UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY

ARE DIVERSITY STRATEGIES ALL OR NOTHING? MOVING AWAY FROM A WINNER TAKES ALL APPROACH TOWARD A FIT FOR PURPOSE APPROACH

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in Psychology

at the

University of Canterbury

By

Savannah Melville

2020

Research Supervisors:

Associate Professor **Kumar Yogeeswaran**, University of Canterbury

Professor **Maykel Verkuyten**, Utrecht University

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank the following people, without whom I would not have been able to complete this thesis. First, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my primary supervisor, Kumar Yogeeswaran. Thank you for your compassion and guidance, during the challenging times I experienced this year. Your support, feedback, and wealth of expertise went beyond the call of duty. Additionally, your infectious enthusiasm and passion toward the field of intergroup relations have been fundamental in my enjoyment throughout the thesis process. I would also like to thank Jessie Gale, whose assistance was integral to the completion of this thesis and to whom I will always be indebted.

Thank you to my dear colleague, Usman Afzali, for providing constant support, coffees and laughter throughout my post graduate experience. To my fiancé, Mena Eskander, who suffered alongside me during the challenging moments and who supported and believed in me unceasingly. Last, but not least, to my mother, Laura Melville, to whom I owe everything and who taught me the art of resilience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Abstract

Various strategies have been brought forward as possible solutions to address the challenges arising from increased levels of diversity and intergroup relations. Some have been favoured more (or less) than others within public and political arenas across national contexts. Research on diversity strategies (i.e., multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness) has indicated mixed results regarding their costs and benefits for intergroup outcomes. An initial exploratory investigation examines whether each strategy is deemed by White Americans as more (or less) suitable for a variety of societal challenges (Study 1). Emerging from these patterns, an experiment examines White and African Americans' preference of these diversity strategies in response to three challenges relating to poor performance (Study 2). The results revealed that, contrary to Study 1, White Americans did not display preference for specific strategies in response to the challenges. However, African Americans indicated clear preference for each strategy depending on the challenge. Specifically, across three social contexts, African Americans chose multiculturalism to address the challenge of ethnic subgroups underperforming, interculturalism for the challenge of poor performance due to a lack of social cohesion and cooperation, and colourblindness for the challenge of poor performance due to a lack of individual motivation. The patterns derived from Study 1 and the hypotheses supported in Study 2 both indicate an absence of a single, clear winner-takes-all strategy for managing diversity; instead, participants' selections of diversity strategies varied in response to the particularities of any given challenge at play. Results therefore suggest that, instead of judging and subsequently labelling diversity strategies as entirely good or bad, it may be more logical to examine/recognize which strategy best manages specific societal challenges, based on each strategy's central components and aims.

Introduction

Managing diversity is a key challenge of the 21st century as many countries experience unprecedented increases in their ethnic and cultural diversity. Policy direction is being sought increasingly by organizations, governments, schools and international bodies in their response to issues on the ground. Historically, many nations adopted an assimilationist model that called for minority groups to give up their cultural identities and embrace the culture of the majority group. However, assimilationist strategies have been shown to worsen psychological outcomes for minority groups in many ways (e.g., Levin, Matthews, Guimond, Sidanius, Pratto, Kteily & Dover, 2012; Verkuyten, 2010; 2011; Wolsko, Park & Judd, 2006), including the undermining of minority self-esteem and wellbeing (Verkuyten, 2005, 2010, 2011), with meta-analyses revealing that assimilation increases the majority groups' prejudice toward minority groups (Whitley & Webster, 2019). It was also deemed unsustainable in a pluralistic nation to ask minority groups to dispose of aspects of their self-concept, given that group identities are an indispensable component of our concept of self (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Indeed, many western countries for several decades began to consider two alternative approaches: colourblindness and multiculturalism. While colourblindness argues for a group-blind approach that focuses on each person as a unique individual while ignoring their group membership (Plaut, 2010; Sasaki & Vorauer, 2013), multiculturalism calls for the recognition and celebration of diversity. Within the last decade, as evidence began to emerge of the costs and benefits of both colourblind and multicultural approaches, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and many local government bodies have argued for a movement toward examining interculturalism, a pro-diversity strategy that places special emphasis on identity flexibility, dialogue and unity as a solution for intergroup relations (Cantle, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012). Put simply, multiculturalism and interculturalism both advocate diversity and, therefore, have the same goal, although each

strategy uses different approaches in order to achieve this goal. Rather than debate the merits and costs of interculturalism versus multiculturalism and colourblindness, the current thesis examines whether each strategy is deemed as more suitable for differing societal challenges. In the sections that follow, I provide a more in-depth explanation for the nature and meaning of each diversity strategy and why they may be more or less suited for varying social challenges in culturally diverse nations.

Diversity strategies

Colourblindness. As mentioned above, colourblindness is a group-blind strategy involving a focus on the uniqueness of individuals, while ignoring group membership. Colourblindness was made popular during the U.S. Civil Rights movement and is a central objective in Martin Luther King Jr.'s speech where he dreamed that people would be judged by "the content of their character rather than the colour of their skin" (Guimond , de la Sablonnière & Nugier, 2014; King Jr, 1963). Research remains divided on whether colourblind approaches are associated with positive intergroup relations. Studies have shown mixed results on whether following a colourblind approach is beneficial or harmful for intergroup relations (Levin et al., 2012; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009; Wolsko, Park, Judd & Wittenbrink, 2000). For example, colourblindness has been shown to be a status-attenuating strategy as it is inversely related to social dominance orientation (SDO) and thereby can reduce prejudice. SDO relates to an individual's belief on whether their ingroup should dominate other groups, as well as support for group-based hierarchies (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994). Indeed, a recent meta-analysis on the relationship between colourblindness and outgroup prejudice revealed a small, but statistically significant effect of reducing outgroup prejudice (Whitley & Webster, 2019). However, the effects of colourblindness may be especially salient for some perceivers. For

example, colourblind beliefs reduce outgroup prejudice among individuals high in SDO but have the opposite effect among those low in SDO (Yogeeswaran, Davies & Sibley, 2017).

A practical critique of colourblindness is that it is idealistic and simply not achievable. Colourblindness is predicated upon the notion that people should ignore race and instead focus on individuality. However, studies have indicated that perceptual differentiation of race occurs in less than one-seventh of a second, making it impossible for humans to ignore (Ito & Urland, 2003). Additionally, racial categorisation between facial features belonging to one's own race and those of other races has been found to occur in infants as young as six months old (Bar-Haim, Ziv, Lamy & Hodes, 2006). Indeed, research suggests that when interacting with different races, White American participants avoid or suppress racial recognition to appear unbiased or to avoid biased thoughts (Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006). Although noble in intention, avoidance in recognising race can produce negative social outcomes. For example, African American participants rated White American participants who avoided talking about race as being more biased than White American participants who spoke more openly about race (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). Adopting a colourblind approach allows majority group members to reinforce the status quo, from which they largely benefit, while making them appear egalitarian and non-biased at the same time, thus further preventing and addressing instances of ethnic and racial bias (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan & Chow, 2009; Levy, West & Ramirez, 2005; Plaut, Thomas, Hurd & Romano, 2018; Ryan, Hunt, Weiblle, Peterson & Casas, 2007). Furthermore, colourblindness has been shown to promote system-justifying beliefs which, in turn, promote opposition to public policies that redress historical inequities (Yogeeswaran, Verkuyten, Osborne & Sibley, 2018). Therefore, colourblindness at best yields mixed results. However, instead of casting colourblindness aside, the present research seeks to investigate whether

there are context-specific challenges where following a colourblind approach might benefit in managing diversity.

Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism has been championed above other diversity strategies, largely because it has been seen to indicate greater positive outcomes for intergroup relations through reducing prejudice toward minority group members and arguing for the recognition and celebration of cultural differences relative to other diversity strategies (Hahn, Banchefsky, Park & Judd, 2015; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Vorauer et al., 2009; Wolsko et al., 2000). For example, a recent meta-analysis revealed that multiculturalism reduced prejudice toward minority groups (Whitley & Webster, 2019), and many lab replications reveal that promoting multiculturalism can even reduce implicit prejudice toward minority groups (Lai et al., 2014). Additionally, when encouraging people to think about multiculturalism, relative to assimilation and colourblindness, they showed greater levels of intergroup perspective-taking (Todd, Bodenhausen & Galinsky, 2012), and increased feelings of power among ethnic minority participants through drawing attention to the unique and valuable differences these groups bring to society (Vorauer & Quesnel 2017).

Paradoxically, however, evidence has also indicated that emphasising different cultural identities can cause majority members to resist multiculturalism in certain contexts and display increased levels of prejudice toward minority groups (Cantle, 2012; Thomas & Plaut, 2008; Verkuyten, 2010) due to interpreting multiculturalism as excluding or threatening to their group and national identity (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). Behavioural outcomes indicate that after being primed with multiculturalism, majority members displayed increased levels of hostility toward ethnic minority partners, when they perceived disagreement or rejection responses (Vorauer & Sasaki, 2011). Additional behavioural outcomes for minorities, in response to

majority group enactment of multiculturalism, includes positive stereotyping, publicly singling out minority group members based on group membership, and causing minority groups to feel excluded from the national identity (Zou & Cheryan, 2015).

At a societal level, multiculturalism as a diversity strategy is undergoing substantial scrutiny. Stemming from Europe, much of the Western world is currently embroiled in a debate regarding the failure of multiculturalism and subsequent abandonment of multicultural policies (Banting and Kymlicka, 2013; Joppke, 2004; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2010). Multiculturalism has been heavily criticised for creating disunity or "paralleled societies" due to a focus on recognising and asserting separate cultural traditions as fundamental in protecting cultural diversity (Banting and Kymlicka, 2013; Hahn et al., 2015; Joppke, 2004; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Taylor (2012) describes a feed-forward feed-back process, whereby multiculturalism's emphasis on separate cultural identities causes ethnic minorities to be in danger of facing marginalisation by majority groups when threat to national identity is felt. Furthermore, this component of multiculturalism, which encourages group segregation through disunity, is a vast oversimplification in a super-diverse context as it does not take into account the intersectionality of various social and cultural identities, creating a 'static' lens in which to perceive ever-expanding urban environments (Morris, Chiu & Liu, 2015). This, along with other shortcomings of multiculturalism mentioned above, has propelled many European leaders such as Angela Merkel of Germany, Nicholas Sakozy of France, and David Cameron of the UK to publicly denounce multiculturalism, accusing it of enabling fragmentation between groups.

Interculturalism. The challenges faced by multiculturalism have led political philosophers and policymakers to explore alternative approaches. Within this discussion, interculturalism has been brought forward as an alternative diversity strategy, even though

several components of both approaches are interrelated (Bouchard, 2010; Meer & Modood, 2012; Taylor, 2012). Both seek to recognise cultural diversity, but where multiculturalism is accused of holding a *static* perspective in solving cultural diversity through emphasising preservation of cultural identities, interculturalism holds a *dynamic* perspective by encouraging the inevitable fusion of cultural identities (Cantle, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012; Morris et al., 2015). This is achieved through its focus on intergroup dialogue, flexible identities and encouragement of intergroup unity (Cantle, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012; Morris et al., 2015).

