UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
White identity and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis and review

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/27j640ms

Author
Goren, Matt J.

Publication Date
2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

White identity and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis and review

by

Matt J. Goren

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Psychology
in the
Graduate Division
of the
University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:
Professor Victoria C. Plaut, Chair
Professor Ozlem Ayduk, Co-Chair
Professor Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton
Professor Jack Glaser

Fall 2014

Abstract

White identity and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis and review

by

Matt J. Goren
Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology
University of California, Berkeley

Professor Victoria C. Plaut, Chair

Despite growing social scientific interest in White racial identification, how White identity predicts intergroup attitudes remains unclear. Across the literature, results are ambiguous and often contradictory. Some researchers have found that White identity predicts more positive intergroup attitudes while others have found that it predicts more negative intergroup attitudes. Others still have found no relationship or a relationship only when the White in-group is threatened. We hypothesize that these conflicting results may be due to differences in how White identity is conceptualized and to differences among Whites' interracial contact. In the meta-analysis, we examined the relationship between multiple measures of White identity and a variety of intergroup attitudes. In general, White identity weakly but significantly predicted more negative intergroup attitudes. We further explored this finding by testing for moderation by multiple forms of methodological bias as well as multiple proxies for positive and negative interracial contact. We found some evidence of publication bias as well as a moderating effect of experience with interracial contact such that White identity predicted relatively more positive intergroup attitudes for Whites who tended to have positive interracial contact. In our discussion, we integrate the results with racial identity theories to help disambiguate the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes.

Dedication

To my friends and lovers

“There are places I remember
All my life though some have changed
Some forever not for better
Some have gone and some remain
All these places have their moments
With lovers and friends I still can recall
Some are dead and some are living
In my life I've loved them all”
(Lennon-McCartney, 1965)

Acknowledgements

Phew. I spent my twenties as a graduate student, doing just about everything a graduate student can do to take 7.5 years to write a dissertation. But here we are. And I do mean "we" because one of these things doesn't get written alone.

My committee (Rudy, Oz, Jack, and Vicky) put a lot of energy into this dissertation and always had my back. Vicky especially has the patience of a saint and has been a tremendous advocate and supporter. I'm also grateful to the faculty at UGA and UF who aren't named on the signature page, particularly Kecia Thomas for her continued support and James Shepperd, Cathy Cottrell, and Jodi Grace who got my career started.

I'm also fortunate that the staff at both UGA and Berkeley are amazing. Special thanks to John Schindel, Harumi Quinones, Elizabeth Peele, Elizabeth Davis, and Tracey Herndon Villaveces. And none of this happened without the dozens of brilliant and diligent research assistants, especially Mona and Melissa who will one day make me a proud second author.

My friends and fellow graduate students have been so supportive in every way possible, from helpful feedback to shared misery. I'm going to miss someone and feel terrible, so here is a short non-exhaustive list of thank yous to Bryan, Jodi, Brittany, Chris, Desi, Laura, Craig, Tchiki, Mike, Fausto, Alice, Pinky, Minxuan, Katherine, Amanda, Christina, Michelle, Carla, Dan, Malik, Kaja, Bryan, Megan, Andy and honorary member Alem.

And of course my non-graduate student friends who probably did more to keep me sane than anyone: Zeeshan, Brandon, Bart, Crystal, Amanda, Lauren, Elliot, Taylor, and especially Hysam who has provided so much free therapy over the years. And finally, thanks to my closest partners who I was so lucky to know even if I didn't always know it: Rachel, Courtney, Amber, Andy, and Meghan. Thank you and everyone else so very very much.

Table of Contents

Dedication i
Acknowledgements ii
Table of Contents iii
Introduction 1
Method 10
Results 12
Discussion 18
References 24
Supplemental References 33
Tables 38
Supplemental Tables 43

White identity and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis and review

Over three decades of research have attempted to answer what may appear to be a simple question: do Whites who strongly identify with their race endorse negative intergroup attitudes? Interest in answering this question has recently grown, but as other scholars have suggested (Knowles & Peng, 2005; Lewis, 2004; White & Burke, 1987), a lack of conceptual clarity has led to a proliferation of White identity measures and isolated theorizing. A cursory glance at research in this area reveals a fairly mixed set of empirical findings. Many studies have found that White identity predicts negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, & Federico, 1998; Unzueta & Binning, 2012; Young & Craig, 1997) and sensitivity to interracial threats (e.g., Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Stephan et al., 2002). Yet, in sharp contrast, other work suggests that White identity predicts *less* prejudice and more pro-diversity behaviors (e.g., Chrobot-Mason, 2004; Linnehan, Chrobot-Mason, & Konrad, 2006; Eichstedt, 2001; Helms, 1984). *Identity form* theorists offer yet another possibility: that *some* strongly identified Whites endorse negative intergroup attitudes while others endorse positive intergroup attitudes (Croll, 2007; Helms, 1984).

Understanding whether and when White identity predicts intergroup attitudes has not only theoretical but practical implications, for example, for interracial contact and multicultural education. In this meta-analysis, we attempt to determine the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes using dozens of studies, conducted over three decades and in five nations. We also test for moderation of this relationship by numerous other variables (e.g., manipulated interracial threat perceptions) and attempt to assess the validity of our findings by testing for measurement and method biases. To inform this meta-analysis, we first summarize research on the ambiguous relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Next, we introduce distinct definitions and dimensions of White identity. Finally, using Social Identity and identity forms theories as guides, we propose numerous possible moderators that may disambiguate the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes.

White Identity and Intergroup Attitudes

Researchers have investigated a variety of attitudes that are relevant to participation in a racially diverse society. In our literature review, we found that researchers have investigated Whites' endorsement of diversity policies and beliefs (e.g., support for affirmative action, opposition to housing segregation, and Social Dominance Orientation), interracial affect (e.g., interracial warmth, interracial anxiety, and prejudice), diversity behavioral intentions (e.g., voting for African American political candidates or attending a voluntary diversity training session), awareness of racial issues (e.g., the belief in White privilege or the rejection of racial color-blindness), and perceptions of interracial threats. To some extent, these attitudes can be understood in the aggregate along a positive to negative continuum; in the present meta-analysis, we report aggregated intergroup attitudes alongside each more specific attitude. Researchers almost exclusively measure these constructs using explicit participant self-report; only one of the included studies used an implicit measure and none used observational measures. In the present section, we first discuss basic research on in-group identity and intergroup attitudes before moving on to studies of White identity specifically.

In-group identification and intergroup attitudes. People in the Western world seem to have a need for positive self-regard (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999) that extends to their social groups – and particularly ones with whom they strongly identify (Crocker &

Luhtanen, 1990). People often attain positive regard for their in-groups without regard to other social groups, for example, by assigning in-groups positive, meaningful, and distinctive traits (see for review Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Tajfel & Turner 1979). Following this evidence, many theorists have argued that, in most cases, in-group identification should be *unrelated* to negative intergroup attitudes and behaviors such as out-group derogation (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999; Brown, 2000; Mummendey, Simon, Dietze, & Grünert, 1992; Turner, 1999). Consistent with the above theorists' expectations, White identity has failed to significantly predict a wide array of intergroup attitudes, from pro- or anti-diversity policy endorsement (Kaiser, Dyrenforth, & Hagiwara, 2006; Linnehan, Konrad, Reitman, Greenhalgh, London, 2006; Renfro, Duran, Stephan, & Clason, 2006) to racial awareness (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007), prejudice (Garza Caballero, 2003; Lowery, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2007) or pro-diversity intentions (Aberson & Gaffney, 2009; Kaplan, 2004).

Yet many others have reported a significant relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Curiously, White identity has predicted both more positive and more negative intergroup attitudes. For example, some researchers have found that White identity predicts fewer pro-diversity policy endorsements (e.g., Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, & Tropp, 2008) while others have found the opposite pattern (e.g., Lowery, Chow, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2012) despite using the same measure. White identity has also predicted more (Mastro, Behm-Morawitz, & Kopacz, 2008) and less (Levin & Sidanius, 1999) positive attitudes toward out-groups as well as more (Thomsen, Green, Ho, Levin, van Laar, Sinclair, & Sidanius, 2010) and fewer (Korf & Malan, 2002) perceptions of interracial threat. Given these inconsistent results, a meta-analysis is an important supplement to a narrative literature review.

