increase these stereotypes (Wolsko et al., 2000; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007). Additionally, exposure to a multicultural message led White Americans to have higher social dominance orientation and greater prejudice, particularly when
they identified strongly with their ethnicity (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010). Thus, recognizing differences runs the risk of increasing stereotyping. When a first priority is to reduce stereotyping as a basis for discrimination, then whatever its other benefits, advocating recognizing differences may be undesirable for that reason alone.

Additionally, if bias is intentional by individuals, then by this account, “bureaucratic structures are impartial and bias is rooted in actors” (Kalev, 2014). Therefore, unseen institutions and unacknowledged discrimination are of less concern, and we can avoid one of the principal downsides of looking beyond differences, in that it allows unseen mechanisms of inequity to persist.

1.4 Hypotheses

Thus, varying perceptions of the intentionality of societal discrimination have different implications for which types of approaches are preferred and effective. As people’s perceptions of the intergroup climate change, their preference for looking beyond differences, as well as the relative effectiveness of this approach, may change. Specifically, I hypothesize that as individuals perceived societal bias to be more intentional, they will be more likely to prefer, and find more effective, an approach advocating looking beyond differences, compared to recognizing differences.

1.5 Overview of studies

I test this hypothesis across three studies. In Study 1, I create and validate a measure of perceived intentionality of societal bias, and evaluate whether this perceived intentionality predicts individuals’ preference for looking beyond or recognizing differences. In Study 2, I experimentally manipulate which approach participants envision, and demonstrate that the causal impact of exposure to these approaches on comfort in intergroup interactions is moderated by the extent to which they perceive societal bias as intentional. Finally, in Study 3 I extend these findings to participants’ will-
ingness to discuss issues of race. Together, these studies introduce a novel construct, the intentionality of societal bias, and demonstrate its value in predicting message preference and effectiveness. It also represents a previously unexamined situational moderator of approach to intergroup relations.
Study 1: Approach Preference

Study 1 had two primary goals. The first goal was to validate the measure of intentionality of societal discrimination and compare it to other measures of racial attitudes and other perceptions of the intergroup climate. The second goal was to test the prediction that, in the context of contemporary race-relations in the U.S., variability in perceptions of the intentionality of societal bias predicts individuals' preference for a diversity approach that focuses on looking beyond, rather than recognizing, differences. Specifically, I anticipated that the greater the degree to which participants perceived societal bias as intentional, the more likely they would be to prefer a “look beyond differences” message over a “recognize differences” approach, and the more effective they would perceive the “look beyond differences” approach to be. We examined this hypothesis with a diverse sample in the context of race relations in the contemporary U.S.

2.1 Methods

2.1.1 Participants

We recruited 238 participants (129 female, 109 male; 185 White, 17 Black, 12 Hispanic, 24 some other race) online via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to answer questions about their perceptions and opinions of race relations in the modern U.S. in exchange for payment. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 75 (M = 35.15, SD = 12.24).
2.1.2 Materials

Approaches to improving intergroup relations

Integrating various approaches in the literature, I identified one main dimension on which they varied: how they recommend treating group differences, and specifically, the extent to which they encourage individuals to either look beyond or recognize group differences. I created two versions of an approach that outlined ways in which the U.S. could improve race relations, one on each end of this scale. Both versions of the message were entitled, “How do we best address issues of race in contemporary society?” and both were organized around the same three subcategories, “How to navigate a social interaction”, “Job evaluation and promotion”, and “Teamwork and productivity.” The look beyond differences version advocated deemphasizing differences (“Putting too much emphasis on issues of race simply sends the wrong message. The best way to improve race relations is to look beyond differences to the qualities that unite all people.”), while the recognize differences version advocated considering and valuing differences (“Ignoring issues of race simply sends the wrong message. The best way to improve race relations is to openly acknowledge and appreciate the importance of differences.”). Otherwise, the language describing each approach was kept as consistent as possible. For the full text of the approach descriptions, see Appendix C.

2.1.3 Measures

See Appendix C for the full list of items in each measure.

Perceived intentionality of societal discrimination

Participants indicated their agreement with six items that assessed their perceptions of the intentionality of societal bias on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). For example, participants responded to items such as, "Most racial discrimination today is intentional" and "Most incidences of racial bias are
accidental. (R)"

Racial centrality (Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Sellers et al., 1997)

Participants indicated their agreement with six items that assessed the importance of their racial identity on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Items included, "I have a strong attachment to other members of my racial/ethnic group," and "Being a member of my racial/ethnic group is an important reflection of who I am."

Perceptions of racial progress (Brodish, Brazy, & Devine, 2008)

Participants indicated their perceptions of racial progress on a 7-point response. The two items were, "How much progress has been made toward equality for racial minorities in the U.S.?" (1 = very little progress, 7 = a lot of progress) and "How much further do you think the U.S. has to go to create equality for racial minorities in the future?" (1 = not much further, 7 = much further).