Using national samples from two diverse nations (the U.S. and Netherlands), recent empirical research has indicated that both interculturalism and multiculturalism indeed represent distinct diversity strategies (Verkuyten, Yogeeswaran, Mepham & Sprong, 2020). Similarly, across experiments in the U.S., Netherlands and New Zealand, priming interculturalism led to decreased outgroup prejudice, increased willingness to engage in intergroup contact and increased intergroup trust and cooperation relative to controls (although only among political liberals in the Netherlands); (see Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2020; Yogeeswaran, Verkuyten & Ealam, 2020). However, as a relatively new diversity strategy, it is less clear what the negative implications of interculturalism may be, but some initial evidence suggests that its component of identity flexibility is less supported among racial/ethnic minorities relative to multiculturalism (Gale, Yogeeswaran & Verkuyten, 2020). Therefore, perhaps it should not be a question of whether one approach is better than the other, as suggested in current debates on the value of replacing multiculturalism with interculturalism, but rather that there may be certain contexts where one strategy is better than another.

Diversity Strategy Approaches depending on the Sociocultural Contexts

Instead of judging and subsequently labelling diversity strategies as entirely good or bad, it may be more logical to examine/recognise which strategy best manages specific societal challenges/situations, based on each strategy's central components and aims. The proposed research aims to investigate this issue. When reviewing previous research pertaining to intergroup diversity strategies, studies have largely neglected the extent to which social and political settings influence which strategy is endorsed. (Guimond et al., 2014; see also Ward, Gale, Staerkle, & Stuart, 2018). Additionally, at times there are discrepancies between what diversity strategy is implemented within national and social policies, and what occurs in real-world situations. For example, experimental studies indicate certain social and political contexts can impact negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities, especially when multicultural recognition was induced in these studies (Verkuyten, 2011). Using laboratory experiments and field evidence, Apfelbaum, Stephens & Reagans (2016) pointed out that diversity approaches do not provide a 'one-size-fits-all' solution and that diversity strategies may convey different outcomes for minority group members. Specifically, research indicates that minority group endorsement for diversity management strategies within educational or organisational contexts depends on a number of factors, including numerical representation of minority and majority group, trust in the given setting, group token status and self-construal (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann & Crosby, 2008; Sekaquaptewa, Waldman & Thompson, 2007). Considering that diversity strategies may have differential effects depending on the sociocultural context or target group at hand, here we consider whether differing diversity strategies would be seen as more or less suitable depending on the social challenge within the same context.

Considering different societal challenges

As discussed in the above section, there may be specific contexts or situations in which diversity strategies might be favoured or disfavoured accordingly. In this section, specific contexts or situations in which multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness might be preferred will be discussed, which involve, respectively, contexts of group inequalities, contexts of social cohesion and contexts of individual achievement.

Contexts of Group Inequalities. It can be argued that multicultural recognition may be especially important when facing racial and ethnic inequalities, as it places greater emphasis on the valuable and unique differences between ethnic groups. Previous research has indicated that minority groups place value in the distinctive qualities of their group membership (Verkuyten, 2005). Additionally, ethnic self-esteem is positively related to feelings of global self-worth and general life-satisfaction (Verkuyten, 2010). Therefore, in societies where recognising existing racial and ethnic inequalities is deemed important, implementing a multicultural approach could be beneficial for intergroup relations. This is due to the emphasis multiculturalism places on the preservation of existing minority identities for a just and egalitarian society (Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2001). Furthermore, in communities with historical intergroup inequality and transgressions, a multicultural perspective may be more appropriate as it provides greater attention toward compensation, just and equitable treatment, and recognition of remaining obstacles faced by ethnic/racial minorities in present time (Kymlicka, 1995; Verkuyten, 2006). Similarly, in contexts where there is highly uneven demographic distribution of groups such as a large asymmetry in majority-minority representation, a multicultural approach may be preferred.

Contexts of Social Cohesion. By contrast to the above challenge, interculturalism may be more preferable in contexts requiring social cohesion and unity due to its focus on intergroup dialogue, flexible identities and encouragement of intergroup unity (Cantle, 2012;

Meer & Modood, 2012). This may hold as pertinent in the face of growing criticism that multiculturalism encourages group segregation through disunity due to its focus on recognising and asserting separate cultural traditions (Banting and Kymlicka, 2013; Hahn et al., 2015; Joppke, 2004; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Taylor (2012) argued that interculturalism has the potential to outshine multiculturalism when implemented among European countries due to their historic and current narratives. The author draws parallels from the Quebec/English Canadian situation to those faced in certain European countries, specifically arguing that multiculturalism was implemented to avoid addressing the French-English identity duality. Interculturalism may be better equipped to deal with these issues through its core components of dialogue and fluidity of cultural identities. To establish a point of intergroup communication, Taylor (2012) suggests that a focus on commonalities is fundamental, putting forward for consideration that the majority of immigrants (or ethnic minority co-nationals) hold similar humanistic aspirations of a better life for themselves and children, a universal hope with which all groups can relate or empathise. However, usually when advocates of interculturalism convey a focus on unity and commonality, the result can be a greater emphasis on subgroup differences within the framework of a larger superordinate national identity (Cantle, 2012).

Interculturalism is also considered an ideal diversity strategy to implement in settings where there are no clear minority/majority divides and where no one group holds a numerical majority, which is increasingly becoming a reality in many cities around the world and an anticipated reality even at a national level in some countries (Colby & Ortman, 2015; Plaut, 2010). In such contexts, an intercultural-based approach may be more suited, as it may even seem absurd, for example, to take a more static representation of cultural diversity.

Context of Individualistic Achievement. Colourblind theory appears to correspond well with western cultures of individualism, equality and meritocracy (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Novoa & Moghaddam, 2014; Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008; Levy et al., 2005). Specifically, colourblindness holds similarities to the Protestant work ethic (PWE), a theory within the intergroup relations field and which is prevalent across many cultures. PWE prescribes that there is equal opportunity for individual achievement, through hard work, regardless of one's social categories (e.g., race, ethnicity and nationality). Indeed, this idea has become synonymous to the ethos of the "American Dream", which proclaims that people have a right to equal opportunities of individual prosperity, achieved by those willing to work for it (Adams, 1941). A study by Verkuyten and Brug (2004) found that majority group members who held high ethnic identification, essentialist beliefs about minority groups, and PWE demonstrated especially low levels of support for multiculturalism.

Levy et al (2005) posits that colourblindness and PWE can be viewed through two intergroup perspectives: as social equalisers and justifiers of inequality. Through the lens of an integrative social-developmental perspective, a study identified that people's characteristics interact with effects of experiences throughout their lifetime. In particular, the study revealed that White American ten-year-old children endorsed PWE as a social equaliser, promoting the beliefs that people should be treated equally and that hard work leads to success. In contrast, late high school White American adolescents utilised PWE as a justifier of inequality - that disadvantaged groups hold the blame in their disadvantage by not working hard enough, in response to that stage in their life course when competition for jobs and college placement was more salient (Levy, West, Ramirez & Karafantis, 2006b). Thus, PWE protects and enhances the status quo for majority groups (Ansell, 2006; Levy et al., 2005; Levy et al., 2006b; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004). Colourblindness also has the potential for majority groups to justify inequality by denying that discrimination exists and purporting

that people can only be disadvantaged due to a fault of their own, preventing social change to occur, and therefore, maintaining their dominant position within society (Ansell, 2006; Apfelbaum, Norton & Sommers, 2012; Guimond et al., 2014; Knowles et al., 2009; Levy et al., 2006b). Therefore, a colourblind approach which emphasises the importance of individual uniqueness is likely to triumph over other diversity strategies when people are faced with situations in which individual achievement is the dominant goal.

Current Research

The proposed research will provide participants with different real-world social challenges present when living with diversity. Participants will then be asked to choose between diversity strategies and decide which are most appropriate for dealing with distinct diversity challenges presented to them. As participants can generally agree with various diversity strategies in principle but reject concrete aspects of implementing them (Yogeeswaran & Dasupta, 2014; also see Whitley & Webster, 2019 meta-analysis), it is important to examine reactions to concrete scenarios involving living with cultural diversity. Diversity strategies available for selection include interculturalism, multiculturalism, and colourblindness. Assimilation will be ignored since research has unequivocally indicated that it hinders intergroup relations and is negative for minority groups (Guimond et al., 2014; Levin et al., 2012; Verkuyten, 2010, 2011; also see Whitley & Webster, 2019 meta-analysis).

Diversity strategies can be conceptualised and interpreted in a variety of ways (Gündemir, Martin & Homan, 2019). This can be observed across countries in their policy discourses where a diversity strategy (e.g., multiculturalism) is conceptualised and subsequently implemented differently (Guimond et al., 2014; Knowles et al., 2009; Modood, 2014; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). For example, no two countries will follow identical multicultural or colourblind approaches within their policies (Guimond et al.,

2014; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Additionally, experiments have indicated that diversity strategies are malleable. Even if individuals usually oppose a given diversity strategy, they can manipulate them in ways that further their own agendas (Knowles et al., 2009). Although it is established that multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness have many definitions or conceptions, the theoretical cores, regarding the static versus dynamic perspectives of cultural identity, are generally agreed upon. To avoid any preconceived ideas of multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness, the proposed research does not plan to measure endorsement directly. Instead, participants will receive strategies and then be asked to pick which strategy they prefer for a given scenario without conveying the strategies' respective labels (i.e. multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness). In other words, the current research endeavours to examine whether diversity strategies could be viewed as solutions to different types of challenges, depending on the context and the issues that the given challenges are attempting to address.

In order to accomplish this goal, the thesis is separated into two studies. Given the novelty of the proposed research, the initial study will be exploratory, seeking to identify patterns of what challenges, within specific contexts, could be leading people to have preferences for one diversity strategy over another. That is, Study 1 seeks to address authentic real-world situations in order to examine participants' preferred responses (to those), thus deriving patterns to be investigated in Study 2. Study 2 will then utilise a confirmatory approach using data derived from Study 1 to carefully construct hypotheses and test specific predictions that are based on the patterns found in the Study 1.

Study 1

Method

      Participants. As Study 1 was exploratory, we did not have a specific required sample size. However, we aimed to have at least 150 responses from White American majority group members in order to have a sufficient sample to draw meaningful conclusions. Given participant attrition and the need to focus only on White American majority group members in Study 1, we recruited 250 participants from Turk Prime (Litman, Robinson & Abberock, 2017). However, twenty-nine responses that were nonsensical and thirty-four participants who did not ethnically identify as White American were removed from the final analyses, leaving a final sample of 187 participants (85 males, 99 females and 3 gender diverse). The age of participants ranged from 24 to 76 years ($M = 41.92$; $SD = 11.12$).