In the following sections, we use Social Identity Theory and identity form theories as frameworks to investigate how White identity predicts intergroup attitudes. As we discuss, identity forms theories provide a wealth of insight into to explain how context influences the content of identity. These theories are therefore very useful for generating hypotheses about when and for whom White identity predicts more positive or more negative intergroup attitudes. Unfortunately, studies in this tradition have only rarely measured identity in a way that can be meta-analyzed. In contrast, researchers often invoke Social Identity Theory to discuss the relationship between identification and intergroup attitudes using well-validated identity measures. Therefore, studies in the Social Identity Theory tradition provide us with both additional theoretical insight and considerable data we can meta-analyze.

Identity Forms **Theories**

A major reason for the ambiguity about White identity is a lack of definitional consistency and clarity. When researchers say they measure White identity, what do they mean? There are two major theoretical frameworks of White identity: *identity forms* theories and Social Identity Theory. Mostly situated in counseling psychology, education, and ethnic studies research, *identity forms* theories define White identity as a cluster of *identity attitudes* that manifest in distinct *identity forms*. Whites with equally strong racial identification may endorse very different *identity forms*. We speculate that much of the ambiguity in the White identity literature is because so few studies in the Social Identity Theory framework attend to the influence of *identity forms*. In the present meta-analysis and review, we attempt to link these two theoretical frameworks.

Until recently, the *identity form* theory framework dominated the scientific discussion of White identity. The most prominent *identity forms* theories are Helms' (1984; 1995) White racial identity attitudes theory and Rowe and colleagues' White racial consciousness theory (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). Others have compared and contrasted these theories (Block & Carter, 1996; Leach, Behrens, & LeFleur, 2002; Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007; Tettegah, 2000) so we will not duplicate their efforts. At their core, these and other *identity form* theories (e.g., Croll, 2007; Perry, 2001) focus on the content of Whites' racial identities and, notably, how this content is inextricably related to Whites' intergroup attitudes.

How people construe their exposure to interracial contact seems to predict which *identity forms* they adopt (Helms, 1984; Phinney, 1990; Quintana, 2007; Rowe et al., 1994). Three White *identity forms* are most common in the United States: a weakly identified form, a prideful form, and a power-cognizant form (for review, see Goren & Plaut, 2012).[1]

Due in part to ongoing real-world (Orfield, Kucsera, & Siegel-Hawley, 2012) and media segregation (Greenberg, Mastro, & Brand, 2002; Mastro & Tropp, 2004), most Whites have weak racial identification (Helms, 1984; Knowles & Peng, 2005; Phinney, 1990; Rowe et al., 1994). In fact, for many Whites, Whiteness itself is invisible or "universal" (Brewer, 1991; Dyer, 1997; Fredrickson, 1999; Knowles & Peng, 2005; McIntosh, 1990; Perry, 2001, 2007; Sue, 2004). Writing on White universalism, Perry (2007) states, "Among most white Americans today, white racial identity is elusive, at best, and is, indeed, experienced more as a 'sense' of group position than as a clearly defined identity. This is largely because white culture and identity are unmarked and positioned as 'normal' in the wider American mainstream" (p. 378). When Whites with a weak racial identity discuss race, they tend to focus on superficial differences like skin color (McDermott & Samson, 2005) while ignoring differences in power or privilege (Helms, 1984; Goren & Plaut, 2012). They tend to endorse positive intergroup attitudes (Burkard, Juarez-Huffaker, & Ajmere, 2003; Carter, 1990, 1995; Croll, 2007; Goren & Plaut, 2012; Gushue & Carter, 2000) but often have awkward and unproductive interracial interactions (e.g., in psychotherapy; Carter, 1995; Utsey & Gernat, 2002; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003).

Whether a White person tends to adopt a prideful or power-cognizant *identity form* seems to depend on the quality of their interracial contact and, more proximally, their awareness of racial issues (Helms, 1984; Knowles & Peng, 2005; Phinney, 1990; Rowe et al., 1994). Pleasant intergroup contact can promote intergroup trust, communication, and awareness whether in the context of friendships (Allport, 1954; Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Gonzalez, 2009; Page-Gould et al., 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Thompson, 2003) or more formal intergroup contact such as diversity training and multicultural education (e.g., Brown, Parham, & Yonker; 1996; Miller & Harris, 2005). Pleasant contact predicts a power-cognizant *identity form*, in which Whites are aware of racial issues, believe in White privilege, and have a relatively strong racial identity (Croll, 2007; Eichstedt, 2001; Goren & Plaut, 2012; Helms, 1984; Warren & Hytten, 2004). Whites who adopt a power-cognizant form tend to endorse positive intergroup attitudes (Eichstedt, 2001; Goren & Plaut, 2012; Carter, 1990).

Unfortunately, not all interracial contact is pleasant. Indeed, most interracial contact can be awkward and discomforting for both Whites and people of color (e.g., Richeson & Shelton, 2007). Even more disconcerting, negative interracial contact is more memorable and affects

[1] While the general process may be the same, the content of *identity forms* varies markedly between ethnic groups (for African Americans, see Sellers et al., 1997; Worrell, Vandiver, Schaefer, Cross, & Fhagen-Smith, 2006; for Whites, for a review, see Goren & Plaut, 2012; also Croll, 2007; Helms, 1984, 1995; Hughey, 2008; Perry, 2001; Rowe et al., 1994).

intergroup attitudes and in-group identification more than positive contact (Paolini, Harwood, & Rubin, 2010). Repeated exposure to negative interracial contact tends to increase Whites' accessibility and belief in negative out-group stereotypes, a nefarious form of racial awareness (Djiker, 1987; Paolini et al., 2010). Negative contact appears to instill a prideful *identity form* in which Whites both strongly identify as White and believe that White culture is superior (Goren & Plaut, 2012; Helms, 1984; Young & Craig, 1997). Whites with a prideful identity tend to associate with other Whites who also endorse system-justifying beliefs and other negative intergroup attitudes, perpetuating a cycle of in-group favoritism and out-group distrust (Helms, 1984; Perry, 2001; Phinney, 1990; Young & Craig, 1997).

Researchers developed complex, multidimensional scales to test the most popular *identity form* theories (e.g., the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale, Choney & Behrens, 1996; the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, Helms & Carter, 1991). Consistent with the assumption that White identity and intergroup attitudes are inextricably linked, both scales measure how "White people think about individuals whom they do not consider to be White" (Leach et al., 2002, p. 69). These scales do not measure identification as it is defined by most identity theorists (Leach et al., 2002; Lowery, Unzueta, Knowles, & Goff, 2006; Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994; Rowe, 2007). Consequently, these scales do not measure Whites' identity per se, but rather their endorsement of a set of relevant attitudes toward racial diversity. Based on their responses, Whites are then categorized into one *identity form* or another. Because we want to investigate how White identity per se predicts intergroup attitudes, we must turn to other measures. Fortunately, researchers in the Social Identity Theory framework have constructed many psychometrically valid and reliable measures of identity that can be used for this purpose. In the present meta-analysis, we build upon a growing body of work that uses these measures to test predictions of *identity form* theories (e.g., Croll, 2007; Goren & Plaut, 2012; Knowles & Peng, 2005; Phinney, 1992).

Social Identity Theory

Within Social Identity Theory, there is no "single, consensual definition of collective identity" (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004, p. 80) but the most cited is "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from knowledge of membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). According to Leach et al. (2008), "most research" treats identity as a single, unidimensional construct (that is, some people have strong identification and others have weak identification). They add, however, that "this approach appears to be inadequate both conceptually and empirically" (p. 144). Consequently, Social Identity and Social Categorization Theorists (Hornsey, 2008) have dedicated considerable energy to further refining this definition. Essentially every theorist agrees that identity should not be considered a unidimensional construct and each has proposed multiple subdimensions. According to these theorists, the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes may depend in part on which dimension(s) of White identity a researcher measures.

The first dimension of identity is *categorization,* the act of self-labeling as a member of a social group. *Categorization* is an interesting phenomenon in its own right (for review, see Ellemers et al., 2002), particularly for Whites who deny that they have a race (Goren & Plaut, 2014). In the meta-analysis, we only used studies that included participants who categorized themselves or were categorized by researchers as White.