Procedural and distributive justice (Folger, 1977)

Participants indicated their agreement with four items that assessed their perceptions of procedural and distributive justice on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Procedural justice captures the extent to which an individual believes that people’s outcomes are determined by processes which are generally fair and just. Distributive justice captures the extent to which an individual believes that the outcomes themselves are fair.

Perceived status of racial groups (Levin, 2004)

Participants indicated the status they perceived various racial groups to have in the U.S. on a 7-point scale (1 = low status, 7 = high status). They indicated the perceived status of White people, Black people, Asian people, Latino/Hispanic people, and Native American people.
Perceived effectiveness of approach

Participants indicated their agreement with six items about the effectiveness of each approach on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The items were, "I can envision this approach working," "I would feel comfortable using this approach," "This approach will be effective in improving race relations," "This approach would be burdensome for individuals to follow," (R) "This approach empowers individuals to improve race relations," and "This approach will help society."

2.1.4 Procedure

After providing consent, participants completed the intentionality of societal bias measure along with a series of other established measures potentially related to this construct. Specifically, participants completed measures of Racial Centrality (Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Sellers et al., 1997), perceptions of the current state of race relations, perceptions of racial progress (Brodish, Brazy, & Devine, 2008), procedural and distributive justice (Folger, 1977), and the perceived status of various racial groups (Levin, 2004).

After completing these questionnaires, participants were told that they would read and evaluate two strategies for improving race relations. Participants viewed the look beyond differences and recognize differences messages side-by-side (left/right presentation randomized across participants). Participants were first asked to select the message they preferred, and then rated the perceived effectiveness of both messages. Finally, participants indicated their age, gender, race, and state of residence.

2.2 Results

See Table 1 for univariate summary statistics, including Cronbach's α for each scale.
2.2.1 Intentionality of Societal Bias

Principal components analysis

To examine whether the intentionality of societal bias measure reflected a single construct, we submitted the six items to a principal components analysis. The scree plot showed that a one-factor solution was sufficient. This first factor, with an eigenvalue of 2.61, explained 64% of the variance. As expected, items 1 (.449), 3 (.452), 4 (.486), and 6 (.345) loaded positively on this factor, and items 2 (-.414) and 5 (-.259) loaded negatively on this factor.

Discriminant validity

In order to assess the discriminant validity of our construct, or the degree to which it is distinct from other measures of bias and climate, we correlated responses on several different measures. Intentionality of societal bias was not correlated with perceptions of procedural or distributive justice, or of the warmth or hostility of race relations. Perceived intentionality was only weakly correlated with perceptions of progress toward racial equality, such that an increase in the perceived intentionality of societal bias was associated with a perception that society had made less progress toward racial equality. These analyses suggest that perceived intentionality of societal discrimination captures a distinct dimension of intergroup perceptions. See Table 2 for the full correlation matrix.

2.2.2 Preference for approach type

We now turn to testing the predictive value of perceived intentionality of societal bias. We ran a logistic regression with perceived intentionality predicting participants’ preference for the look beyond differences or recognize differences approach (coded as 0 and 1, respectively). Perceived intentionality of bias significantly predicted message preference, such that participants who perceived societal bias to be more intentional were more likely to prefer the look beyond differences message over the recognize dif-
ferences message; specifically, for every point more intentional participants perceived societal bias to be, they were 31% more likely to prefer to the look beyond differences approach over the recognize differences approach \((\log \text{odds} = -0.381, p = 0.005)\). (See Table 3, Model 1.) These results held when including an interaction between perceived intentionality and race; perceived intentionality predicted approach preference and the interaction term was non-significant. (See Table 3, Model 2.)

### 2.2.3 Perceived approach effectiveness

We averaged the six perceived message effectiveness items to form composite scores of perceived effectiveness for the look beyond differences approach \((\alpha = .93)\) and for the recognize differences approach \((\alpha = .93)\). Overall, participants perceived the look beyond differences message to be more effective \((\text{mean} = 4.64, \text{SD} = 1.31)\) than the recognize differences message \((\text{mean} = 4.39, \text{SD} = 1.35, \text{though not significantly so}; \text{paired } t(237) = 1.64, p = .102)\).

Next, we used linear regression to examine whether perceived intentionality of societal discrimination predicted how effective participants believe each approach would be.

#### Look beyond differences approach

For all participants, perceived intentionality predicted ratings of the Look beyond differences approach, such that the more participants perceived societal discrimination as intentional, the more effective they rated the look beyond differences approach \((\beta = .225, p = 0.009)\). (See Table 3, Model 3.)