      Manipulating Sociocultural Contexts. As participants can generally agree with various diversity strategies in principle but reject more concrete aspects of implementing them (Yogeeswaran & Dasupta, 2014; also see Whitley & Webster, 2019 meta-analysis), it is important to examine reactions to various concrete scenarios involving living with cultural diversity. Therefore, participants were presented with three different social contexts: school, neighbourhood, and workplace. Participants were presented with a paragraph length description of each context (See Appendix D for all sociocultural contexts in Study 1). In each context, participants were asked to imagine themselves as a leader (i.e., principal, head of HR, and community leader) and that, given their position, they are required to select strategies which would best impact the various challenges of the particular social context. Participants were given 9 challenges: 3 in the school context, 3 in the work context, and 3 in the neighbourhood context. The challenges across the social contexts are presented below.

School context.

"As Principal of this school, indicate which of these strategies is best suited to...."

1. Create a sense of belonging and community among students and teachers.

2. Promote trust and cooperation relations between students within the classroom.

3. Increase fairness and equity in student learning outcomes.

Work context.

"As Head of Human Resources, indicate which of these strategies is best suited to...."

1. Encourage collaboration and positive relationships between employees from different ethnic backgrounds.

2. Boost innovation and creativity of employees within the organization.

3. Promote fairness and equity within the organization to prevent potential wage gaps and inequities in hiring and promotion.

Neighbourhood context.

"As community leader, indicate which of these strategies is best suited to...."

1. Build trust and cooperation between residents from different ethnic communities within the neighbourhood.

2. Create a sense of belonging among all residents.

3. Prevent self-segregation of residents across ethnic lines and migration out of the neighbourhood.

Measures

Participants completed a brief demographic questionnaire assessing their age, gender, ethnicity and nationality.

Preferred diversity strategy. Participants were presented with descriptions of three diversity management strategies that resembled the approaches of colorblindness, multiculturalism, and interculturalism (only without using those specific labels) (see Appendix C for diversity strategies). The wording of these strategies, as read by participants, were as follows:

"**Strategy A** involves recognising and celebrating cultural differences, where each ethnic community is seen as being deeply influenced by their heritage culture."

"**Strategy B** involves facilitating intergroup dialogue and promoting national unity and commonalities against the backdrop of cultural differences. It also emphasizes the creation of new 'mixed' forms of identity."

"**Strategy C** involves focusing on the uniqueness of each individual, without regard to race, culture, or ethnicity. Put simply, it encourages people to interact with one another based on the content of character rather than racial or ethnic membership."

Strategy A, B and C correspond to components of multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness, respectively. From this point on, when making reference to Strategies A, B and C in the context of participant endorsement, the terms multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindess, respectively, will be used for clarity. However, it should be made explicit that participants were not made aware of this mapping, thus, from their perspective only the terms Strategies A, B and C were present.

Evaluation of diversity strategies. Participants were asked to choose between these diversity strategies and decide which are most appropriate for addressing the various challenges within the sociocultural contexts described to them. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate their preference of strategy in response to the challenges across contexts on a 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (*extremely adequate*) and 5 (*extremely inadequate*).

They were also required to rank each strategy from 1 to 3, with 1 being the most desirable strategy and 3 being the least desirable. Therefore, there were two ways of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies, using 5-point Likert scales and rank ordering. Rank ordering was used to best eliminate biases such as response style and social desirability through forced choice. Parallel analyses were conducted on each in order to ascertain whether results converged.

Procedure. The project was conducted entirely online. Through Turk Prime, participants registered on the platform and clicked on a link to complete the survey. Participants first completed a brief demographic questionnaire which assessed their age, gender, ethnicity, and nationality. They were then asked to read a consent form and confirm their agreement to the terms of the study (see Appendix A for full consent form). They were then presented with the sociocultural contexts described above. Participants then responded with the diversity management strategies after reading each sociocultural context. Lastly, participants were debriefed as to the true nature of the study (see Appendix B for debrief sheet).

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

Tables 1 and 2 provide Likert and rank order means[1] and standard deviations for participants' evaluations of each strategy in response to challenges across social contexts. Across all outcome variables (except for sense of belonging in the neighbourhood context), overall preference between diversity strategies was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Overall, interculturalism was the preferred strategy when addressing most challenges across the social contexts. However, participants indicated higher endorsement for colourblindness when addressing challenges related to fairness and equity, and innovation and creativity across the

---

[1] Smaller numbers represent higher endorsement to ensure same directionality between Likert and rank order responses (in both Studies 1 and 2).

school and workplace contexts. Interestingly, multiculturalism was consistently the least

preferred strategy across all challenges.

Table 1. *Mean Likert scale responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
		M *(SD)*	M *(SD)*	M *(SD)*
School context	Sense of belonging & community	3.37 *(1.23)* **	2.27 *(1.06)* **	2.88 *(1.44)* **
	Trust & cooperation	3.09 *(1.27)* ***	2.04 *(1.05)* ***	2.29 *(1.22)***
	Fairness & equity	3.05 *(1.15)***	2.37 *(0.93)***	2.14 *(1.13)***
Work context	Collaboration & positive relationships	3.09 *(1.30)***	2.17 *(1.17)***	2.35 *(1.33)***
	Innovation & creativity	3.15 *(1.30)***	2.52 *(1.17)***	2.22 *(1.37)***
	Fairness & equity	3.20 *(1.28)***	2.56 *(1.09)***	2.12 *(1.21)***
Neighbourhood context	Trust & cooperation	2.98 *(1.35)**	2.04 *(1.04)**	2.62 *(1.24)**
	Sense of belonging	2.84 *(1.31)*	2.09 *(1.00)*	2.60 *(1.23)*
	Prevent self-segregation	3.25 *(1.38)***	2.27 *(1.12)***	2.50 *(1.33)***

Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 2. *Mean rank order responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
School context	Sense of belonging & community	2.30	1.57	2.13
	Trust & cooperation	2.39	1.64	1.96
	Fairness & equity	2.42	1.80	1.78
Work context	Collaboration & positive relationships	2.36	1.70	1.95
	Innovation & creativity	*2.37*	1.83	*1.80*
	Fairness & equity	*2.37*	1.86	1.77
Neighbourhood context	Trust & cooperation	2.18	1.61	2.21
	Sense of belonging	*2.16*	1.60	2.24
	Prevent self-segregation	2.35	1.67	1.98

All rank order analyse were significant *p* < .001.

School context. To better understand the results, they are unpacked separately for each context, starting with the school context.

Sense of belonging and community. Addressing the challenge of creating a sense of belonging and community among students and teachers, a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement rating between the three diversity strategies, $F(1,185) = 10.24$, $p = .002$. Specifically, pair-

samples t-tests revealed that all strategies were rated as significantly different from one another. Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to interculturalism, $t(186)= 10.40$, $p < .001$ and colourblindness, $t(186) = 3.30$, $p = .001$, respectively. Additionally, interculturalism and colourblindness were also rated as significantly different from one another, $t(186) = -3.94$, $p < .001$. Therefore, Likert endorsement of strategy in response to this challenge revealed, through t-tests, that interculturalism was preferred over colourblindness and multiculturalism, respectively.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy to address this challenge, $X^2(2) = 64.12$, $p <.001$. Post hoc analysis with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests was conducted with a Bonferroni correction applied, resulting in a significance level set to $p < .017$. Median (IQR) endorsement for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 2.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 1.00 (1.00 to 2.00) and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -8.16$, $p < .001$) and colourblindness ($Z = -5.93$, $p < .001$). However, colourblindness and multiculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -2.13$, $p = .033$). Therefore, both methods (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies indicated converging results: interculturalism was preferred overall, colourblindness second and multiculturalism last.

Trust and cooperation. Regarding the challenge of promoting trust and cooperation relations between students within the classroom, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1,185) = 30.75$, $p < .001$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that multiculturalism and

interculturalism were rated as significantly different from one another $t(186)= 9.96$, $p < .001$. Additionally, multiculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(186) = 5.68$, $p < .001$. However, interculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(186) = -1.88$, $p = .062$. This indicates that multiculturalism was the least preferred diversity strategy, whilst interculturalism and colourblindness were most preferred.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy to address this challenge, $X^2(2) = 63.71$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests and the Bonferroni correction were applied, $p < .017$. Median (IQR) endorsement for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. All strategies were rated as significantly different from one another. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -8.14$, $p < .001$) and colourblindness ($Z = -3.68$, $p < .001$). Colourblindness and multiculturalism were also significantly different from one another ($Z = -4.47$, $p < .001$). Therefore, both methods (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies slightly diverged. Rank ordering analyses revealed that interculturalism was preferred overall, followed by colourblindness, and multiculturalism the least preferred. In contrast, Likert endorsement indicated that both interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred, for addressing this challenge, over multiculturalism.

Fairness and equity. Lastly, for the challenge concerned with increasing fairness and equity in student learning outcomes, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1,185) = 46.44$, $p < .001$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that multiculturalism and interculturalism were rated as

significantly different from one another, $t(186) = 8.06$, $p < .001$. Additionally, multiculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(186) = 6.93$, $p < .001$. However, interculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(186) = 1.86$, $p = .064$. Therefore, once again, Likert endorsement ratings of the diversity strategies revealed that interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred over multiculturalism to address this challenge.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 59.52$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests and the Bonferroni correction were applied, $p < .017$. Median (IQR) endorsement for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 1.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to colourblindness ($Z = -6.09$, $p < .001$) and interculturalism ($Z = -7.43$, $p < .001$). However, colourblindness and interculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -0.01$, $p = .991$). Therefore, for this challenge, Likert and rank order endorsement indicate a uniform pattern regarding preference of diversity strategy; interculturalism and colourblindness held greater endorsement whilst multiculturalism held the least.

Workplace context. Next, we considered preferred suitability of each diversity strategy for challenges emerging in the workplace.

Collaboration and positive relationships. Addressing the challenge of encouraging collaboration and positive relationships within this context, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement rating between the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 160) = 19.41$, $p < .001$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that

multiculturalism and interculturalism were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161)= 8.24$, $p < .001$. Additionally, multiculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161) = 4.49$, $p < .001$. However, interculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161) = -1.14$, $p = .257$. Therefore, in terms of Likert ratings of endorsement, interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred over multiculturalism to address this challenge.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 43.66$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests and the Bonferroni correction were applied, $p < .017$. Median (IQR) preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to colourblindness ($Z = -3.98$, $p < .001$) and interculturalism ($Z = -7.35$, $p < .001$). Additionally, colourblindness and interculturalism were also rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -2.84$, $p = .004$). Therefore, for this challenge, both methods (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies slightly diverged. Rank ordering analyses revealed that interculturalism was preferred overall, followed by colourblindness, and multiculturalism the least preferred. In contrast, Likert endorsement indicated that both interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred, for addressing this challenge, over multiculturalism.