The *centrality*, *solidarity*, and *evaluation* dimensions, defined below, receive the majority of theoretical and empirical attention and form the basis of all three-factor models of identity we are aware of (e.g., Cameron, 2004; Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999; Hinkle, Taylor, Fox-Cardamone, & Crook, 1989; Jackson, 2002). Several other dimensions of identity have received less attention, preventing us from including them in the analysis.[2]

White identity *centrality* is the extent to which a White person believes his or her White identity is important or central to the self-concept. Theorists have named this dimension *centrality* (Cameron, 2004; Leach et al., 2008), *importance* (Ashmore et al., 2004), *cognitive* (Hinkle et al., 1989; Jackson, 2002; cf. Leach et al., 2008), *salience* (Roberts, Phinney, Masse, Chen, Roberts, & Romero, 1999), and *self-categorization* (Ellemers et al., 1999). We found *centrality* to be the most frequently measured dimension of White identity. Popular items include "In general, being White is an important part of my self-image" or "Overall, being White has very little to do with how I feel about myself (reverse scored)" (modified from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Sellers et al., 1997).

White identity *solidarity* is the extent to which a White person feels an emotional or psychological bond with other Whites. Theorists have named this dimension *solidarity* (Leach et al., 2008), *emotional* (Ellemers et al., 1999; Hinkle et al., 1989; cf. Leach et al., 2008), *affect-ties* (Jackson, 2002), *in-group ties* (Cameron, 2004), *commitment* (Roberts et al., 1999), and *attachment* (Ashmore et al., 2004) and some relevant items include words such as closeness or belonging (Phinney, 1992). The *solidarity* definition is measured most often with items such as "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group" (from Phinney, 1992) or "I have a strong attachment to other White people" (modified from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Sellers et al., 1997).

White identity *evaluation* is the extent to which a White person feels positively about their racial in-group. Theorists have named this dimension *evaluation* (Ashmore et al., 2004; Ellemers, et al., 1999; Hinkle et al.,1989; Jackson, 2002), ingroup affect (Cameron, 2004), regard (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), and satisfaction (Leach et al., 2008). Evaluation is often measured with a single item feeling thermometer or with items such as "I feel good about the race I belong to" (modified from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Sellers et al., 1997).

How each of the aforementioned dimensions predicts Whites' intergroup attitudes – if at all – is a matter of debate. Some theorists argue that *centrality* but not the other dimensions will predict more negative intergroup attitudes, at least under conditions of threat (Leach et al., 2008). Westerners seem to have a need for positive self-regard and may engage in self-enhancing and other-derogating behaviors to maintain this regard – particularly when the self is threatened (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999). For Whites with high White identity *centrality*, perceived threats to the White in-group will be perceived as threats to the self. In the face of these threats, according to Leach et al. (2008), Whites with high White identity *centrality* are particularly likely to endorse intergroup attitudes that derogate the out-group and affirm White supremacy. Perhaps because some people chronically perceive intergroup threats, *centrality,* and

[2] Examples include *social embeddedness* (the extent to which an identity is reflected in a person's everyday relationships; Ashmore et al., 2004), *behavioral involvement* (the extent to which a person engages in actions relevant to the identity; Ashmore et al., 2004), *common fate* (the extent to which one's fate is shared with members of their social group; see Jackson, 2002), *self-stereotyping* (the extent to which a person assigns attributes of the social group to the self; Leach et al., 2008), and *in-group homogeneity* (the extent to which a person considers members of their social group to be similar; Leach et al., 2008).

not the other dimensions, has been found to predict negative intergroup attitudes even in the absence of overt threats to the in-group (e.g., Jackson, 2002).

In contrast, other theorists argue that *solidarity,* and not the other dimensions, is most likely to predict negative intergroup attitudes. Ashmore et al. (2004) argue that *solidarity* is unrelated to out-group attitudes in most circumstances. In their view, typically, people with high *solidarity* adopt a relational self-concept between the in-group and the self; out-groups are simply not a concern. When the relationship or emotional bond between the self and the in-group is threatened, however, *solidarity* and not *centrality* will predict out-group derogation. Cameron (2004) agrees with this logic, but extends it further to suggest that people high in *solidarity* will be chronically attuned to intergroup threats and therefore more likely to derogate out-groups even in the absence of overt threats. Ellemers and colleagues (1999) found just this pattern among Dutch students who were not exposed to overt intergroup threat: the *solidarity* dimension alone predicted in-group favoritism when controlling for the other two dimensions. Finally, in reviewing minimal group paradigm studies, Jackson (2002) reports that *solidarity* tended to predict in-group bias whereas *centrality* did not.

There is considerably more agreement regarding whether *evaluation* will predict negative intergroup attitudes. Generally, theorists argue that *evaluation* measures in-group focused affect and is unlikely to predict out-group attitudes (e.g., Brewer, 1999). Ellemers and colleagues (1999) found *evaluation* to be unrelated to intergroup attitudes when controlling for *solidarity*, while Jackson (2002) found *evaluation* to be unrelated or perhaps even positively related to intergroup attitudes. Studies using feeling thermometers often find *evaluation* to be positively correlated with out-group attitudes (e.g., Goren & Plaut, 2012). Kinket and Verkuyten (1999), in contrast, argue that *evaluation* may serve a self-protective function and therefore be predictive of negative intergroup attitudes when a person perceives intergroup threats.

In summary, we included measures of *centrality*, *solidarity*, and *evaluation* as independent measures in this meta-analysis. When possible, we meta-analyzed the correlations among these dimensions. Theorists disagree on which of these dimensions is most predictive of intergroup attitudes but generally agree that experiences of negative interracial contact will cause White identity to predict more negative intergroup attitudes. We have not included measures of other identity dimensions due to lack of empirical attention. Finally, we used *categorization* as a selection criterion for our participants.

Moderation by interracial contact

Whites' experiences with interracial contact – both in the immediate environment and over time – appear to profoundly affect the content and consequences of their racial identities. According to *identity form* theories, more frequent and more positive contact will lead a White person to adopt a power-cognizant *identity form* that predicts positive intergroup attitudes. At the group level, the presence of positive interracial contact would increase the proportion of Whites who adopt a power-cognizant *identity form*. We would expect, then, that White identity would predict more positive (vs. negative) intergroup attitudes with more positive (vs. negative or infrequent) interracial contact. To test this hypothesis, we compared correlations between White identity strength and intergroup attitudes in studies where participants were likely exposed to more frequent or more positive interracial contact versus studies where participants' interracial contact was likely to be less frequent or more negative. In the following sections, we introduce our four proxies for interracial contact: the effect of manipulated interracial threats, the effect of

living in a location with a legacy of interracial conflict, the effect of participant age, and the effect of publication year.

Interracial threats. Exposure to interracial threats is a microcosm of negative interracial contact. According to the Integrated Threat Theory (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000), negative intergroup attitudes are linked to the perception of many types of intergroup threats. Intergroup threats directed at the self (Fein & Spencer, 1997) or group (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001) also tend to magnify the relationship between in-group identification and out-group derogation and discrimination. This general principle has been born out in the White identity literature with laboratory manipulations of interracial threats. People who perceive their group to be powerful or dominant seem particularly attuned to threats (Sonnenschein, Bekerman, & Horenczyk, 2010) and respond to threats by derogating out-groups (Ellemers et al., 2002). Verkuyten and Zaremba (2005) demonstrated this effect when they measured Dutch participants' attitudes toward ethnic minorities before, during, and after the dramatic rise and fall of an anti-immigration politician in the Netherlands. Before, attitudes toward ethnic minorities were relatively positive and most respondents embraced multiculturalism. As anti-immigration rhetoric increased the salience of intergroup conflict, respondents' attitudes shifted markedly negative and most came to embrace assimilationism (the majority group culture is superior and minority group members must adapt to it). Once heightened awareness of inter-group conflict began to fade, however, respondents' attitudes again warmed toward ethnic minorities.