#### Recognize differences approach

For all participants, perceived intentionality marginally predicted ratings of the recognize differences approach, such that the more participants perceived discrimination to be intentional, the less effective they rated the recognize differences approach \((\beta = -0.114, p = 0.078)\). (See Table 3, Model 4.)
2.3 Discussion

Study 1 provides evidence, first, that the perceived intentionality of societal bias is a psychological construct distinct from conceptually related measures of bias and justice, and, second, that it is predictive of the general type of intergroup relations approach that individuals prefer and perceive to be effective. I demonstrate that individual differences in perceptions of the intentionality of societal bias predict preferences for, and the perceived effectiveness of, approaches promoting looking beyond or recognizing differences to improve intergroup relations. Specifically, the more that participants perceived societal bias to be intentional, the more they preferred the look beyond differences approach over the recognize differences approach. Additionally, the more that participants perceived societal bias to be intentional, the more effective they thought the look beyond differences approach would be. Understanding predictors of preferences for one type of approach over another is important, but only if those preferences translate into actual increased effectiveness. In Study 1, the association between Perceived intentionality of societal bias and approach preference observed here is correlational. Additionally, I measured participants’ preferences and perceptions of each approach’s general effectiveness. However, participants’ preferences may not align with what is the most effective, and perceptions of what would be most effective may not be accurate. In Study 2, I use random assignment to make a causal inference about the effect of the two approaches on individuals’ attitudes toward interracial interactions. Further, I examine whether the perceived intentionality of societal bias predicts actual effectiveness of the approaches in improving participants’ attitudes toward intergroup interaction.
Study 2: Approach Effectiveness

Study 2 uses an experimental design to test the extent to which individual differences in perceived intentionality of bias predict the evaluation of and effectiveness of approaches to improving intergroup relations that advocate recognizing or looking beyond differences. To examine message effectiveness, we measure participants’ attitudes toward intergroup interactions. Prior research has identified several constructs which can serve as indicators of the quality of intergroup interactions, including interracial anxiety, promotion focus, self-efficacy, positive expectations, and perspective-taking.

Interracial anxiety can occur as a result of negative expectancies for interracial interactions, and is associated with hostility toward outgroups and a decreased desire for future interracial interactions (Plant & Devine, 2003). If an approach to improving interracial interaction is to be effective, it should reduce such interracial anxiety. Promotion focus (striving to have a positive interaction) makes such interracial interactions less cognitively taxing than an avoidance focus (trying to avoid being prejudice) (Trawalter & Richeson, 2006). Therefore, an approach that encourages promotion focus may be effective in improving interracial interactions. Self-efficacy and positive expectations for interracial interactions are associated with less anger and more positive outcomes (Plant, Butz, & Tartakovksy, 2008). Similarly, the perception that an outgroup member is not open to the interaction resulted in hostility and a tendency to blame one’s interaction partner if the interaction went badly (Butz & Plant, 2006). Thus, an increased belief that an interracial interaction partner will like and respect you may be associated with improved interracial interactions. Perspective-taking may also be an important precedent to positive interracial interactions. Specifically, taking the perspective of outgroup members may reduce stereotyping and in-group
favoritism (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000).

In Study 2, we randomly assign participants to envision one approach or the other being implemented on a large scale to address contemporary race relations. We then assess both the perceived effectiveness of the message as well as participants’ attitudes toward intergroup relations on these dimensions.

3.1 Methods

3.1.1 Participants

We recruited 495 participants (263 female and 232 male; 339 White, 59 Black, 34 Hispanic, 19 Asian, 44 some other race) via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to respond to questions about their beliefs regarding race-related attitudes in the U.S. in exchange for payment. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 74 (mean = 33.03, SD = 11.77).

3.1.2 Materials

Approaches to improving intergroup relations

Study 2 used the same descriptions of the approaches as Study 1. See Appendix C for the full text of the descriptions.

3.1.3 Measures

See Appendix C for the full list of items in each measure.

Perceived effectiveness of approach (abridged)

Participants indicated their agreement with two items about the effectiveness of each approach on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The items were, "This approach will be effective in improving race relations," and "This approach will help society."
Attitudes toward interracial interactions

Participants indicated their agreement with eight statements assessing their attitude toward interracial interactions on a 7-point scale (1, strongly disagree to 7, strongly agree), including perspective-taking, interracial anxiety, and positive expectations.

3.1.4 Procedure

As in Study 1, after providing consent, participants completed measures of perceived intentionality of societal bias. Next, participants were asked to read and compare two strategies for improving race relations. They viewed the Look beyond differences and Recognize differences messages side-by-side. After reading both messages, participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. They were asked to consider either the Look beyond differences or Recognize differences message being implemented on a large scale to improve race-relations in the U.S. We then asked them to consider how this implementation would affect future race relations; to encourage participants to mentally simulate specific consequences of the approach, we then asked them to list three ways in which they would be personally affected by widespread adoption of the approach.

Next, participants responded to an index of interracial interaction efficacy. Participants were asked to confirm which message they had been asked to envision being implemented, and then rate the effectiveness of the approach. Finally, participants were asked demographic information including age, gender, race, and educational attainment.

1In pretesting, when participants viewed only one message and rated its effectiveness, there was a ceiling effect as participants rated both messages as highly effective. Presenting the messages side-by-side draws attention to the key distinction, namely, the treatment of differences between groups.
3.2 Results

3.2.1 Manipulation check

Thirty-three participants (7%) failed to correctly recall which approach they had been told to envision being implemented and were thus excluded from further analyses.