Innovation and creativity. Regarding the challenge of promoting innovation and creativity within the workplace context, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 160) = 30.28$, $p < .001$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that multiculturalism and interculturalism were

rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161)= 6.53$, $p < .001$. Additionally, multiculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161) = 5.63$, $p < .001$. However, interculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(161) = 1.91$, $p = .058$. Therefore, in terms of Likert ratings of endorsement, interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred over multiculturalism to address this challenge.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 40.64$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests and the Bonferroni correction were applied, $p < .017$. Median (IQR) preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 1.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to colourblindness ($Z = -5.40$, $p < .001$) and interculturalism ($Z = -6.29$, $p < .001$). However, colourblindness and interculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -0.23$, $p =.815$). Therefore, for this challenge, Likert and rank order endorsement indicate a uniform pattern regarding preference of diversity strategy; interculturalism and colourblindness held greater endorsement whilst multiculturalism held the least.

Fairness and equity. Lastly, for the challenge concerned with increasing fairness and equity within the workplace context, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 160) = 48.13$, $p < .001$. Specifically, pair-samples t-tests revealed that all strategies were rated as significantly different from one another. Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to interculturalism; $t(161)= 7.16$, $p < .001$ and colourblindness, $t(161) = 7.03$, $p < .001$, respectively. Additionally, interculturalism and colourblindness were also rated as

significantly different from one another, $t(161) = 3.12$, $p = .002$. Therefore, Likert endorsement of strategy in response to this challenge revealed that colourblindness was preferred over interculturalism and multiculturalism, respectively.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 40.29$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests and the Bonferroni correction were applied $p < .017$. Median (IQR) preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 1.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Multiculturalism was rated as significantly different to colourblindness ($Z = -5.30$, $p < .001$) and interculturalism ($Z = -5.83$, $p < .001$). Colourblindness and interculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -0.63$, $p = .532$. Therefore, for this challenge, both methods (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies slightly diverged. Rank ordering analyses revealed that colourblindness and interculturalism held greater endorsement than multiculturalism. Likert endorsement indicated that colourblindness was preferred over interculturalism and multiculturalism.

Neighbourhood context. Last, we considered preferred suitability of each diversity strategy for challenges emerging in the neighbourhood context.

Trust and cooperation. Addressing the challenge of encouraging trust and cooperation within the neighbourhood context, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement rating between the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 152) = 5.15$, $p = .025$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that multiculturalism and interculturalism were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = 8.18$, $p < .001$.

Additionally, interculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = -3.86$, $p < .001$. However, for the challenge of promoting trust and cooperation in this context, multiculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = 2.27$, $p = .025$. Therefore, Likert endorsement of strategy in response to this challenge revealed that interculturalism was preferred over colourblindness and multiculturalism, respectively.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 41.90$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were applied. Median (IQR) preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 2.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -5.70$, $p < .001$) and colourblindness ($Z = -5.89$, $p < .001$). Multiculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -0.13$, $p = .897$). Once again, for this challenge, Likert and rank order endorsement indicated a uniform pattern regarding preference of diversity strategy. Interculturalism held greater endorsement compared to colourblindness and multiculturalism, respectively.

Sense of belonging. Regarding the challenge of creating a sense of belonging among all residents within the neighbourhood context, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a non-significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 152) = 2.62$, $p = .108$.

However, Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 44.85$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were applied. Median (IQR)

preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 2.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -5.77$, $p < .001$) and colourblindness ($Z = -6.27$, $p < .001$). Multiculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another ($Z = -0.55$, $p = .584$). Therefore, for addressing this challenge, rank order endorsement indicates that interculturalism was preferred over colourblindness and multiculturalism, respectively.

Self-segregation. Lastly, for the challenge concerned with preventing self-segregation of residents across ethnic lines and migration out of the neighbourhood, a repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in Likert endorsement ratings of the three diversity strategies, $F(1, 152) = 21.03$, $p < .001$. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that multiculturalism and interculturalism were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = 8.35$, $p < .001$. Additionally, multiculturalism and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = 4.49$, $p < .001$. However, interculturalism and colourblindness were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(153) = -1.38$, $p = .170$. Therefore, Likert endorsement of strategy revealed that interculturalism and colourblindness were preferred over multiculturalism, in response to this challenge.

Friedman's ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge, $X^2(2) = 42.81$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were applied. Median (IQR) preference for multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness were 3.00 (2.00 to 3.00), 2.00 (1.00 to 2.00), and 2.00 (1.00 to 3.00), respectively. All strategies were rated as significantly different from one another. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -6.95$, $p < .001$) and colourblindness ($Z = -3.29$, $p = .001$).

Colourblindness and multiculturalism were also rated as significantly different from one another (Z = -3.31, p = .001). Therefore, for addressing this challenge, both methods (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing participant preference of diversity management strategies slightly diverged. Rank ordering analyses revealed that interculturalism was preferred over colourblindness and multiculturalism, respectively. Likert endorsement indicated that both colourblindness and interculturalism was preferred over multiculturalism.

Discussion

The findings of Study 1 appear to suggest that White American participants preferred interculturalism overall when addressing the various challenges. However, colourblindness was preferred in challenges addressing fairness and equity in both school and workplace contexts. It is also worth noting that interculturalism and colourblindness were equally preferred for the challenge addressing innovation and creativity within the workplace context. Multiculturalism came consistently last in all challenges across social contexts.

The patterns found in Study 1 support the general exploratory predictions as there is no clear winner-take-all strategy across challenges. Specifically, the findings suggest that when White American participants perceived a challenge to be group oriented, they preferred interculturalism over colourblindness and multiculturalism. In contrast, when the participants perceived a challenge to be individualistic in nature, they appeared to prefer colourblindness over the other strategies. Curiously, White American participants indicated a strong aversion to multiculturalism as it was never preferred across all challenges. Given the nature of these diversity strategies, the findings are not surprising, but the pattern is indeed interesting.

Study 2 Introduction

Study 2 will explore and expand upon the findings of the initial study. Specifically, participants displayed a clear distinction in strategy preference, depending on whether the challenge was individual or group oriented. This finding will be examined further by systematically manipulating the challenges across the contexts, making Study 2 hypothesis-driven.

Groups. According to self-categorisation theory, people categorise themselves at three different levels in order to make sense of their social world. People categorise themselves as an individual (in which they are the only member), as part of various collective social groups (in which their level of inclusion or exclusion varies), and as a human being who is part of the collective humanity (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987; Hornsey, 2008; Verkuyten, Drabbles & Van Den Nieuwenhuijzen, 1999). However, categorisation of social groups naturally creates an "us versus them" mentality of ingroup favouritism and outgroup bias causing intergroup conflict (Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2008; Wilder, 1986). An abundance of research has indicated that intergroup contact and cooperation, in order to achieve superordinate goals, helps reduce intergroup conflict (Allport, 1954; Al Ramiah & Hewstone, 2013; Gaertner, Dovidio, Banker, Houlette, Johnson & McGlynn, 2000; Pettigrew, 1998; Sherif, 1958; see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006 for meta-analysis). Interculturalism supports elements of intergroup contact, cooperation and shared superordinate goals through its components of dialogue, interactions, a focus on commonalities and national unity as a solution for positive intergroup relations (Cantle, 2016; Loobuyck, 2016). Therefore, it is not surprising that participants preferred interculturalism over the other two strategies when they perceived a challenge to be collectively orientated. In Study 2, participants will be given a collectively oriented challenge (i.e. underperformance due to a lack of intergroup cooperation and cohesion) across all social contexts. Illustrating to

groups the need to focus on a superordinate goal has been shown to reduce the likelihood of ingroup projection (Wenzel et al., 2008) and intergroup conflict (Sherif, 1958). These challenges should logically warrant participants to select a pluralistic strategy, such as interculturalism, rather than an individual oriented strategy.

Individual. Within organisations, colourblindness is generally the dominant diversity strategy proposed to address workplace diversity (Stevens et al., 2008), as the approach serves western ideals of individualism, equality and meritocracy (Levy et al., 2005; Stevens et al., 2008). Additionally, due to the pervasiveness of PWE beliefs within some western cultures, people tend to believe that individual effort applied is relative to individual gain (or loss) of prosperity (Levy et al., 2005). Furthermore, people are more likely to categorise themselves in individualist terms when they are in social contexts which encourage competitiveness, autonomy and dominance over others (Triandis, 1993). Therefore, it is not surprising that participants selected colourblindness when confronted with concrete challenges which involve the potential gain (or loss) of individualistic advancement (or failure) such as: fairness and equity, and innovation and creativity within the work and school context. Study 2 will examine this by presenting participants with a challenge of underperformance that is due to a lack of individual motivation across all social contexts.

Subgroups. Across all challenges, multiculturalism was never preferred out of the three strategies and came consistently last. This may be because the study used concrete scenarios involving specific diversity challenges and a concrete meaning of multiculturalism (without the label), phrased as Strategy A. Previous work suggests that the majority group is less favourable toward the concrete forms of multiculturalism (Mahfud, Badea, Verkuyten & Reynolds, 2018; Rios & Wynn, 2016; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta 2014, also see Whitley & Webster, 2019 meta-analysis). Additionally, research indicates that multiculturalism's central component of emphasising different cultural identities can cause majority members to resist

multiculturalism in certain contexts and display increased levels of prejudice toward minority

groups (Cantle, 2012; Thomas & Plaut, 2008; Verkuyten, 2010) due to interpreting

multiculturalism as excluding or threatening to their group and national identity (Plaut et al.,

2011; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). Furthermore, multiculturalism has been criticised for

encouraging essentialism, reifying minority group identities which in turn prevents social

cohesion and unity between groups (Kymlicka, 2014; Verkuyten, 2007). This could lead

participants to perceive the multicultural strategy, as an answer to challenges pertaining to

social cohesion and cooperation, as counterintuitive.

However, as Study 1 was exploratory, none of the challenges displayed salient

intergroup inequality or minority group struggles. As mentioned previously, multiculturalism

is generally put forward when addressing inequalities of a social redistributive and cultural

recognition nature for minority groups (Guimond et al., 2014; Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2001;

Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). For example, a study which assessed ethnic majority

(Dutch) and minority (Turk/Kurd) group attitudes toward multiculturalism in the Netherlands

found that perceived structural discrimination turned out to be positively related to the

endorsement of multiculturalism, specifically more so by the minority group (Verkuten &

Martinovic, 2006). Furthermore, it is argued that multiculturalism is seen as a collective or

group approach (Parekh, 2001) which can promote positive attitudes towards outgroup

members (Katz & Hass, 1988) and ingroup commitment (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). As

multiculturalism came consistently last among the diversity strategies in Study 1, a scenario

in which it was made salient to participants that only ethnic minority groups were

underperforming will be included in Study 2. The aim is to identify whether there is a context

where multiculturalism would be the better contender compared to the other diversity

strategies, especially given the current debate on whether interculturalism should replace

multiculturalism (Cantle, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012).