Multiple studies have demonstrated the moderating effect of experimentally manipulated interracial threats on the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. For example, when participants read that the proportion of White workers in a company decreased due to affirmative action, only highly identified Whites responded by claiming the policy was unfair and unnecessary (Lowery et al., 2006). Similarly, highly-identified Whites who learned that Asian Americans were surpassing Whites academically endorsed more negative stereotypes of Asians than did weakly-identified Whites or highly identified Whites who were not exposed to this threatening information (Gonsalkorale, Carlisle, & von Hippel, 2007).

Location. Even in the absence of laboratory manipulations, intergroup threats may be salient to White people who live in areas of the world with a history of strained intergroup contact. Members of dominant groups tend to discriminate against and derogate out-groups even when not directly threatened (e.g., Blanz, Mummendey, & Otten, 1995; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1991). For example, Verkuyten and Yildiz (2006) found that Turks' ethnic identity predicted positive intergroup attitudes in the Netherlands, where Turks are a low-power group, but negative intergroup attitudes in Turkey, where Turks are a high-power group. Importantly, *perceived* power seems to be more important than *actual* power. In Israel, Levin and colleagues (1998) asked moderately powerful Mizrahi Jews to consider more powerful Ashkenazim Jews or less powerful Palestinians. When making upward comparisons to a more powerful group, they endorsed more positive intergroup attitudes; when making downward comparisons, they endorsed negative intergroup attitudes.

For centuries, Whites have been the dominant racial group in the racially diverse Western world, that is, Europe and some of its former colonies such as the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (Painter, 2010). In the past, Whites' placement atop the racial hierarchy was explicit and often celebrated (Fredrickson, 1999). Beginning in the mid-20th century, many Western nations changed their laws in ways that reduced blatant, de jure White supremacy.

Changes to Whites' actual and perceived social power were not universally welcomed or successful. South Africa and the United States South in particular were slow to abandon discriminatory practices. In both places, reform coincided with outside intervention and dramatically heightened interracial conflict (Quillian, 1996; Ross, 2007). Whites in the American South have a relatively strong sense of White dominance and perception of interracial threats (Giles & Evans, 1985). Giles and Evans attribute this unique racial subculture, in part, to the relatively large numbers of racial minorities and their rapid rise in social status following the Civil Rights Movement. These characteristics are even more pronounced in the cultural ecology of South Africa, a nation whose supermajority of Blacks only recently rose from de jure second-class citizenship to the highest echelons of political power.

In the meta-analysis, we contrast South Africa and the United States South with other locations to indirectly test whether living in a location with a legacy of interracial conflict strengthens the association between White identity and negative intergroup attitudes. According to the *identity form* theoretical framework, Whites who live in a location with a history of interracial conflict may be more likely to endorse an *identity form* that predicts more negative intergroup attitudes. To the extent this is true, we would expect to see in these locations stronger correlations between White racial identification and negative intergroup attitudes.

Age. Whites' racial identity development is an ongoing process affected by introspection and social context (Helms, 1984). It is therefore reasonable to expect age differences in how Whites' racial identities predict prejudice. According to research on White universalism (Perry, 2007), identity development (Phinney, 1990; Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007), and intergroup contact (Phinney, 1990; Plantz, 1996), older adults tend to have put more thought into their racial identities than younger adults. Younger adults spend more time in relatively segregated schools and neighborhoods (Orfield, et al., 2012) while older adults spend more time in relatively desegregated workplaces (Esen, 2005). Moreover, older adults are more likely to have experienced multicultural education in universities and in the workplace that raises their racial awareness and racial identity (Esen, 2005; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003). In contrast, younger White adults enrolled in competitive universities – as were almost all the younger adults in this meta-analysis – may be especially attuned to potential interracial threats to their academic or career opportunities. For example, growing proportions of high performing Asian classmates may disrupt Whites' position as the dominant race academically (Jiménez & Horowitz, 2013) and instill stereotype threat in important academic domains (Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele, & Brown, 1999).

To the extent that younger adults have spent less time introspecting about their racial identities or experiencing positive interracial contact, we would expect a smaller proportion of younger vs. older adults to have developed racial identities that predict positive intergroup attitudes. We might find this relationship even if the mean valence of younger adults' intergroup attitudes is more positive than older adults'. Moreover, note that we test for an age effect independently of a cohort effect. In our age analyses, we compared younger adults to older adults regardless of the year the study was published.

Publication year. Relative to the time of the Civil Rights Movement, racial attitudes have shifted markedly and positively (Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997). To the extent that the national climate for diversity has become more positive, we would expect that an increasing number of Whites would adopt *identity forms* that predict positive intergroup attitudes. Consequently, we would expect White identity to increasingly predict positive intergroup attitudes over time. In the present meta-analysis, we are limited to investigating effects since

1992. Has the climate improved since then? According to some measures, yes. Workplace segregation has dipped dramatically while, simultaneously, multicultural education programming has become a multibillion dollar industry (Esen, 2005). The election of an African American US president serves as a symbol of these changes.

But according to other measures, the climate has not improved. For example, negative intergroup attitudes seem to have plateaued (Bobo, Charles, Krysan, & Simmons, 2012). Racial segregation has actually increased in schools and housing (Orfield et al., 2012) and desegregation in the form of gentrification may actually increase racial conflict (Boyd, 2008). More troubling, hate crimes actually spiked in the mid-2000s (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2014). In summary, there is evidence both for and against a more positive interracial climate since the early 1990s. It is unclear on the balance how these changes will affect the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes so we refrain from making any hypotheses.

Analyses of Bias

Besides the aforementioned moderators, the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes may also be inconsistent because of various forms of bias such as publication bias. Publication bias is a common problem (Thornton & Lee, 2000) that can arise from factors ranging from benign methodological decisions to the rejection of supposedly uninteresting null results. In the meta-analysis we gauge the severity of publication bias by directly testing whether published journal articles, compared to unpublished datasets or national databases, show a stronger relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. We then examine whether publication status influences any of the other moderation analyses.

We also tested for methodological bias. There is a great deal of methodological variance in the White identity literature, as is typical for social science research. One major source of variance is whether a study was completed in the presence of a researcher or more anonymously, that is, over the phone or the internet. Because of the sensitive nature of racial issues, White people tend to alter their self-reported intergroup attitudes as an impression management strategy (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; McConahay et al., 1981). When they are face-to-face with researchers, Whites' may over-report positive intergroup attitudes and under-report negative intergroup attitudes compared to when their responses are more anonymous. Therefore, in face-to-face studies we may find 1) relatively strong correlations between White identity and positive intergroup attitudes and 2) relatively weak correlations between White identity and negative intergroup attitudes.

Also, as mentioned earlier, there is great variability in how White identity is measured. Some measures, such as the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), have demonstrated good reliability over the past two decades. In contrast, some studies use only single item measures, even though they may systematically underestimate true relationships (Loo, 2002). Following Pettigrew and Tropp's (2006) contact theory meta-analysis, we investigate whether single item measures and reliable multi-item measures of White identity differentially predict intergroup attitudes.

Finally, we tested for less common forms of bias. To test for bias from studies with large sample sizes, we constructed and statistically analyzed funnel plots using with Egger's method (Egger, Davey Smith, Schneider, & Minder, 1997). We also tested for bias by studies with small samples, studies that manipulated threats, and studies from national databases. For more information on how we tested for biases, see the preliminary analyses section of the results.

The Present Meta-analysis

This meta-analysis informs the debate regarding the direction and magnitude of the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes by revealing an aggregate effect size estimate and testing for the influence of multiple, theoretically-informed moderators. To this end, we conducted a thorough literature search, carefully included and coded relevant studies, and performed common and validated meta-analytic statistical analyses.

Method

Literature Search

In March, 2012, we searched three computer databases to locate published studies for the meta-analysis. We first searched abstracts, titles, and keywords in the PsycInfo and ProQuest Dissertation and Theses databases using dozens of keywords created by combining 1) "White", "Caucasian", "Anglo", "dominant", or "majority", 2) "identi*", "centrality", "identi*", "prejud*", "preference", "evaluation", "affect*", "warmth", "lik*", "lov*", "feel*", "bias*", "regard", "private regard", "public regard", or "attitude*", and 3) "ingroup", "in-group", "rac*", "ethnic*", or no additional term. Note that an * in a keyword, such as "identi*", will return "identify", "identification", "identity", and so on.