3.2.2 Promoting positive interracial interaction

The key goal of Study 2 was to determine whether perceived intentionality of societal discrimination moderates the effectiveness of the look beyond differences and recognize differences approaches. First, we averaged the interracial interaction efficacy items into a single score (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .87$). Then, we examined whether individual differences in perceived intentionality of societal discrimination and approach type predicted interracial interaction efficacy. We performed a linear regression with perceived intentionality of societal discrimination and approach type (and their interaction) predicting self-efficacy in interracial interactions. As predicted, there was a significant interaction between perceived intentionality and approach type ($\beta = -0.214$, $p = 0.018$), such that the more intentional participants perceived societal discrimination to be, the more those assigned to the look beyond differences condition had more positive attitudes toward interracial interaction than those assigned to the recognize differences condition. (See Figure 2 for a visualization.) This suggests that the effectiveness of each approach in improving interracial interactions is not a constant, but rather is moderated by an individual’s perception of the intentionality of societal discrimination. Additionally, there was a main effect of perceived intentionality ($\beta = 0.54$, $p < 0.001$), such that higher levels of perceived intentionality predicted more positive attitudes toward interracial interaction, as well as a main effect of approach type ($\beta = -0.22$, $p = 0.013$). (See Table 5, Model 1.)
3.2.3 Perceived message effectiveness

I then tested whether same pattern of perceptions of message effectiveness as in Study 1 were present here. First, I combined the two perceived message effectiveness items above into a composite score for each message. I performed a linear regression predicting perceived message effectiveness with perceived intentionality of societal discrimination and message type, with an interaction term. As predicted, and consistent with the results of Study 1, there was a significant interaction between perceived intentionality and approach type, such that as participants perceived discrimination to be more intentional, the look beyond differences message was rated as more effective compared to the recognize differences message ($\beta = -0.261$, $p = 0.004$). (See Table 5, Model 2, and Figure 3 for a visualization.) Also as in Study 1, participants rated the look beyond differences message as more effective ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 1.69$) than the recognize differences message ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.66$, $t(460) = 2.45$, $p = 0.015$).

3.3 Discussion

Together, Studies 1 and 2 provide evidence that there are individual differences in perceived intentionality of societal discrimination, and that these individual differences predict a preference for looking beyond or recognizing differences as well as ratings of perceived effectiveness of these messages. Further, the perceived intentionality of societal discrimination moderates the relative effectiveness of these two types of approaches in improving attitudes toward interracial interaction.

Studies 1 and 2 asked participants to consider race relations in the U.S. broadly, with the possible approaches to improvement touching on a cross-section of the domains in which discrimination may emerge (e.g., in social interactions, in teamwork, in hiring and promotion). Given the heterogeneity in contexts across the United States, participants may spontaneously consider different environments, or be prompted by the study materials to consider different situations. It is also possible that abstract
versus concrete situations promote different mindsets and attitudes (e.g. Forster, Friedman, & Liberman, 2004; Watkins, Moberly, & Moulds, 2008). In Study 3, in order to provide stronger experimental control, participants’ attention was focused both to a specific interracial context, and they were asked to consider how these approaches would affect a specific aspect of intergroup relations.
4 Study 3

Study 3 focused all participants' attention to the same intergroup context, specifically, racial conflict in Ferguson, Missouri. In the summer of 2014, the shooting of a Black teenager by a White police officer in Ferguson, MO sparked protests and a series of conflicts between citizens and police. The events were covered by national news over several weeks, and at the time of our survey in August—two weeks after the shooting and well before the trial and grand jury's decision not to indict the police officer—over 90% of our sample was familiar with the events.

Although the events were limited in geographical space, they sparked conversations across the United States. People's willingness to engage in conversations about race can be an important factor in the quality of their interactions. For example, a refusal to mention race can affect performance and lead to negative evaluations (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). Additionally, their expectations about whether they will be liked or respected, whether positive or negative, may influence how well those interactions go in practice (Plant, Butz, & Tartakovsky, 2008; Bergsieker, Shelton, & Richeson, 2010).

Here, I examine perceived intentionality of bias as both a predictor of how effective they felt an approach advocating looking beyond or recognizing differences would be in improving community relations in Ferguson, as well as a moderator of the impact of these approaches on participants' willingness to engage in conversations about race.

4.1 Methods

4.1.1 Participants

We recruited 1086 participants via Amazon's Mechanical Turk to respond to questions about current events in the U.S. in exchange for payment. Ninety-seven participants (9%) indicated that they were not aware of the events in Ferguson and were excluded.
from further analyses. The final sample thus consisted of 989 participants (537 male and 452 female; 743 White, 91 Black, 73 Asian, 49 Hispanic, 33 some other race). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 82 (mean = 34.99, SD = 12.19).

4.1.2 Materials

Approaches to improving intergroup relations

For Study 3, the approach descriptions were modified slightly to focus on community relations. For the full text of the descriptions, see Appendix C.