Underperformance. As Study 1 was exploratory, the challenges presented to participants varied, with some being identical across two contexts and some novel to only certain contexts. However, none of the challenges were present across all contexts. For example, the challenge of preventing self-segregation and promoting innovation and creativity were unique to the neighbourhood and work context, respectively. In comparison the challenge of creating a sense of belonging was shared in the school and neighbourhood context. To assess whether endorsement of diversity strategies could indeed vary, depending on the challenges presented across social contexts, Study 2 selected underperformance to be the underlying issue across the contexts. Underperformance was selected to be the overall problem across contexts as it was an action that could be manipulated on an individual level and within groups. Group performance can be characterised as the degree to which a shared goal is achieved (Joshi & Roh, 2009). Furthermore, performance has been used extensively within organisational and educational settings when examining and addressing cultural diversity (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Gündemir et al., 2019; Steele, Spencer & Aronson, 2002 also see Bowers, Pharmer & Salas, 2000 and Joshi & Roh, 2009 meta-analyses).

Racial/Ethnic Minority and Majority Endorsement of Diversity Strategies.

While the primary goal of Study 2 was to systematically manipulate the nature of the challenge underlying underperformance in various real-world contexts to examine whether people strategically choose colourblind, multicultural, and intercultural strategies to address such issues, Study 2 also had an important second goal. Specifically, I wish to examine whether majority and minority participants would similarly evaluate these diversity strategies to address those goals. Previous research reveals that endorsement of diversity strategies is often nuanced and interpreted differently across majority and minority groups (Dovidio, Gaertner & Saguy, 2009; Hehman, Gaertner, Dovidio, Mania, Guerra, Wilson, & Friel, 2012; Plaut et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007; Ryan, Casas & Thompson, 2010; Verkuyten & Brug,

2004; Wolsko et al., 2006; Zárate, Shaw, Marquez & Biagas, 2012). Specifically, majority groups typically prefer assimilationist and colourblind approaches compared to pluralistic approaches such as multiculturalism, while ethnic minorities tend to prefer multicultural approaches over colourblind or assimilationist approaches (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2009; Hehman et al., 2012; Ryan et al., 2010; 2007; Zárate et al., 2012). The assumption is that ethnic minorities should change to conform to the majority group as a way for the majority group to resist change and maintain the status quo under assimilationist and colourblind approaches (Ansell, 2006; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004; Verkuyten, 2005). In contrast, minority groups generally endorse pluralistic approaches over assimilationist approaches in order to maintain their culture and resist change (Dovidio et al., 2009; Hehman et al., 2012; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006; Zárate et al., 2012). Additionally, group size, rather than group membership (e.g. race) within a given context may also influence the endorsement of a given diversity strategy (Hehman et al., 2012). This may also explain the blanket disregard of multiculturalism to address the challenges across social contexts in Study 1 given that the participants were comprised of only White Americans. Therefore, in Study 2, I examine evaluations of different diversity strategies for contemporary challenges by contrasting evaluations among both majority and minority groups (i.e., White and African Americans in the U.S.).

Goals of Study 2

Judging from the patterns derived in Study 1, it appears that participants are indeed selecting diversity management strategies to cater for the particularities of any given challenge at play. The absence of a single clear winner-takes-all outcome across contexts supports the general hypotheses of the exploratory study. Study 2 will be hypothesis-driven and endeavours to examine the patterns further by systematically manipulating the scenarios

across the contexts. The contexts will remain similar to before (i.e., school and workplace), except I replaced neighbourhood with a small city council context. A small city council would make it easier to establish a context where I can manipulate the reasons for underperformance rather than a neighbourhood.

The challenges presented in each context will all consist of an underlying issue relating to underperformance. There will be underperformance due to a lack of individual motivation, lack of cohesion and cooperation, and due to only ethnic minority group members underperforming in the specific context (i.e., in the school, workplace or city council). Three predictions are advanced. Firstly, it is predicted that participants presented with various challenges which highlight the need for social cohesion and cooperation between groups will endorse interculturalism (i.e. Strategy B) as the most appropriate and feasible strategy compared to multiculturalism (i.e. Strategy A) and colourblindness (i.e. Strategy C). Secondly, in social contexts which illustrate the challenges of a strong majority-minority divide and only ethnic subgroups underperforming, it is predicted that participants will select multiculturalism over interculturalism and colourblindness. Lastly, in challenges where individual success and meritocracy are salient, it is predicted that participants will select colourblindness over multiculturalism and interculturalism.

Study 2

Method

      Participants. Given the need to collect an equal number of majority and minority participants, we used Qualtrics research services, which maintain a large database of participants from around the world. We recruited a total of 211 participants. However, 4 responses which were nonsensical were removed, and 2 participants who responded were 16 years old and therefore removed from the final analyses. The final sample comprised 205 American adults (105 White American and 100 African American). These participants ranged from 18 to 72 years of age ($M = 40.54$; $SD = 14.43$). All participants in the sample were U.S. citizens or residents with English identified as their primary language. The gender composition consisted of 80 males, 123 females and 2 gender diverse participants. Given the study had a within-subjects design, we required only a small sample size of 100 per group to detect a medium-sized effect ($\eta_p^2 = .05$) with 80% power.

      Manipulating Sociocultural Contexts. Similar to Study 1, participants were presented with three different social contexts: school, workplace, and city council. Each social context described three challenges relating to poor performance due to: a lack of individual motivation, a lack of cooperation and cohesion, and ethnic subgroups underperforming (see Appendix E for challenges across social contexts).

      In order to get an averaged composite score which evaluates the strategies most preferred for addressing the three challenges, corresponding challenges were collapsed across social contexts (i.e., lack of individual motivation, lack of cohesion and cooperation, and ethnic subgroups underperforming across work/school/city council contexts).

Separate analyses for each context were also performed and the results (discussed in the results section below) converged with the averaged collapsed score, with two exceptions. Therefore, final analyses were conducted on the collapsed scores. The two exceptions are mentioned in the results section (Study 2) and occurred specifically in relation to the challenge of ethnic subgroups underperforming. Cronbach alphas displayed below confirm the validity of collapsing the challenges across contexts.

α for addressing the challenge of lack of individual motivation with multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness across collapsed contexts, $\alpha = .81$, $\alpha = .71$, and $\alpha = .76$, respectively. For addressing the challenge of social cohesion and cooperation with multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness across collapsed contexts, $\alpha = .81$, $\alpha = 7.32$, and $\alpha = .74$, respectively. Lastly, for addressing the challenge of ethnic subgroups underperforming with multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness across collapsed contexts, $\alpha = .77$, $\alpha = .68$, and $\alpha = .75$, respectively.

Measures

Participants completed a brief demographic questionnaire assessing their age, gender, ethnicity and nationality.

Preferred diversity strategy. Participants were presented with the same diversity management strategies that resembled the approaches of colorblindness, multiculturalism, and interculturalism (only without using those specific labels) used in Study 1 (see Appendix C for diversity strategies). As discussed in this section of Study 1, when making reference to Strategies A, B and C in the context of participant endorsement, the terms multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindess, respectively, will be used. Similarly, participants were not made aware of this mapping.

Evaluation of diversity strategies. As in Study 1, participants were asked to choose between these diversity strategies and decide which are most appropriate for addressing the three types of challenges within the sociocultural contexts described to them. Participants were given nine challenges in total (3 in the school context, 3 in the work context and 3 in the small city council context) and were asked which strategy would most successfully address that challenge from their point of view. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate their preference of strategy in response to the challenges across contexts on a 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (*extremely adequate*) and 5 (*extremely inadequate*). They were also required to rank each strategy from 1 to 3, with 1 being the most desirable strategy and 3 being the least desirable. As a reminder, the three challenges presented to participants in each context consisted of poor performance due to: a lack of individual motivation among students/employees/city council representatives, a lack of cooperation and cohesion between students/employees/city council representatives, or ethnic subgroups underperforming within the school/workplace/city council (see Appendix E for challenges across social contexts).

Procedure. The project was conducted entirely online. Through Qualtrics panel services, White and African American participants registered on the platform and clicked on a link to complete the survey. Participants first completed a brief demographic questionnaire which assessed their age, gender, ethnicity and nationality. They were then asked to read a consent form and confirm their agreement to the terms of the study (see Appendix A for full consent form). Then participants were presented with the three different challenges outlined above across the social contexts of school, work and city council. Participants then responded to the diversity management strategies described above, after reading challenges across

sociocultural contexts. Lastly, participants were debriefed as to the true nature of the study (see Appendix B for debrief sheet).

Results

Tables 3 and 4 provide means and standard deviations of African American and White American participants' rank order preference of strategy in response to challenges across social contexts. To better understand the results, we unpack these separately for each method (Likert scale and rank order) of assessing preference of diversity strategy, respectively.

Rank order preference of diversity strategies

In contrast to Study 1, White American participants did not display preference between strategies when addressing the challenges in each context. However, African American participants preferred different strategies depending on the challenges presented to them. When addressing ethnic subgroups underperforming across contexts, African American participants preferred multiculturalism and interculturalism. Specifically, within the school and city council context, they selected multiculturalism to overcome this issue. For the challenge of collective underperforming due to a lack of cohesion and cooperation, African Americans chose interculturalism as the best strategy to resolve the issue. Interestingly, neither White Americans nor African Americans indicated preference of diversity strategies when addressing the challenge of underperformance due to a lack of individual motivation. However, rank order means of both groups indicate an approaching significance for colourblindness as the preferred strategy.

Table 3. *Mean African American rank order responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
School context	Lack of individual motivation	2.03	2.10	1.87
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	1.99**	1.79**	2.22**
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	1.77**	1.95**	2.28**
Work context	Lack of individual motivation	2.13	2.06	1.81
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.14*	1.82*	2.04*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	1.84	2.02	2.14
Local city council context	Lack of individual motivation	2.05	1.99	1.96
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	1.96***	1.73***	2.31***
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	1.83**	1.92**	2.25**

Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4. *Mean White American rank order responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
School context	Lack of individual motivation	2.10	2.02	1.88
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.05	1.93	2.02
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	1.88	2.02	2.10
Work context	Lack of individual motivation	2.10	2.08	1.82
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.00	1.90	2.10
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.03	1.98	1.99
Local city council context	Lack of individual motivation	2.15	1.95	1.90
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.09	1.83	2.09
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	1.88	1.99	2.13

Cohesion and cooperation

White American participants. Friedman's ANOVA revealed that rank order endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for White Americans, $X^2(2) = 2.35, p = .309$.

African American participants. However, a Friedman's ANOVA revealed that for African Americans, there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement

of strategy for addressing this challenge across contexts, $X^2(2) = 15.41$, $p = .001$. Post hoc analysis with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests was conducted with a Bonferroni correction applied, resulting in a significance level set a $p < .017$. Median (IQR) endorsement for multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness were 2.0 (1.67 to 2.33), 1.67 (1.33 to 2.00) and 2.33 (1.67 to 2.67), respectively. Interculturalism was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -2.77$, $p = .006$) and colourblindness ($Z = -3.99$, $p = .001$). Colourblindness and multiculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another, ($Z = -1.80$, $p = .072$). Therefore, for addressing this challenge, African American rank order endorsement indicates that interculturalism was preferred over multiculturalism and colourblindness across social contexts.