We also used The Social Sciences Citation Index (within Web of Science) to find articles citing the original sources of the most frequently used measures of White identity. These were the Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), Inclusion of the Ingroup in the Self (IIS; Tropp & Wright, 2001), and the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers, Rowley, Tabbye, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; authors have reworded these items for White participants, e.g., Lowery et al., 2006). For the previously mentioned methodological reasons, we did not include identity attitudes scales such as the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) or White Racial Consciousness Development Scale Revised (WRCDS-R; Lee, Puig, Pasquarella-Daley, Denny, Rai, Dallape, & Parker, 2007).

These searches resulted in 692 articles and dissertations. In an attempt to locate additional unpublished datasets, we posted a request for unpublished relevant work on the Society for Personality and Social Psychology member listserv. This query returned an additional 13 datasets. Finally, we included 15 datasets from the General Social Survey (years 1996 to 2010) and the National Election Survey (years 1972 to 2000) for years that included a measure of racial identity. In total, we found 710 articles, dissertations, unpublished datasets, and published datasets.

Inclusion Criteria

To be included in the meta-analysis, studies had to meet a variety of inclusion criteria. First, studies had to utilize a measure of racial identity, that is, a measure of centrality or solidarity with a racial in-group. Second, studies had to measure an attitude toward diversity, broadly defined. Third, they must present results separately for non-Hispanic White participants as defined by self-reported categorization. Fourth, studies had to report a correlation between a White identity measure and an intergroup attitude measure or report statistics that could be converted into correlation coefficients. Some studies met all inclusion criteria except the third or fourth; in other words, their authors collected but did not report data we could include. If these

studies were published in the past seven years, we emailed their authors for more statistical information.

Of our initial pool of 710 datasets, published articles, and unpublished manuscripts, 82 could be coded for the meta-analysis (see supplemental materials for citations). In some cases, published articles and unpublished manuscripts included multiple independent samples, leaving us with a total count of 178 independent samples for analysis. Within these samples, we coded 2,999 individual tests (for further discussion on individual tests, independent samples, and datasets, see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Sample sizes ranged widely from 6 to 4,612, with a median of 143 and a total *N* of 44,503.

We were unable to include more datasets for a variety of reasons. About one third of the rejected datasets measured identity using an identity attitudes scale. Another 20% were qualitative investigations, while a further 15% were theoretical papers. Another 10% were excluded because they assessed a dependent variable other than an intergroup attitude (e.g., career development decisions). The remaining papers were excluded for a variety of reasons such as a failure to obtain necessary data through e-mail or measuring in-group categorization rather than in-group identity.

Coding

Two coders (the first and second authors; both self-categorize as White) completed all of the coding for the meta-analysis. We coded White identity measures of the *centrality*, *solidarity*, or *evaluation* dimensions based on item face-validity (see Leach et al., 2008). Given the common if ill-advised tendency for researchers to create composite White identity scales that measure multiple dimensions simultaneously, we also created and analyzed an aggregate White identity measure by averaging within studies the White identity dimensions' correlations with intergroup attitudes. Studies that included composite scales were coded as missing data for the individual identity dimension analyses only.

Based on item face validity, we coded intergroup attitudes into the following categories, reverse coding when necessary: support for pro-diversity policies and beliefs, positive affect toward racial out-groups, pro-diversity behavioral intentions, awareness of racial issues, and perceptions of interracial threat. Initial agreement among the raters (mean Kappa = 0.95) was "almost perfect" (Landis & Koch, 1977) and all disagreements were resolved by discussion. We also calculated per study the aggregate correlation between all intergroup attitudes and White identity to investigate more general patterns. Individual correlations were reverse coded when necessary such that higher aggregate correlations suggest White identity predicts more positive intergroup attitudes.

When provided with enough information, we additionally coded for the following moderators: nation, region (United States Midwest, Northeast, South, or West), location with a history of conflict (South Africa and United States South or other), age (<18 adolescent, 18 to 23 "younger adults", and >23 "older adults"; see Kling, Hyde, Showers, and Buswell, 1999), publication year, method (face-to-face or phone/internet), publication status (General Social Survey and National Election Survey databases, unpublished manuscripts and dissertations, or published article), whether the sample was representative or convenient, and the presence or absence of manipulated interracial threats.

Data Analysis

We conducted most analyses using the Raju, Burke, Normand, and Langlois (1991) method with an adapted version of SAS PROC MEANS (Arthur, Bennett, & Huffcutt, 2001). We weighted data by sample size and corrected for attenuation due to unreliability in the predictor and criterion variables (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). When reliabilities were not reported, the missing data was replaced with the average reliability for studies that did report reliabilities, thus constructing a distributional artifact correction. We calculated the number of effect sizes, k, the total sample size, n, and the mean correlation before correcting for attenuation, r.

We then calculated the attenuation corrected correlation parameter estimate, ρ, and its standard error, SE_ρ. To interpret these effect sizes, we used Cohen's (1992) thresholds. For "small" effect sizes, $\rho > |0.100|$. For "medium" effect sizes, $\rho > |0.300|$. Finally, for "large" effect sizes, $\rho > |0.500|$. We next calculated the 95% confidence intervals around ρ to examine whether they included zero (in the case of the main effect analyses) or whether they overlapped with other intervals (in the case of categorical moderator analyses). In our analysis, many effects are statistically significant but do not exceed even the small effect threshold.

Finally, we calculated the Q-statistic, a measure of heterogeneity in the correlations across studies. This statistic follows the chi-squared distribution with $k - 1$ degrees of freedom. A significant Q-statistic indicates that moderators may be operating. If the Q-statistic becomes non-significant after accounting for different levels of a moderator, this suggests that the moderator accounts for the variance.

We conducted continuous moderation analyses using the Card (2012) method in which effect sizes are regressed on the moderator. We weighted data by sample size and then calculated the number of effect sizes, k, the total sample size, n, and r, the unstandardized beta weight before correcting for attenuation. We then corrected for attenuation and calculated the intercept and slope of ρ. To calculate the parameter estimate for a given value of the moderator, one must add the intercept to the slope multiplied by that value. To calculate ρ's standard error, SE_ρ, we divided the standard error of the unstandardized beta weight by the mean square error of the regression equation. Finally, we calculated the Q-residual statistic using the error sum of squares of the regression equation. This statistic follows the chi-squared distribution with k-2 degrees of freedom. In the context of continuous moderation, a significant Q-residual statistic indicates that additional moderators may be operating.

Results

In this section, we first report the "main effects" of White identity on both aggregate and individual intergroup attitudes. We then report analyses of biases. Finally, we examine the effect of each moderator in turn and, when appropriate, report results with and without controlling for bias. In all analyses, we constructed 95% confidence intervals around our parameter estimates to determine statistical significance. Parameter estimates are statistically significantly different from zero at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level if their intervals do not include zero. Additionally, parameter estimates are statistically significantly different from one another at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level if their intervals do not overlap.

Aggregate White Identity

We first examine the main effects of aggregate White identity, i.e., the average of each identity dimension. As show in Tables 1 and 2, aggregate White identity predicted statistically

significantly more negative aggregate intergroup attitudes, ρ = -0.043 (-0.052, -0.033). This pattern is consistent with Social Identity Theory (Ellemers, 2002) but masks significant variation among more specific intergroup attitudes. Additional analysis reveals that the main effect was driven by the relationships between White identity and policy attitudes, ρ = -0.063 (-0.074, -0.053) and threat perceptions, ρ = 0.079 (0.093, 0.065). White identity also predicted positive intergroup attitudes such as more racial awareness, ρ = 0.064 (0.036, 0.091) and more positive interracial affect, ρ = 0.041 (0.029, 0.053). To this point in our analysis, it appears that our results mirror our narrative literature review: the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes is inconsistent. We note, however, that for every main effect analysis, we found a large and statistically significant Q statistic. This finding suggests the presence of bias, moderation, or both. We search for further clarity below with additional analyses.