4.1.3 Measures

See Appendix C for the full list of items in each measure.

Comfort with conversations about race

Participants rated their agreement with five items assessing their comfort and confidence in participating in a discussion about race on a 7-point scale (1, strongly disagree to 7, strongly agree). The items included, “This approach makes me feel anxious about having a conversation about race,” (R) and “Because of this approach, I will seek out conversations about improving race relations.”

Perceived effectiveness of approach (abridged)

Participants indicated their agreement with two items about the effectiveness of each approach on a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The items were, “This approach will be effective in improving race relations,” and “This approach will help society.”

4.1.4 Procedure

After providing consent, participants were asked if they were aware of the events in Ferguson, MO and were then presented with a brief factual timeline of events that
had transpired in Ferguson. Then participants completed the measure of perceived intentionality of bias as in Studies 1 and 2.

Next, participants were told that they would be reading and comparing two approaches for improving race relations. As in Studies 1 and 2, the approaches advocated either looking beyond or recognizing differences. In this case, however, they focused on improving community and reducing tensions in race relations. For instance, the look beyond differences approach recommended, “Community members should acknowledge their similarities, and the importance of receiving the same treatment, regardless of background,” while the recognize differences approach recommended, “Community members should acknowledge their differences, and the importance of taking into account how these differences affect experiences and outcomes.” After reading both messages, participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. They were told to consider either that the look beyond differences or the recognize differences message was chosen by a “diverse and impartial group of public policy leaders” as the best way to improve the situation. Then, participants responded to a set items gauging their anticipated comfort and confidence in participating conversations about race, as well as the condensed message effectiveness items as in Study 2. Finally, participants completed demographic information as in Studies 1 and 2.

### 4.2 Results

**Conversations about race**

To investigate the effect of perceived intentionality of societal bias and approach type on comfort with conversations about race, the 5 items assessing comfort with conversations about race were averaged together (Cronbach’s α = .77). Then, I conducted a linear regression with perceived intentionality, approach type, and their interaction predicting comfort with conversations about race. There was a marginally significant interaction between message type and perceived intentionality (β = -.10, p = .097), such that at higher levels of perceived intentionality, the look beyond
differences approach resulted in greater comfort with conversations about race, while at lower levels of perceived intentionality, the recognize differences approach resulted in greater comfort. There was a main effect of perceived intentionality, such that the more intentional participants perceived societal discrimination to be, the more comfortable they were having a conversation about race ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$). There was also a main effect of approach type, such that participants assigned to the look beyond differences approach were less comfortable having conversations about race ($\beta = -.12$, $p = .064$). (See Table 7, Model 1.)

**Perceived approach effectiveness**

I also examined whether, as in the previous studies, perceived intentionality of societal bias predicted ratings of message effectiveness. First, I combined the two perceived message effectiveness items above into a composite score for each message. I then ran a linear regression predicting perceived message effectiveness with perceived intentionality of societal discrimination and approach type, with an interaction term. There was no significant interaction between perceived intentionality and approach type ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .18$). (See Table 7, Model 2.) However, an analysis of simple slopes showed that perceived intentionality predicted ratings of the look beyond differences approach, such that the more intentional participants perceived bias to be, the more effective they rated it ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$). The relationship was smaller for participants the recognize differences condition ($\beta = .09$, $p = .05$). (See Table 8, Models 1 and 2, and Figure 4 for a visualization.)

### 4.3 Discussion

These results show the same pattern observed in Studies 1 and 2. Looking beyond differences is both preferred and more effective as participants perceive societal discrimination to be more intentional. Additionally, this effectiveness extends to comfort engaging in conversations about race, in addition to the intentions for intergroup interaction seen in Study 2. However, these effects are weaker than in previous studies.
Although the goal of this study was to focus participants’ attention to specific events, it may be that they already had strongly formed opinions about the situation in Ferguson, given the intensive media coverage of events in Ferguson.
5 | General Discussion

Across 3 studies, we provide evidence that individual differences in perceived intentionality of bias predict both message preference and effectiveness. In Study 1, we demonstrate that individual differences in perceived intentionality of societal bias predicts the choice between looking beyond differences and recognizing difference, as well as the perceived effectiveness of each of these messages. In Study 2, we introduce message type as an experimental manipulation and demonstrate that the impact of these messages on intentions for interracial interaction is moderated by perceived intentionality of societal bias. Finally, in Study 3, we extend these findings to a specific context in U.S. current events and demonstrate the same effect for comfort with conversations about issues of race.

5.1 Contribution

The present research contributes a novel measure to the literature on worldviews and lay theories, and evidence of a moderator of preference and effectiveness to the literature on intergroup ideologies.

Prior research on worldviews about discrimination measure mainly aspects of how much discrimination exists, rather than its type or qualitative nature. For instance, procedural and distributive justice measure the extent to which an individual believes outcomes in society are determined by fair processes, and are distributed fairly (Folger, 1977). However, among people who believe there is the same degree of fairness, there may still be variation in their beliefs about the causes or nature of this unfairness. The present studies identify a construct that varies across individuals and captures their beliefs about the causes and types of discrimination in society.