Ethnic subgroups underperforming

White American participants. Friedman's ANOVA revealed that rank order endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for White Americans, $X^2(2) = 1.45$, $p = .486$.

African American participants. However, a Friedman's ANOVA revealed that for African Americans, there was a statistically significant difference in rank order endorsement of strategy for addressing this challenge across contexts, $X^2(2) = 16.16$, $p = .001$. Post hoc analysis with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests was conducted with the Bonferroni correction, $p < .017$. Median (IQR) endorsement for multiculturalism, interculturalism and colourblindness were 1.67 (1.33 to 2.33), 2.00 (1.67 to 2.33) and 2.33 (1.67 to 2.67), respectively. Interculturalism and multiculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another, ($Z = -1.97$, $p = .049$). However, there was a statistically significant aversion for colourblindness overall in addressing ethnic subgroups underperforming. Colourblindness was rated as significantly different to multiculturalism ($Z = -3.36$, $p = .001$) and interculturalism ($Z = -2.48$, $p = .013$).

Further separate analyses conducted within each context, revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in preference of strategy for African Americans, whereby multiculturalism was preferred in both the school and city council context, $X^2(2) = 13.38$, $p = .001$ and $X^2(2) = 9.78$, $p = .008$, respectively. Therefore, rank order analyses revealed that White Americans did not indicate preference between the diversity strategies when addressing this challenge, whilst African Americans did differentiate in preference between each strategy. Specifically, African Americans displayed aversion to colourblindness and preference for multiculturalism and interculturalism for addressing this challenge across collapsed contexts. Separate analyses revealed that multiculturalism was preferred in both the school and city council context.

Individual motivation

White American participants. Friedman's ANOVA revealed that rank order endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for White Americans, $X^2(2) = 4.71$, $p = .095$.

African American participants. Similarly, Friedman's ANOVA revealed that rank order endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for African Americans, $X^2(2) = 3.55$, $p = .170$.

However, the means of rank order endorsement in response to challenges, presented in the table above, indicated that colourblindness was approaching in significance particularly in the workplace context for both African American $X^2(2) = 5.66$, $p = .059$ and White American participants $X^2(2) = 5.20$, $p = .074$.

Likert scale preference of diversity strategies

Tables 5 and 6 give means and standard deviations of African American and White American participants' Likert preference of strategy in response to challenges across social contexts. Similar to the findings of the rank order analyses, White American participants did not show preference for strategies when addressing the challenges in each context. However, in contrast to the rank order analyses, African American participants only indicated a preference in diversity strategy in relation to the challenge of poor performance due to lack of individual motivation. For addressing this challenge, African Americans indicated a preference for colourblindness over interculturalism and multiculturalism.

Table 5. *Mean African American Likert scale responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
		M*(SD)*	M*(SD)*	M*(SD)*
School context	Lack of individual motivation	2.55 *(1.18)***	2.71 *(1.10)***	2.29 *(1.31)***
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.51 *(1.30)*	2.48 *(1.13)*	2.56 *(1.39)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.21 *(1.22)*	2.58 *(1.17)*	2.59 *(1.34)*
Work context	Lack of individual motivation	2.67 *(1.33)* ***	2.78 *(1.11)* ***	2.20 *(1.36)* ***
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.55 *(1.24)*	2.41 *(1.10)*	2.64 *(1.43)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.38 *(1.27)*	2.81 *(1.15)*	2.67 *(1.35)*
Local city council context	Lack of individual motivation	2.55 *(1.20)**	2.64 *(1.10)**	2.34 *(1.43)**
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.46 *(1.27)*	2.26 *(1.12)*	2.82 *(1.39)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.42 *(1.22)*	2.44 *(1.10)*	2.75 *(1.40)*

Note. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 6. *Mean White American Likert scale responses towards diversity management strategies*

Social contexts	Challenges	Diversity management strategies		
		Multiculturalism	Interculturalism	Colourblindness
		M *(SD)*	M *(SD)*	M *(SD)*
School context	Lack of individual motivation	2.75 *(1.26)*	2.66 *(1.20)*	2.29 *(1.29)*
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.70 *(1.29)*	2.60 *(1.12)*	2.70 *(1.38)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.63 *(1.32)*	2.65 *(1.12)*	2.69 *(1.38)*
Work context	Lack of individual motivation	2.78 *(1.35)*	2.80 (1.20)	2.27 *(1.20)*
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.66 *(1.34)*	2.62 *(1.03)*	2.61 *(1.32)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.69 *(1.36)*	2.64 *(1.12)*	2.71 *(1.29)*
Local city council context	Lack of individual motivation	2.85 *(1.31)*	2.90 *(1.15)*	2.33 *(1.31)*
	Lack of cohesion and cooperation	2.74 *(1.31)*	2.57 *(1.16)*	2.60 *(1.40)*
	Ethnic subgroups underperforming	2.49 *(1.31)*	2.66 *(1.13)*	2.70 *(1.37)*

Cohesion and cooperation

Addressing the challenge related to cohesion and cooperation among groups across contexts, a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there was a non-significant interaction effect between race and endorsement of diversity strategies, $F(1, 203)$ = 1.05, p = .308. The main effect of endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for White Americans $F(1,203)$ = 1.87, p = .173 and African Americans, $F(1, 203)$ = 0.21, p = .647.

Ethnic subgroups underperforming

Regarding the challenge of ethnic subgroups underperforming across contexts, a repeated ANOVA, revealed that there was a non-significant interaction effect between race and endorsement of diversity strategies, $F(1, 203)$ = 1.08, p = .300. The main effect of endorsement between diversity strategies was also insignificant for White Americans, $F(1,203)$ = 1.50, p = .222 and African Americans, $F(1, 203)$ = 3.80, p = .053.

Individual motivation

Lastly, for the challenge regarding a lack of individual motivation across contexts, a repeated ANOVA revealed that there was a non-significant interaction effect between race and endorsement of diversity strategies, $F(1, 203)$ = 0.63, p = .429. The main effect of endorsement between diversity strategies was insignificant for White Americans, $F(1, 203)$ = 1.26, p = .264.

However, the main effect of endorsement between diversity strategies was statistically significant for African American participants, $F(1, 203)$ = 12.08, p = .001. After Bonferroni corrections were applied, setting the significance level to $p < .017$, pair-samples t-tests revealed that interculturalism (M = 2.75, SD = .91) and colourblindness (M = 2.29, SD = 1.08) were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(204)$= 4.49, $p < .001$.

Additionally, multiculturalism ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.08$) and colourblindness were rated as significantly different from one another, $t(204) = 3.50$, $p = .001$. However, multiculturalism and interculturalism were not rated as significantly different from one another, $t(204) = -0.83$, $p = .406$. Therefore, repeated measures ANOVA revealed that White Americans did not indicate a preference between the diversity strategies when addressing this challenge, whilst African Americans showed preference between each strategy. Specifically, African Americans displayed preference for colourblindness over interculturalism and multiculturalism when addressing this challenge.

General Discussion

The present research sought to explore whether people would prefer varied diversity strategies for differing social challenges instead of a one-size-fits-all approach. Specifically, instead of debating and subsequently choosing a single diversity strategy for all societal challenges to the exclusion of other strategies, the present research sought to recognise which individual strategies, based on their central components and aims, best meet the needs arising from specific challenges and realities faced within differing societal contexts. I did so by considering the utility of multiculturalism, interculturalism, and colourblindness for differing goals in real-world contexts of the classroom in schools, workplaces, and local community (neighbourhood in Study 1, and local government in Study 2).

Given the novelty of the present research, I took a bottom-up approach where Study 1 was exploratory, allowing for the derivation of concrete hypotheses which were tested in Study 2. Results found in Study 1 revealed that across multiple contexts, white majority group members tended to select colourblindness for challenges that appeared more individualistic in nature. However, for challenges which indicated collectivistic goals such as social cohesion and cooperation, interculturalism was preferred. Interestingly, participants in Study 1 never selected multiculturalism as the best approach to addressing the challenges presented to them.

Study 2 utilised a confirmatory research approach to test whether people would differentially choose interculturalism, colourblindness, and multiculturalism for varying societal challenges. Specifically, I predicted that participants would choose interculturalism for addressing challenges involving underperformance in the classroom, workplace or local government stemming from lack of cooperation and cohesion, while colourblindness would be the preferred strategy for addressing underperformance due to a lack of individual motivation within the classroom, workplace or local government. By contrast to both of the

above, I expected multiculturalism would be the preferred strategy for addressing the challenge of certain ethnic groups underperforming in the classroom, workplace or local government. Study 2 explored these issues considering the perspective of both white majority group members and African American minority participants.

The results of Study 2 were mixed, as White American participants did not display a clear preference in choosing between diversity strategies. However, African American participants displayed clear preferences between the diversity strategies according to each challenge. Specifically, African American participants preferred Strategy A, which corresponds to the multicultural diversity strategy, when addressing the challenge of ethnic subgroups underperforming within the school and city council contexts. African American participants displayed preference for Strategy B, which corresponds to the intercultural diversity strategy, over the other strategies to address groups underperforming due to a lack of social cohesion and cooperation. Lastly, African American participants indicated a preference toward Strategy C, which corresponds with the colourblind diversity strategy, when addressing the challenge related to a lack of individual motivation. Therefore, African American participants followed the direction of the predicted hypotheses, whilst in contrast, the responses of the White American participants did not support the predicted hypotheses by showing no clear preference for diversity strategies across the various challenges.

The malleability of African American endorsement to particular diversity strategies depending on the challenge presented across social contexts supports previous research regarding the relationship between group-based needs and subsequent endorsement (Dovidio et al., 2009, 2010; Hehman et al., 2012). When considering diversity strategy selection to strategically address group-based needs for racial minorities, historical group narratives need to be considered, as they contribute to present day psychological drivers of strategy

endorsement and how racial minorities internalise social environments (Markus, Steele & Steele, 2000; Plaut, 2010).

African American history is marred and characterized by enduring discrimination and inequality, beginning with the arrival of slaves from Africa to the U.S, segueing to Jim Crow laws and continuing to present-day instances of police brutality and poorer socioeconomic outcomes (Berlin, 2004; Chaney & Robertson, 2013; Katz, Stern & Fader, 2005). Although, originally born out of the Civil Rights movement as a social justifier of equality to gain equal citizenship for African Americans, colourblindness can also serve as a mode of racial denial and enforcer of status quo systems of privilege for White Americans (Ansell, 2006; Knowles et al., 2009; Levy, et al., 2005; Plaut et al., 2018; Ryan et al., 2007). In contrast, multiculturalism, developed after the Civil Rights movement during the 1970s, may be seen by African Americans to provide better outcomes compared to colourblindness through recognition of group disparities within the legal, educational, organisational and national context (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Markus et al., 2000; Plaut, 2010). Therefore, the challenge of ethnic minority groups underperforming across social contexts in Study 2 may have triggered subgroup identification by making representation disparities salient between groups within the social context, leading African American participants to select multiculturalism as a collective action (Dovidio et al., 2009; 2010; Hehman et al., 2012).