Analyses of Bias

Publication bias. We divided studies into three types: published datasets (35% of the sample), unpublished datasets (19%), and national databases (46%). Publication bias may exist if published datasets show a significantly stronger relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. The magnitude of the relationship between aggregate White identity and aggregate intergroup attitudes was significantly different between each publication status: published datasets showed the strongest relationship, ρ = -0.103 (-0.119, -0.088), followed by unpublished datasets, ρ = -0.029 (-0.046, -0.012), and finally national databases, ρ = 0.007 (-0.009, 0.0023).

We next investigated whether this trend is robust when we analyze the more specific categories of intergroup attitudes (see Supplemental Tables). First, we found that unpublished datasets were generally not statistically significantly different from published datasets. We did, however, generally find that both types of datasets reported stronger correlations than did the national databases.

Are national datasets underestimating or are other datasets overestimating the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes? National databases are unlike other datasets in two important ways. First, they exclusively use older, adult samples while other datasets typically use college aged samples. Differences between publication types may therefore be due to age differences: we return to age effects in a later section. Second, national databases use representative samples while other datasets tend to use convenience samples. We analyze sampling bias below.

Given the differences between national databases and other datasets, we wondered whether including or excluding national datasets would affect the outcomes of our moderation analyses. Of greatest concern, does the inclusion of the national datasets cause us to report significant moderation where there truly is none? We tested for this possibility by re-running all analyses without the national datasets. Generally, the pattern of results did not change even if the magnitude of the effect size did. In other words, publication type generally exerts only a main but not moderating effect on the results. When applicable in later sections, we report analyses without national databases.

Sampling bias. Differences in sampling procedure may explain why national databases report weaker effects of White identity. Because they tend to use convenience samples, published and unpublished datasets may be overestimating the true relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Convenience samples were used by 45% of the studies while representative samples were used by the remaining 55%. In the aggregate, White identity for

convenience samples predicted more negative outcomes, ρ = -0.122 (-0.138, -0.106), than for representative samples, ρ = -0.004 (-0.015, 0.008). Removing national databases has essentially no effect on the effect size for representative samples, suggesting this difference is not merely due to their inclusion. This pattern was fairly consistent across the individual identity dimensions and more specific intergroup attitudes. Before assuming the presence of sampling bias, we must also consider the extreme covariation between sampling method and average sample age. As we demonstrate in a later section, age differences may help to explain this apparent bias.

Method bias. Fifty-seven percent of the sampled studies utilized face-to-face data collection and 34% used relatively anonymous methods such as phone interviews and online data collection. In the following analyzes, we omitted the 9% of studies with indeterminable methodologies. Because of self-presentation concerns, participants may underreport negative intergroup attitudes and over-report positive intergroup attitudes when they are in the immediate vicinity of an experimenter. Ceiling and floor effects would artificially reduce the magnitude of the correlations between White identity and intergroup attitudes among studies that utilize a face-to-face methodology. Therefore, we hypothesized that White identity will be associated with relatively few negative intergroup attitudes and relatively many positive intergroup attitudes among studies utilizing a face-to-face methodology, compared to other studies.

We found little evidence for this hypothesis. As expected, aggregate White identity was associated with significantly fewer aggregate positive intergroup attitudes among studies that utilized relatively anonymous methodologies, ρ = -0.037 (-0.052, -0.023), compared to studies utilizing a face-to-face methodology, ρ = -0.008 (-0.021, 0.006). But exploring this disparity further for each identity dimension and more specific intergroup attitudes does not reveal a consistent pattern. If anything, analyses for the *evaluation* and *solidarity* dimensions suggest the opposite pattern of results. In sum, if there is any method bias, it is very small and not in a consistent direction.

Bias by large samples. According to the law of large numbers, random sampling error decreases as sample size increases. In the absence of bias, individual effect sizes will be distributed symmetrically about the average effect size and this symmetry will not fluctuate based on sample size. Systematic sampling bias, however, will not decrease as sample size increases. In the meta-analysis, we weighted studies by sample size. If any of the largest samples were somehow different from the majority of the samples, they would systematically bias the results and lead us to make inappropriate conclusions. For example, some of our largest samples are from New Zealand while the vast majority of our samples are from other nations. We statistically tested for bias due to large samples by regressing the ratio of a study's effect size to its standard error on the inverse of its standard error and then assessing whether the intercept of this regression equation is significantly different from zero (i.e., Egger's method; Egger et al., 1997). This test revealed no bias, $t(174) = 1.35$, $p = 0.18$.

Other sources of bias. We also tested for two other sources of bias: bias from studies with small sample sizes and bias from including studies with manipulated threat perceptions in all analyses. Because studies with small sample sizes are weighted so lightly and because studies with manipulated threats are so few in number, it made essentially no difference whether these studies were included in all analyses.

Moderation Analyses

Moderation by identity dimension. We reviewed earlier how the identity dimensions of *centrality*, *solidarity*, and *evaluation* are related but distinct aspects of racial identity that may

uniquely predict intergroup attitudes. When a researcher investigates racial identity, it is important to consider how they are measuring the construct. We found that 61% of our sample measured *solidarity*, 34% measured *centrality*, 5% measured an average of these dimensions, and 32% measured *evaluation*. Only two studies measured and independently reported both *centrality* and *solidarity*. In contrast, 30% of our sample measured *evaluation* alongside *centrality*, *solidarity*, or an average of these dimensions.

We first investigated how *centrality*, *solidarity*, and their aggregate predicted *evaluation*. Because so little research included both *centrality* and *solidarity*, we were unable to meta-analyze the relationship between these dimensions (it is likely they are moderately correlated, see Jackson, 2002; Leach et al., 2008). As reported in Table 1, *evaluation* was significantly, positively, and equally related to the aggregate of the other dimensions, $\rho = 0.196$ (0.183, 0.209), to *centrality* alone, $\rho = 0.190$ (0.171, 0.209), and to *solidarity* alone, $\rho = 0.180$ (0.162, 0.197). Additional details, including tests for the influence of moderators, are reported in Supplemental Tables 26, 27, and 28.

Next, we investigated how the identity dimensions predicted intergroup attitudes. Recall that there is no consensus in the research literature on this issue and we therefore did not make directional hypotheses. As shown in Tables 1 through 5, we found that the identity dimensions each had a unique relationship with aggregate intergroup attitudes. Recall that aggregate White identity predicted aggregate intergroup attitudes, $\rho = -0.043$ (-0.052, -0.033). It turns out this finding totally masks considerable variability among the identity dimensions. While higher levels of *centrality* predicted lower levels of positive intergroup attitudes, $\rho = -0.108$ (-0.120, -0.095), *solidarity* failed to predict these attitudes, $\rho = -0.013$ (-0.027, 0.000), and higher levels of *evaluation* predicted higher levels of positive intergroup attitudes, $\rho = 0.110$ (0.096, 0.125). Each effect was associated with a large and statistically significant Q statistic, suggesting the presence of additional underlying moderators.

As reported in Table 1, we next analyzed more specific intergroup attitudes. With some minor variation, *centrality* tends to predict the most negative and least positive intergroup attitudes. For example, *centrality* predicts significantly more threat perceptions, significantly fewer pro-diversity behavioral intentions, and significantly more anti-diversity policy attitudes. In contrast, *solidarity* only racial awareness, $\rho = 0.105$ (0.052, 0.159) better than $\rho > 0.02$. And while *evaluation* significantly predicted aggregate intergroup attitudes, that result appears to be entirely due to how well it predicts interracial affect, $\rho = 0.279$ (0.265, 0.293).

In summation, we first found that both *solidarity* and *centrality* moderately predict *evaluation*. Next, we found that *solidarity* and *evaluation* are generally unrelated to intergroup attitudes. In contrast, *centrality* predicts slightly more negative and slightly fewer positive intergroup attitudes. In the following sections, we explore additional potential moderators of the relationship between each identity dimension and intergroup attitudes.

Moderation by interracial contact. According to *identity forms* research, 1) the content of one's racial identity can moderate the relationship between identity strength and intergroup attitudes and 2) this content is strongly related to the valence and frequency of interracial contact (for review, Goren & Plaut, 2012). We tested for the moderating influence of interracial contact in four ways: manipulated interracial threats, location, age, and publication year.