The literature on intergroup ideologies has been mixed, but most studies point to a specific approach as the most effective, or investigate the pros and cons of one
approach. Comparisons between approaches often choose candidate approaches for their popular use, and they therefore may vary along a variety of dimensions. Here I isolate one important dimension on which many of these approaches differ—whether to look beyond or recognize differences between groups—allowing us to reason more specifically about when one approach is preferred or effective.

Among studies that do investigate the same approaches, there is rarely consensus on an approach’s effect. For instance, a variety of studies find that multiculturalism predicts increased engagement and less ethnocentrism (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009, Ryan et al., 2007), yet another body of works find that this same approach may increase stereotyping and other outgroup antipathy (Wolsko et al., 2000; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010). It may be that this apparent paradox is because these studies investigate the effects of these approaches in different settings and with different populations. Overall, then, there is not necessarily a one-size-fits-all approach to treating differences. What works in one situation or for one person may not be what works in other situations or for other people, and the present research identifies one reason for this.

5.2 Future Directions

These results point to several possible directions for future research. The first is to investigate these effects on behavioral outcomes, rather than survey measures. Although I took care to avoid items with clearly “right” or “wrong” answers, intergroup relations, and in the United States race in particular, are often fraught with social desirability and demand characteristics. Behavioral measures can offer more direct insight into the true effects of one approach to improving intergroup relations.

Additionally, the present research focused on race relations in the present-day United States. However, there are a multitude of other intergroup contexts, both within the United States and in other countries. An investigation of these effects in other contexts would offer a more complete picture of whether the perceived inten-
tionality of societal discrimination is a generalizable moderator of approach preference and effectiveness. Other situations may also offer between-context variation in perceived intentionality in addition to individual variation. Larger variation in perceived intentionality could have a larger impact on approach effectiveness.

5.3 Conclusion

In the present studies, I created and validated a measure of intentionality of societal bias—the extent to which someone perceives the bias that exists in society to be the result of purposeful actions by others and intentional, rather than accidental and unintentional. I then demonstrated the value of this measure by showing that it predicts whether someone will prefer a message advocating looking beyond differences or recognizing differences, and that it moderates the impact of these approaches on intentions for intergroup contact and comfort with conversations about race.

Depending on someone's experiences, they may respond differently to messages about diversity. Yet to improve intergroup relations, it is important to consider how to reach out to people with a range of experiences. These findings point to the importance of considering the audience of your message—one approach to improving intergroup relations and interactions may not work across all contexts. The identification of an important moderator brings us closer to understand when, and for whom, one approach with be more effective than another.
## Tables

Table A.1: Study 1 Univariate Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>4.216</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial centrality</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current state of race relations</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>3.460</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>3.311</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived progress toward equality</td>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look beyond differences approach</td>
<td>4.644</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize differences approach</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=238
Table A.2: Study 1 Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Intentionality of Societal Discrimination</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.131*</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.198**</td>
<td>-0.272**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.282**</td>
<td>0.622**</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.226**</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.333**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current state of race relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.403**</td>
<td>0.648**</td>
<td>0.260**</td>
<td>0.622**</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.226**</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.129*</td>
<td>0.235**</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.235**</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status in America of Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>0.359**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *p<0.05; **p<0.01
Table A.3: Study 1 Regression Models

|                         | Approach preference \n|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                         | (0=look beyond differences; 1=recognize differences) | Perceived effectiveness of looking beyond differences | Perceived effectiveness of recognizing differences |
|                         | logistic                  | OLS                         | OLS                         |
|                         | (1)                       | (2)                         | (3)                         | (4)                         |
| Perceived intentionality | -0.381***                 | -0.683**                   | 0.225***                    | -0.114*                     |
|                         | (-0.649, -0.113)          | (-1.326, -0.040)           | (0.101, 0.349)              | (-0.241, 0.012)             |
| Race (1=white)          | -0.052                    |                             |                             |                             |
|                         | (-0.694, 0.590)           |                             |                             |                             |
| Perceived intentionality * Race | 0.373                  |                             |                             |                             |
|                         | (-0.336, 1.081)           |                             |                             |                             |
| Constant                | -0.245*                   | -0.195                      | -0.000                      | -0.000                      |
|                         | (-0.505, 0.016)           | (-0.765, 0.376)            | (-0.124, 0.124)             | (-0.126, 0.126)             |
| Observations            | 238                       | 238                         | 238                         | 238                         |
| R²                      |                           |                             | 0.051                       | 0.013                       |
| Adjusted R²             |                           |                             | 0.047                       | 0.009                       |
| Log Likelihood          | -159.260                  | -158.694                   |                             |                             |
| Akaike Inf. Crit.       | 322.520                   | 325.387                    |                             |                             |
| Residual Std. Error (df = 236) | 0.976                | 0.996                      |                             |                             |
| F Statistic (df = 1; 236) | 12.596***                | 3.127*                     |                             |                             |