However, to address the challenge specific to underperforming occurring at a collective level across groups due to a lack of cooperation and social cohesion, African Americans selected interculturalism. Research indicates that manipulating the inclusive framing of social categorisation can change the perceptions of group membership (Gaertner et al., 2000) and the reduction of ingroup projection (Wenzel et al., 2007) and intergroup conflict (Sherif, 1961; 1958) by focusing on common superordinate goals. Therefore, framing the challenge of underperformance as one which requires cooperation, regardless of group

membership, may have caused African Americans to identify as group members of a larger collective group with a common goal. Interculturalism supports elements of intergroup contact, cooperation and shared superordinate goals through its components of dialogue, interactions, and focus on commonalities and national unity as solutions for positive intergroup relations (Cantle, 2016; Loobuyck, 2016).

Interestingly, African American participants displayed preference for colourblindness when addressing the challenge of underperformance due to a lack of individual motivation. This is in contrast to previous research, which generally indicates that racial/ethnic minority groups tend to prefer multicultural approaches over colourblind or assimilationist approaches in order to maintain their culture and resist change (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2009; Hehman et al., 2012; Ryan et al., 2010; 2007; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006; Zárate et al., 2012). However, group size, rather than group membership (e.g. race) within a given context has been shown to influence the endorsement of a given diversity strategy (Hehman et al., 2012). Given this challenge was individualist oriented, threat to ingroup identity was not made salient and, therefore, may explain this result. Additionally, scenarios which support individualism, equality and meritocracy (Levy et al., 2005; Stevens et al., 2008) have been shown to promote colourblind endorsement. Therefore, future research should examine African American endorsement of diversity strategies within individualistic contexts to examine whether preference for colourblindness is consistent.

Overall, the findings of Study 2 indicate that people think of diversity in nuanced and multifaceted ways, and as a result, select diversity strategies that best complement certain social challenges instead of a winner-take-all approach.

However, only African American participants in this work showed the pattern of results we predicted. White Americans indicated no preference for diversity strategies when addressing challenges across social contexts. One possible reason for this finding may be because their group status is contained within the upper echelons of the U.S. national context as well as within those specific social contexts (Hehman et al., 2012). Therefore, there is no real motivation to generate change (Zarate et al., 2012) or address group-based needs (Dovidio et al., 2009, 2010) when faced with challenges in those contexts.

Viewing the White Americans' responses to the diversity strategies (i.e., tables 4 and 6) the results appear to indicate that White American participants' endorsement of strategies, in response to each challenge, are generally coinciding with the predicted directions of Study 2. However, the mean responses recorded within the tables appear to be lacking in variability and thus, produced insignificant results. An explanation regarding the lack of variability and subsequent absence of preference for diversity strategies may be due to individual differences of the White American participants.

Research indicates that individual differences largely influence white participants' evaluations of diversity strategies and out group attitudes (Kauff, Asbrock, Thörner & Wagner, 2013; Knowles et al., 2009; Morrison, Plaut & Ybarra, 2010; Yogeeswaran et al., 2017; Yogeeswaran et al., 2018). Specifically, research indicates that individual differences related to meritocracy beliefs, system justification and social dominance orientation (SDO) moderates support for a colourblind strategy (Knowles et al., 2009; Yogeeswaran et al., 2017; Yogeeswaran et al., 2018). In contrast, individual differences associated with ingroup ethnic identification, right wing authoritarianism (RWA) and national identity threats have been shown to influence support for multiculturalism and outgroup attitudes (Kauff et al., 2013; Morrison et al., 2010; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). Furthermore, essentialist thinking by white individuals is negatively related to interculturalism (Verkuyten et al. 2020). Overall,

research indicates that there are many individual difference factors which may influence whites' support for certain diversity strategies. It may be possible that these individual difference factors are driving White American participants' reactions, creating minimal variability within their evaluations of diversity strategies. Therefore, future work should examine the role of individual difference factors in whites' responses.

If these diverging patterns of ideological response can be observed between just two racially different groups when addressing group-based needs, the absurdity of selecting one strategy to serve social policies within national contexts, which contain numerous social categories, should be considered. For example, in Study 2, African Americans selected multiculturalism when presented with a challenge of ethnic minority groups underperforming across social contexts. However, other disadvantaged groups related to race, class, sexuality or gender may display differing ideological responses when presented with challenges pertaining to their experiences of inequality and group-based needs (Gündemir et al., 2019). Furthermore, the implausibility of supporting one overarching strategy becomes even more problematic when intersectionality is considered.

Research indicates that individuals categorised with multiple disadvantaged identities struggle to fit the prototypes of their respective groups, and as a result, experience "intersectional invisibility", meaning that their group membership to these groups is not recognised (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008) nor their experiences of group inequality. Whilst, one of interculturalism's central component of identity flexibility serve to embrace plural identities, compared to multiculturalism which holds a static stance of cultural identities by protecting singular forms of identity, research has yet to discern how interculturalism fares in addressing the challenges of multiple disadvantaged identities (e.g. African American women) or how these individuals conceptualise diversity strategies,

conflicting group-based needs, and various challenges of inequality across different social contexts.

Limitations and Future Directions

It is important to point out that the present research only provides preliminary evidence of its intended purpose given the novelty of the topic. To the best of the author's knowledge, the current study is an initial attempt at matching intergroup strategies, based on their individual characteristics and aims, to address concrete challenges that societies and organisations face in day-to-day life. Further research is therefore needed. However, the current studies provide a precursory glance at how people react to different concrete realities of living with diversity and the solutions which best fit them. Additionally, the social contexts examined in the current research were only limited to three settings: workplace, school and neighbourhood/city council. Future replications would therefore need to expand upon these by investigating the role of diversity strategies in addressing challenges occurring in other settings. The same principle can be argued for the challenges created within those contexts. The findings of the current study are grounded in the social contexts and the challenges presented within those contexts. If these were to be changed in any way, then it would be plausible to receive differing results. Hence, the findings are attached to the specifics of the manipulation of social contexts and the intergroup challenges within them.

Another limitation of the current research is that diversity strategies can be conceptualized and interpreted in a variety of ways (Guimond et al., 2014; Gündemir et al., 2019). For example, colourblindness has been conceptualized and interpreted as value-in-homogeneity, value-in-individual-differences and value-in-equality. Equally, multiculturalism has been positively interpreted as a recognition and celebration of cultural differences and negatively as a segregationist approach (Hahn et al., 2015; Gündemir et al., 2019; Plaut et al., 2009; Verkuyten, 2010). For the purposes of the present study,

colourblindness and multiculturalism were utilised as value-individual-differences and celebration of cultural differences approaches, respectively, which are established practice and widely accepted in social psychological research (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Hahn et al., 2015; Plaut et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2007; Verkuyten, 2010). The different conceptualizations and interpretations of strategies can also be observed in policy discourses across different national contexts where multiculturalism and colourblindness are conceptualized and subsequently implemented differently (Guimond et al., 2014; Knowles et al., 2009; Modood, 2014; Taylor, 2012; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2010, p. 2). Put simply, no two countries will follow identical ideological approaches within their policies. For example, multiculturalism is understood and implemented differently in Canada compared to the UK (Guimond et al., 2014; Verkuyten, 2005; Taylor, 2012). Another example can be made with comparing colourblindness in the U.S. and France.

Fundamentally, colourblindness in the U.S. and France appeals to an ideal of ignoring group differences and the right to individual access for equality. However, France has incorporated additional features to their practice of colourblindness, dating back to the revolution. Unique features within the French policy of colourblindness, absent in the U.S. context include the importance of secularism (laïcité), and the absence of the existence of minority groups (Akan, 2009; Guimond et al., 2014). In terms of racial relations, research suggests that colourblindess has a greater positive effect in the national context of France compared to the U.S. context (Guimond et al., 2014). The same distinction can be made between multiculturalism practiced and understood in the European context compared to Canada, where Canada appears to have greater positive outcomes for intergroup relations (Guimond et al., 2014; Taylor, 2012). Hence, it is acknowledged that the findings of the present study may be contained to that of the United States context and therefore, future research in this topic should examine other national contexts.

Broader Implications

The global inevitability of increasing ethnic and cultural diversity make the need for efficient strategies to aid positive intergroup interactions more imperative than ever. Recently, there appears to be a political shift away from the previously championed multiculturalism back to assimilation policies in many European countries (Entzinger, 2006; Joppke, 2004; Verkuyten, 2010). To avoid this seemingly regressive step back to assimilationist approaches, UNESCO, many local government bodies, and the Council of Europe have argued for an alternative, though similar in essence to multiculturalism, pro-diversity strategy, interculturalism (Bouchard, 2010; Cantle, 2012; Meer & Modood, 2012; Taylor, 2012).

However, research indicates diversity strategies provide nuanced outcomes and there is no clear winner for intergroup relations. For example, whilst multiculturalism appears to indicate greater positive outcomes for ethnic minority group members (Hahn et al., 2015; Plaut et al., 2009; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Vorauer et al., 2009; Wolsko et al., 2000), after being exposed to multiculturalism, majority behavioural outcomes toward minority groups include increased hostility, positive stereotyping and exclusion from the national identity (Plaut et al., 2011; Morrison et al., 2010; Vorauer & Sasaki, 2011; Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014). Additionally, colourblindness also has mixed effects for ethnic minority groups (Levin et al., 2012; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Vorauer et al., 2009; Wolsko et al., 2000; also see Whitley & Webster, 2019 meta-analysis). Although, several governments and international organizations appear eager to replace multiculturalism with interculturalism, little is known about its implications for intergroup relations, as interculturalism is a relatively new diversity management strategy. Recent empirical research indicates that it provides similar positive effect to multiculturalism regarding intergroup relations (Verkuyten et al., 2020; Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2020; Yogeeswaran et al.,

2020). However, its component of identity flexibility is less supported among racial/ethnic minorities relative to multiculturalism (Gale et al., 2020).

Therefore, instead of debating for one overarching strategy to solve the question of increasing diversity and the implications on intergroup relations, the current research sought to provide flexibility when thinking about diversity management: that perhaps it may be more logical if strategies can be matched, according to their central components and aims, to the different types of challenges face in ever changing social realities. This focus is critical as governments, organisations and other institutions worldwide already spend billions of dollars a year on well-intentioned diversity programs that are often ineffective and can even backfire by leading to more negative outcomes in organisations, communities and national level policies (Kalev, Dobbin & Kelly, 2006; Kaiser et al., 2013). The current research, therefore, provides a starting point for a deeper understanding of how both majority and minority groups perceive these differing diversity strategies for addressing real-world challenges around ethnic and cultural diversity.

The issues described above, serve to reinforce the notion that living with diversity at a concrete level is complex and nuanced. Debating one diversity strategy over another as the solution for an increasingly diverse world may be impractical. The current research sought to investigate how people respond to various diversity challenges across different social contexts, and which strategy they felt were most appropriate when addressing these challenges, based on the central components and aims of a given strategy. The current thesis only provides a starting point for such an approach to be developed and explored further within the area of diversity and intergroup relations.