Moderation by manipulated interracial threats. According to both *identity form* theories and Social Identity Theory (Ellemers et al., 2002), interracial threats to the in-group will strengthen the relationship between racial identity and negative intergroup attitudes. To test this prediction, we split our sample into studies with or without explicit interracial threat

manipulations. As shown in Tables 2 to 5, the direction of the means was generally consistent with this prediction. However, these differences generally did not reach statistical significance whether we consider tests vs. zero or tests vs. studies without threat manipulations. The fact that these analyses are severely underpowered undercuts our confidence in this null result.

Moderation by location. In our literature search, almost all studies were conducted in the United States (95% of the sample) with the remainder conducted in Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. Of the studies conducted in the United States, 25% were conducted in the South, 18% in the Northeast, 16% in the Midwest, 23% in the West, and the remainder in an unknown region. In this section, we compare locations with historically elevated levels of interracial conflict (namely, the United States South and South Africa) to other locations. We hypothesized that White identity in these locations would be associated with fewer pro- and more negative intergroup attitudes.

As shown in Table 2, aggregate White identity in the United States South and in South Africa, compared to other locations, did not predict significantly more negative intergroup attitudes, although the trend was in the hypothesized direction. Further analyses, reported in the Supplemental Tables, suggest that this null result masks significant variation among more specific attitudes. For example, as expected, White identity predicts more positive interracial affect in low, ρ = 0.081 (0.066, 0.097), vs. high conflict areas, ρ = -0.005 (-0.028, 0.018) and more pro-diversity behavioral intentions in low, ρ = 0.018 (-0.011, 0.048), vs. high conflict areas, ρ = -0.055 (-0.097, 0.013). Analyses for the other intergroup attitudes were not statistically significant. Generally speaking, we found partial support for our hypothesis.

Moderation by age. Among studies in our sample, 39% included primarily young adults attending college, 60% included primarily older, adult samples, and 1% included adolescents. Because so few studies investigated adolescents, we have excluded them from the following analyses. It is likely that younger adults in our sample have relatively few interracial contact experiences compared to older adults: they are more likely to experience racial segregation, less likely to experience multicultural education, and less likely to consider the important of their racial identity. We hypothesize that younger adults' White identity will predict relatively negative intergroup attitudes compared to older adults.

We found support for this hypothesis. As shown in Table 2, the relationship between aggregate White identity and aggregated positive intergroup attitudes was significantly more negative for younger, ρ = -0.138 (-0.038, -0.014), than older adults, ρ = 0.002 (-0.009, 0.014). Examining more specific intergroup attitudes, we find a fairly consistent pattern of results. As shown in the Supplemental Tables, White identity predicted significantly more negative out-group affect, less pro-diversity policy endorsement, fewer pro-diversity behavioral intentions, and more interracial threat perceptions. Additionally, younger adults' *centrality* dimension predicts *evaluation* twice as well. From an *identity forms* perspective, this pattern of results consistently suggests that younger adults are less likely to endorse a power-cognizant White identity.

As we mentioned before in the section on publication bias, we found considerable co-variation between whether a sample had an older adult sample and whether it came from a national database. We were therefore concerned that our age effects were confounded by the inclusion of the national databases. We therefore reran our age analyses without the national databases. Fortunately, the pattern of results remained and, if anything, showed even greater age differences in the hypothesized direction.

Moderation by publication year. The meta-analysis includes studies conducted between 1972 and 2012. Most of these studies were conducted in just the past few years, reflected in the median publication date of 2006. Because so few studies were conducted before 1992 (the year the Collective Self-Esteem Scale and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure were published), we limited the following analyses to only those studies conducted since 1992. Depending on the measure, segregation and interracial experiences have either worsened, plateaued, or improved (Bobo et al., 2012; Esen, 2005; Orfield et al., 2012). Consequently, we refrained from making any hypotheses regarding the moderating effect of year.

We found that the closer studies were conducted to the present day, the stronger the association between White identity and aggregate intergroup attitudes, $\rho = 0.002$ (0.000, 0.004). This parameter estimate tells us that the strength of the correlation increased by about 0.002 units every year. We can interpret this parameter estimate more easily by estimating the magnitudes of the correlations in 1992 and in 2012 (when the studies for this meta-analysis were collected). The full regression equation for this effect is Y = -0.080 + 0.002 * (Year-1992) where Y is the parameter estimate. We subtract 1992 from the year because we calculated all analyses with 1992 as Year = 0. Entering the years 1992 and 2012 into this equation, we estimate that White identity predicted aggregate negative intergroup attitudes with a magnitude of -0.080 in 1992 and -0.040 in 2012.

This small effect masks larger effects for each of the three identity dimensions, reported in Tables 3, 4, and 5. Replicating the above analysis for *centrality*, we find averages effects of -0.217 in 1992 and -0.077 in 2012. For *solidarity*, we find average effects of -0.086 in 1992 and 0.094 in 2012. Finally, for *evaluation*, we find average effects of 0.024 in 1992 and 0.184 in 2012. In each case, the correlation between White identity and intergroup attitudes increased by at least 0.140, indicating a "small effect" (Cohen, 1992). The correlation between White identity and specific intergroup attitudes also increases markedly in the past 20 years. For example, the correlation between aggregate White identity and racial awareness increased from -0.144 in 1992 to 0.156 in 2012. Similarly, the correlation between aggregate White identity and pro-diversity behavioral intentions increased from -0.106 in 1992 to 0.034 in 2012. In contrast, the average correlation between aggregate White identity and interracial affect and pro-diversity policy endorsements has not changed.

In 1992 vs. 2012, a relatively high proportion of the studies came from national databases. We wondered whether including national databases may have artificially inflated the observed year effects. Therefore, we removed national databases from the dataset and reran all year analyses. Counter to our concerns, removing the national databases actually increased the year effect. For example, the average yearly increase in the correlation between aggregate White identity and aggregate intergroup attitudes is 0.002 with the national databases and 0.014 without. This corresponds to a 1992 correlation of -0.266 vs. a 2012 of 0.014. We find a similar pattern of results across the various identity dimensions and more specific intergroup attitudes. Overall, then, we find some evidence that the correlation between White identity and intergroup attitudes has increased over time.

Summary. Overall, we found some support for our general hypothesis that our proxies for interracial contact moderate the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. For every moderator, the pattern of results was in the anticipated direction. Manipulated threats analyses did not reach statistical significance, but as expected White identity tended to predict more positive intergroup attitudes in low vs. high conflict areas. Also as expected, the White

identities of younger (vs. older) adults predicted more negative intergroup attitudes. In more recent years, White identity became a stronger predictor of intergroup attitudes.

General Discussion

We have presented the first meta-analysis of the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Across dozens of studies, we found that White racial identity predicted somewhat more negative intergroup attitudes. It is important to keep in mind, however, this main effect was qualified by the presence of multiple moderators. In this section, we discuss how each of these moderators affected the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Before concluding, we discuss potential biases, limitations, future directions, and implications.

Main effects

Overall, White identity predicted more interracial affect and racial awareness – but also fewer pro-diversity policy endorsements and more perceptions of interracial threats. This pattern of results is consistent with the predictions of Social Identity Theory. According to this theory, highly identified members of dominant groups are sensitive to intergroup threats and seek to maintain the status quo (Ellemers, 2002). Moreover, in the absence of perceived threats, highly identified people are said to be unlikely to hold prejudices. These results are less consistent with the idea that highly identified people are chronically motivated to maintain a positive collective self-esteem by derogating out-groups (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). We note, however, that these main effects are qualified by moderators we discuss next.

Identity definition

We separately analyzed measures of the three most widely studied dimensions of identity: *centrality*, *solidarity*, and *evaluation*. We found that the *solidarity* and *evaluation* dimensions did not consistently predict intergroup attitudes. On the other hand, *centrality* consistently predicted more negative intergroup attitudes. Leach and colleagues (2008) anticipated that *centrality* dimension would be the most predictive of negative intergroup attitudes. Almost every theorist predicted that an identity dimension would predict even more negative intergroup attitudes when interracial contact was negative. In general, our data support this prediction. Depending on the proxy for interracial contact, certain dimensions appear to be more sensitive to negative contact.

In our literature review, we found that many researchers failed to disambiguate the *centrality* and *solidarity* identity dimensions. Given that these dimensions appear to differentially predict intergroup attitudes, this failure may help explain why some researchers find that White identity predicts more negative intergroup attitudes while others find the opposite.