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standardized coefficients and 95% confidence intervals reported
Table A.4: Study 2 Univariate Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial interaction intentions</td>
<td>4.356</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of look beyond differences approach</td>
<td>4.405</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of recognize differences approach</td>
<td>4.023</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=462
Table A.5: Study 2 Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>Interracial interaction intentions</th>
<th>Perceived effectiveness of approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>0.541*** 0.541***</td>
<td>0.606*** 0.606***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.265, 0.818) (0.265, 0.818)</td>
<td>(0.329, 0.883) (0.329, 0.883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach type (1=look beyond differences)</td>
<td>-0.224** -0.224**</td>
<td>-0.197** -0.197**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.400, -0.047) (-0.400, -0.047)</td>
<td>(-0.374, -0.021) (-0.374, -0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality * approach type</td>
<td>-0.214** -0.214**</td>
<td>-0.261*** -0.261***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.391, -0.038) (-0.391, -0.038)</td>
<td>(-0.438, -0.085) (-0.438, -0.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.322** 0.322**</td>
<td>0.282** 0.282**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047, 0.597) (0.047, 0.597)</td>
<td>(0.007, 0.557) (0.007, 0.557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error (df = 458)</td>
<td>0.964 0.964</td>
<td>0.964 0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic (df = 3; 458)</td>
<td>12.722*** 12.722***</td>
<td>12.738*** 12.738***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standardized coefficients and 95% confidence intervals reported
### Table A.6: Study 3 Univariate Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>4.338</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with conversations about race</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of look beyond differences approach</td>
<td>4.631</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effectiveness of recognize differences approach</td>
<td>4.247</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=989
Table A.7: Study 3 Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>Comfort with conversations about race</th>
<th>Perceived effectiveness of approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>0.345***</td>
<td>0.262***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.154, 0.536)</td>
<td>(0.070, 0.454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach type (1=look beyond differences)</td>
<td>-0.116*</td>
<td>-0.249***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.238, 0.007)</td>
<td>(-0.371, -0.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality * approach type</td>
<td>-0.104*</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.226, 0.019)</td>
<td>(-0.206, 0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.172*</td>
<td>0.372***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.021, 0.365)</td>
<td>(0.178, 0.565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error (df = 985)</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic (df = 3; 985)</td>
<td>14.871***</td>
<td>12.785***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Standardized coefficients and 95% confidence intervals reported
Table A.8: Study 3 Regression Models (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>Perceived effectiveness of looking beyond differences</th>
<th>Perceived effectiveness of recognizing differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intentionality</td>
<td>0.195*** (0.110, 0.279)</td>
<td>0.091** (0.001, 0.180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.005 (-0.092, 0.081)</td>
<td>0.003 (-0.085, 0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error</td>
<td>0.981 (df = 493)</td>
<td>0.997 (df = 492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic</td>
<td>20.131*** (df = 1; 493)</td>
<td>3.915** (df = 1; 492)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Standardized coefficients and 95% confidence intervals reported
Figures
Figure B-1: Frequency of the phrase “melting pot” in books between 1900 and 2008. (From Google Ngrams, Michel et al., 2010)
Figure B-2: The interaction of perceived intentionality and approach type in Study 2. Regression lines with perceived intentionality predicting positive intentions for interracial interaction for participants in the look beyond differences and recognize differences conditions.
Figure B-3: The interaction of perceived intentionality and approach type in Study 2. Regression lines with perceived intentionality predicting ratings of message effectiveness for participants in the look beyond differences and recognize differences conditions.
Figure B-4: The interaction of perceived intentionality and approach type in Study 3. Regression lines with perceived intentionality predicting ratings of message effectiveness for participants in the look beyond differences and recognize differences conditions.
C Measures

C.1 Perceived intentionality of societal discrimination

- Most racial discrimination today is intentional.
- Most incidences of racial bias are accidental. (R)
- When someone acts in a racially biased way, it is usually on purpose.
- Usually, when people discriminate, they are doing so deliberately.
- Most incidences of racial bias are subtle. (R)
- When discrimination occurs, it is usually obvious.

C.2 Racial centrality

(Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Sellers et al., 1997)

- Overall, my racial/ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
- In general, being a member of my racial/ethnic group is an important part of my self-image.
- My destiny is tied to the destiny of other members of my racial/ethnic group.
- My racial/ethnic group is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
- I have a strong sense of belonging with other members of my racial/ethnic group.
- I have a strong attachment to other members of my racial/ethnic group.
- Being a member of my racial/ethnic group is an important reflection of who I am.
- Being a member of my racial/ethnic group is not a major factor in my social relationships.
C.3 Perceptions of racial progress

(Brodish, Brazy, & Devine, 2008)

- How much progress has been made toward equality for racial minorities in the U.S.?
- How much further do you think the U.S. has to go to create equality for racial minorities in the future?