References

Adams, J. T. (1941). The epic of America. New York, NY: Blue Ribbon.

Akan, M. (2009). Laïcité and multiculturalism: The Stasi Report in context 1. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *60*(2), 237-256.

Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving, and preventing intergroup conflict: Evidence, limitations, and potential. *American Psychologist, 68*(7), 527.

Allport GW. 1954. The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 537 pp.

Ansell, A. E. (2006). Casting a blind eye: the ironic consequences of color-blindness in South Africa and the United States. *Critical Sociology*, *32*(2-3), 333-356.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(4), 918.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(3), 205-209.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Stephens, N. M., & Reagans, R. E. (2016). Beyond one-size-fits-all: Tailoring diversity approaches to the representation of social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*(4), 547.

Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (2013). Is there really a retreat from multiculturalism policies? New evidence from the multiculturalism policy index. *Comparative European Politics*, *11*(5), 577-598.

Bar-Haim, Y., Ziv, T., Lamy, D., & Hodes, R. M. (2006). Nature and nurture in own-race face processing. *Psychological Science*, *17*(2), 159-163.

Berlin, I. (2004). American slavery in history and memory and the search for social justice. *The Journal of American History, 90*(4), 1251-1268.

Bouchard, G. (2010). What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal*, *56*, 435.

Bowers, C. A., Pharmer, J. A., & Salas, E. (2000). When member homogeneity is needed in work teams: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, *31*(3), 305-327.

Cantle, T. (2012). Interculturalism: For the era of globalisation, cohesion and diversity. *Political Insight*, *3*(3), 38-41.

Cantle, T. (2016). The case for interculturalism, plural identities and cohesion. *Multiculturalism and interculturalism: Debating the dividing lines*, 133-157.

Chaney, C., & Robertson, R. V. (2013). Racism and police brutality in America. *Journal of African American Studies, 17*(4), 480-505.

Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). Projections of the Size and Composition of the US Population: 2014 to 2060. Population Estimates and Projections. Current Population Reports. P25-1143. *US Census Bureau.*

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the complexity of "we": Social attitudes and social change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(1), 3-20.

Dovidio, J. F., Saguy, T., & Gaertner, S. L. (2010). Appreciating the role of the "individual mind" in diversity science: Commonality, harmony, and social change. *Psychological Inquiry, 21*(2), 108-114.

Entzinger, H. (2006). Changing the rules while the game is on: From multiculturalism to assimilation in the Netherlands. In Y.M. Bodemann & G. Yurkakul (Eds.), *Migration, citizenship, ethnos* (pp. 121-144). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Banker, B. S., Houlette, M., Johnson, K. M., & McGlynn, E. A. (2000). Reducing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorization, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 4*(1), 98.

Gale, J., Yogeeswaran, K., & Verkuyten, M. (2020). Diversity ideologies and their relation with minority ethnic and national identification. Manuscript in preparation.

Guimond, S., de la Sablonnière, R., & Nugier, A. (2014). Living in a multicultural world: Intergroup ideologies and the societal context of intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology, 25*(1), 142-188.

Gündemir, S., Martin, A. E., & Homan, A. C. (2019). Understanding diversity ideologies from the target's perspective: A review and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10.*

Hahn, A., Banchefsky, S., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2015). Measuring intergroup ideologies: Positive and negative aspects of emphasizing versus looking beyond group differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*(12), 1646-1664.

Hehman, E., Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Mania, E. W., Guerra, R., Wilson, D. C., & Friel, B. M. (2012). Group status drives majority and minority integration preferences. *Psychological Science, 23*(1), 46-52.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and personality psychology compass, 2*(1), 204-222.

Ito, T. A., & Urland, G. R. (2003). Race and gender on the brain: Electrocortical measures of attention to the race and gender of multiply categorizable individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(4), 616.

Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy 1. *The British Journal of Sociology, 55*(2), 237-257.

Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(3), 599-627.

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 104*(3), 504.

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American sociological review, 71*(4), 589-617.

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*(6), 893.

Katz, M. B., Stern, M. J., & Fader, J. J. (2005). The New African American Inequality. *The Journal of American History, 92*(1), 75-108.

Kauff, M., Asbrock, F., Thörner, S., & Wagner, U. (2013). Side effects of multiculturalism: The interaction effect of a multicultural ideology and authoritarianism on prejudice and diversity beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(3), 305-320.

King, M. L. Jr. (1963). I have a dream. Speech delivered on the steps at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C. on August 28, 1963.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2014). The essentialist critique of multiculturalism: Theories, policies, ethos. *Ethos (May 2014). Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies Research Paper No. RSCAS*, *59*.

Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: Motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(4), 857.

Lai, C. K., Marini, M., Lehr, S. A., Cerruti, C., Shin, J. E. L., Joy-Gaba, J. A., ... & Frazier, R. S. (2014). Reducing implicit racial preferences: I. A comparative investigation of 17 interventions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*(4), 1765.

Levin, S., Matthews, M., Guimond, S., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Kteily, N., ... & Dover, T. (2012). Assimilation, multiculturalism, and colorblindness: Mediated and moderated relationships between social dominance orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 207-212.

Levy, S. R., West, T. L., & Ramirez, L. (2005). Lay theories and intergroup relations: A social-developmental perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *16*(1), 189-220.

Levy, S. R., West, T., Ramirez, L., & Karafantis, D. M. (2006b). The Protestant work ethic: A lay theory with dual intergroup implications. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 9, 95 – 115.

Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime. com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior research methods, 49*(2), 433-442.

Loobuyck, P. (2016). Towards an intercultural sense of belonging together: Reflections on the theoretical and political level. *Multiculturalism and interculturalism. Debating the dividing lines*, 225-245.

Mahfud, Y., Badea, C., Verkuyten, M., & Reynolds, K. (2018). Multiculturalism and attitudes toward immigrants: The impact of perceived cultural distance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*(6), 945-958.

Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. *Daedalus*, *129*(4), 233-259.

Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism?. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *33*(2), 175-196.

Modood, T. (2014). Multiculturalism, interculturalisms and the majority. *Journal of Moral Education*, *43*(3), 302-315.

Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 631-659.

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*(12), 1648-1661.

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., Apfelbaum, E. P., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color blindness and interracial interaction: Playing the political correctness game. *Psychological Science*, *17*(11), 949-953.

Novoa, C., & Moghaddam, F. M. (2014). Policies for managing cultural. In V. Benet-Martinez & Y. Hong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity*, 462.doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199796694.013.009

Parekh, B. (2001). Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory. *Ethnicities*, *1*(1), 109-115.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*(1), 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 90*(5), 751.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities?. *Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 444-446.

Plaut, V. C. (2010). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*(2), 77-99.

Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 101*(2), 337.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., Hurd, K., & Romano, C. A. (2018). Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*(3), 200-206.

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*(4), 741.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5-6), 377-391.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(4), 615.

Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*(1), 12-21.

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 417-423.

Rios, K., & Wynn, A. N. (2016). Engaging with diversity: Framing multiculturalism as a learning opportunity reduces prejudice among high White American identifiers. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*(7), 854-865.

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 & Intergroup Relations*, *10*(4), 617-637.

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(1).

Sasaki, S. J., & Vorauer, J. D. (2013). Ignoring versus exploring differences between groups: Effects of salient color-blindness and multiculturalism on intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7*(4), 246-259.

Sekaquaptewa, D., Waldman, A., & Thompson, M. (2007). Solo status and self-construal: Being distinctive influences racial self-construal and performance apprehension in African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *13*(4), 321.

Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *American journal of Sociology, 63*(4), 349-356.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 379-440). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*(1), 116-133.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conˉict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33±47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Taylor, C. (2012). Interculturalism or multiculturalism? *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *38*(4-5), 413-423.

Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2008). The many faces of diversity resistance in the workplace. *Diversity Resistance in Organizations*, 1-22.

Todd, A. R., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). Perspective taking combats the denial of intergroup discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(3), 738-745.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *27*(3-4), 155-180

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

Verkuyten, M., Drabbles, M., & Van Den Nieuwenhuijzen, K. (1999). Self-categorisation and emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*(5-6), 605-619.

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *26*(1), 91-108.

Verkuyten, M., & Brug, P. (2004). Multiculturalism and group status: The role of ethnic identification, group essentialism and protestant ethic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*(6), 647-661.

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*(1), 121.

Verkuyten, M. (2006). Multicultural recognition and ethnic minority rights: A social identity perspective. *European review of social psychology, 17*(1), 148-184.

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

Verkuyten, M. (2007). Social psychology and multiculturalism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *1*(1), 280-297.

Verkuyten, M. (2010). Assimilation ideology and situational well-being among ethnic minority members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 269-275.

Verkuyten, M. (2011). Assimilation ideology and outgroup attitudes among ethnic majority members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *14*(6), 789-806.

Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., Mepham, K., & Sprong, S. (2020). Interculturalism: A new diversity ideology with interrelated components of dialogue, unity, and identity flexibility. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50,* 505-519.

Verkuyten, M., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2020). Interculturalism and the acceptance of minority groups: The role of political orientation. Social Psychology, 51, 135-140. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000404

Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Abington, England: Routledge.

Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science*, *20*(7), 838-845.

Vorauer, J. D., & Sasaki, S. J. (2011). In the worst rather than the best of times: Effects of salient intergroup ideology in threatening intergroup interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 307.

Vorauer, J. D., & Quesnel, M. S. (2017). Salient multiculturalism enhances minority group members' feelings of power. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(2), 259-271.

Ward, C., Gale, J., Staerklé, C., & Stuart, J. (2018). Immigration and multiculturalism in context: A framework for psychological research. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*(4), 833-855.

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2008). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 331-372.

Wilder, D. A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 291-355). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Whitley Jr, B. E., & Webster, G. D. (2019). The relationships of intergroup ideologies to ethnic prejudice: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *23*(3), 207-237.

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*(4), 635-654.

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*(3), 277-306.

Yogeeswaran, K., & Dasgupta, N. (2014). The devil is in the details: Abstract versus concrete construals of multiculturalism differentially impact intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*(5), 772-789.

Yogeeswaran, K., Davies, T., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). Janus-faced nature of colorblindness: Social dominance orientation moderates the relationship between colorblindness and outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*(4), 509-516.

Yogeeswaran, K., Verkuyten, M., Osborne, D., & Sibley, C. G. (2018). "I have a dream" of a colorblind nation? Examining the relationship between racial colorblindness, system justification, and support for policies that redress inequalities. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(2), 282-298.

Yogeeswaran, K., Verkuyten, M., & Ealam, B. (in press). A way forward? The impact of interculturalism on intergroup relations in culturally diverse nations. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations. DOI: 10.1177/1368430220918651

Zárate, M. A., Shaw, M., Marquez, J. A., & Biagas Jr, D. (2012). Cultural inertia: The effects of cultural change on intergroup relations and the self-concept. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(3), 634-645.

Zou, L., & Cheryan, S. (2015). When Whites' attempts to be multicultural backfire in intergroup interactions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *9*(11), 581-592.

Appendices available upon request.