C.4 Procedural and distributive justice

(Folger, 1977)

- In general, people of different races receive the same treatment.
- In general, people of different races have the same access to opportunities.
- Outcomes for people of different races are generally equitable.
- Overall, resources are fairly allocated between people of different races.

C.5 Perceived effectiveness of approach

- I can envision this approach working.
- I would feel comfortable using this approach.
- This approach will be effective in improving race relations.
- This approach would be burdensome for individuals to follow.
- This approach empowers individuals to improve race relations.
- This approach will help society.

C.6 Attitudes toward interracial interaction

- The proposed approach will make me feel anxious about interacting with someone of a different race. (R)
Because of this approach, I will seek out interactions with people from different racial backgrounds than me.

When interacting with someone of another race, this approach will make me feel motivated to understand his or her point of view.

Based on this approach, I will be unsure how to act in order to convey respect when interacting with someone of another race. (R)

Based on this approach, I am confident that I will be able to respond without prejudice when interacting with someone of another race.

Based on this approach, I will be confident in my ability to make a positive impression when interacting with someone of another race.

This approach makes me confident that people from other racial backgrounds will respect me

This approach makes me confident that people from other racial backgrounds will like me.

C.7 Comfort with conversations about race

This approach makes me feel anxious about having a conversation about race. (R)

Because of this approach, I will seek out conversations about improving race relations

When discussing race, this approach will make me feel motivated to understand others’ points of view.

Based on this approach, I will be unsure how to act in order to convey respect when discussing race. (R)

Based on this approach, I will be confident in my ability to make a positive impression when discussing race.

C.8 Approach descriptions
How should we address issues of race in contemporary society?

**Approach #1**

**Look beyond differences between people.**
This simple idea can improve a range of situations, from interpersonal interactions to groups in the workplace.

**Approach #2**

**Recognize the ways in which people are different.**
This simple idea can improve a range of situations, from interpersonal interactions to groups in the workplace.

*How this approach applies to social interactions*

When you interact with someone of a different race than you, it’s important to remember that social labels like race don’t matter. Try not to pay much attention to these differences and keep in mind that everyone has similar thoughts and experiences. We should not put too much emphasis on cultural differences. Instead, we should acknowledge that many experiences are shared by all individuals, irrespective of their background.

When you interact with someone of a different race than you, it’s important to remember that social category differences matter. Try to keep these differences in mind and remember that everyone has different thoughts and experiences. We should acknowledge that all individuals have unique cultural heritages and backgrounds, and these differences can shape the way in which people understand and experience everyday situations.

*How this approach applies to job evaluations and promotion*

Dealing with issues of race in the job promotion process can be challenging, but following one basic principle will help create the best outcomes for everyone, and for the organization. The principle is that everyone must get access to the same opportunities to advance their career, regardless of their background.

Dealing with issues of race in the job promotion process can be challenging, but following one basic principle will help create the best outcomes for everyone, and for the organization. The principle is that a range of experiences is beneficial to the firm. Evaluation practices should embrace differences, and the perspectives that come with different backgrounds.

*How this approach seeks to improve teamwork and productivity*

Once teams are formed, it is important to recognize similarities that unite the group. This not only fosters a more inclusive environment, but also one that is more productive. One organization that has adopted this approach says, “While other firms mistakenly focus too much on their staff’s differences, we train our diverse workforce to be respectful and embrace the commonalities they share. This approach creates a more inclusive and collaborative work environment.”

Once teams are formed, it is important to recognize the differences that make members of the group unique. This not only fosters a more inclusive environment, but also one that is more productive. One organization that has adopted this approach says, “While other firms mistakenly try to shape their staff into a single mold, we train our diverse workforce to be respectful and appreciate their differences. Diversity fosters a more inclusive and collaborative work environment.”

*Summary*

Whether in everyday interactions, hiring practices, or in organizations, putting too much emphasis on issues of race simply sends the wrong message. The best way to improve race relations is to look beyond differences to the qualities that unite all people.

Whether in everyday interactions, hiring practices, or in organizations, ignoring issues of race simply sends the wrong message. The best way to improve race relations is to openly acknowledge and appreciate the importance of differences.
How should we address issues of race in contemporary society?

**Approach #1**
 Appreciate the importance of acknowledging differences. This simple idea can improve community and race relations.

**Approach #2**
 Appreciate the importance of equal treatment. This simple idea can improve community and race relations.

*How this approach seeks to improve community and reduce tensions*

Dealing with issues of race within a community can be challenging, but following one basic principle will help create the best outcomes for everyone, and for the community. The principle is that a community's strength comes from recognizing the different experiences of its members. Community members should acknowledge their differences, and the importance of taking into account how these differences affect experiences and outcomes.

This not only fosters a more inclusive environment, but also one that is more welcoming for everyone. While some communities mistakenly focus too much on their members' similarities, it is better to encourage a diverse community to understand the differences in their experiences.

Summary

In light of the recent events in Ferguson, the best way to create a harmonious community and to reduce tensions is to appreciate the importance of acknowledging differences among all citizens.
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