Moderation by interracial contact

We indirectly tested for the moderating influence of interracial contact in with experimentally manipulated threat perceptions, location, age, and publication year.

Manipulated threat perceptions. Both Social Identity Theory and *identity form* theories suggest that interracial threats will cause White identity to predict more negative intergroup attitudes. White identity in studies with manipulated threats did predict somewhat more negative intergroup attitudes; however, this effect was not statistically significant. This null result may be due to low statistical power.

Location. Interracial threat perceptions are not confined within the walls of psychology labs – some locations have a sordid history of interracial conflict. We indirectly tested the moderating influence of historical interracial conflict in the meta-analysis by contrasting White people who live in the United States South or South Africa with people from other locations. The pattern of results was in the expected direction but only statistically significant for interracial affect and pro-diversity behavioral intentions. This pattern of results – though weak – suggests that interracial threats can become embedded into culture, coloring the content and consequences of racial identities.

Age. *Identity form* theories suggest that greater racial awareness (often gained through interracial contact or multicultural education) will cause Whites to adopt a more power-cognizant *identity form* that is associated with more pro-diversity and fewer negative intergroup attitudes. We indirectly tested this hypothesis using age. If older adults, compared to younger adults, are more likely to embrace a power-cognizant *identity form*, we would expect their White identities to predict more pro- and fewer negative intergroup attitudes. We found the expected pattern consistently, even when controlling for publication bias.

Most of the studies in the meta-analysis were conducted in the past decade, a time of rising racial segregation in housing, education, and the media (Orfield et al., 2012; Mastro & Tropp, 2004). Most young adults in these studies have not experienced the interracial contact that seems so important for developing racial awareness or an anti-racist White identity (Helms, 1984; Rowe et al., 1994). Interracial contact may be particularly hostile in high schools, leading many White students to adopt a prideful White *identity form* that predicts negative intergroup attitudes (Perry, 2001). Owing to their unstable career position, younger adults may be particularly attuned to the supposed interracial threat of reverse discrimination due to affirmative action.

Publication year. In the time since the first study in our sample was conducted in 1972, racial politics and attitudes have shifted markedly toward egalitarianism (Schuman et al, 1997). Because most of the studies in our sample were conducted within the past twenty years, however, we limited our analysis to studies conducted since 1992. Since then, evidence is mixed whether the international climate for diversity has improved further (Bobo et al., 2012; Esen, 2005; Orfield et al., 2012). We found that White identity tended to predictor more positive intergroup attitudes over time. A greater proportion of Whites may be experiencing positive interracial contact and adopting positive intergroup attitudes and power-cognizant White identities (Helms, 1984; Rowe et al., 1994).

Analyses of bias

Publication bias. The White identity literature appears to suffer from a small publication bias. Published studies, compared to unpublished datasets and especially to national databases, found a stronger relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. The reason for this bias is unclear. This literature may suffer from the so-called file-cabinet effect in which researchers and journals are hesitant to publish null or weak results. We note, however, that many studies in our sample included White identity only as a moderator variable and therefore did not anticipate a strong correlation between White identity and other variables. Another possibility is that published studies tend to use more valid and reliable measures of White identity. Consistent with the latter possibility, both national databases, which found White identity to be essentially unrelated to intergroup attitudes, used single item measures rather than

more robust scales. Whatever the cause, publication bias did not appear to appreciably confound any of our other analyses.

Method. In the meta-analysis, we included a host of stigmatized attitudes. White participants might feel more pressure to mask stigmatized attitudes in face-to-face than in relatively anonymous studies. If this occurs, it would create ceiling or floor effects that would mute observed correlations between these attitudes and White identity. Contrary to our expectations, we did not find much support for this expectation. In some analyses, face-to-face studies showed relatively weak correlations; in other analyses, they showed stronger correlations. The lack of a consistent pattern of results leads us to conclude that at least this form of method bias is not detracting from the validity of our results. An alternative, untestable possibility is that participants felt self-presentation concerns even in relatively anonymous studies. A large body of research on the color-blind model of diversity finds that many Whites believe that merely discussing race is taboo (e.g., Apfelbaum et al., 2008). If participants across both types of studies did mask their attitudes, it would help to explain the small size of our effects.

Practical Implications

In the present meta-analysis, some of the effect sizes, while statistically significant, do not exceed the "small effect" threshold of $\rho = |0.100|$ (Cohen, 1992). In some cases, small main effect sizes mask larger moderated effects. In other cases, the presence of biases potentially mute what may be larger effects. In any event, even small effects "can have societally large effects" as demonstrated by analysis of the predictive validity of the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, Banaji, & Nosek, 2015).

An understanding of the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes has practical implications for individuals and for organizations trying to foster positive race relations. We found that White identity predicts relatively more positive intergroup attitudes for people who likely had positive (vs. negative or infrequent) interracial contact. This pattern of results is consistent with an *identity forms* account (e.g., Helms, 1984; Perry, 2001; Rowe et al., 1994) and implicates the need to foster positive interracial contact. As racial segregation increases (Orfield et al., 2012), fewer Whites – and, in particular, fewer *young* Whites – are able to develop positive relationships with people of color, reject White universalism, and develop White identities that emphasize power-cognizance and positive intergroup attitudes.

Reducing racial segregation in housing and schools requires substantial and ongoing investment and effort from individuals, educators, the private sector, and many levels of government. Even limited interventions such as multicultural education can foster the development of power-cognizant White identities and reduce the association between White identity and negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., Brown et al. 1996). These efforts seem to have the most success in non-threatening environments that avoid blaming Whites for racism but still teach the White privilege lesson (e.g., Holladay, Knight, Paige, & Quiñones, 2003; Pendry, Driscoll, & Field, 2007). Generally speaking, then, trainers and educators must attempt to mimic the real-world effects of positive interracial contact: maintain category boundaries, reduce real and imagined barriers to further contact, and promote perspective-taking and empathy across groups (Brown & Hewstone, 2005).

Limitations and future directions

Our ability to draw conclusions from the meta-analysis was limited in several ways. In this section, we discuss some of the biggest limitations and offer directions for future research.

Namely, we could only indirectly test the identity attitudes theories, we could not make direct national comparisons, and we could only broadly investigate the consequences of interracial threats.

Testing *identity form* theories. Our literature search revealed that only a minority of White identity researchers utilize the framework Social Identity Theory. We are among the first to attempt to reconcile the White *identity form* and Social Identity Theory literatures (c.f., Croll, 2007; Goren & Plaut, 2012; Knowles & Peng, 2005; Phinney, 1992) and indeed we found indirect support for White *identity form* theories. Unfortunately, our efforts were limited because most studies of White identity used the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1991) or similar *identity form* measures that do not measure racial identification. We believe there are numerous directions of future work in this area. Generally, future work should more directly test White identity attitudes theories, particularly regarding how interracial contact affects the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes. Future work should also address measurement and validity concerns with the WRIAS and other scales (Leach, 2002). In particular, identity researchers should consider how each *identity form* relates to *centrality*, *solidarity*, and *evaluation*.

Investigating interracial threats. We were able to investigate how both manipulated interracial threats and living in areas with a history of interracial conflict moderated the relationship White identity and intergroup attitudes. Both sets of analyses were limited, however. First, because so few studies manipulated interracial threats, we were 1) limited in our ability to test for statistical significance and 2) unable to divide interracial threats into realistic, symbolic, or identity threats. Different types of threats are likely to elicit different emotional responses: for example, guilt vs. anger (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). If a threat elicits guilt, for example, it may actually predict the endorsement of positive intergroup attitudes (e.g., Swim & Miller, 1999). Future studies should investigate how different types of interracial threat influence the content and consequences of White identity.

Second, we can only speculate about the interracial contact experiences of people who live in areas with a history of interracial conflict. Certainly, not everyone from the U.S. South or South Africa typically experiences negative interracial contact and, conversely, certainly not everyone (or perhaps even the majority) or people from other regions typically experience positive interracial contact. Future studies should measure interracial contact and assess how positive and negative contact influences the relationship between White identity and intergroup attitudes.

Making national comparisons. In the meta-analysis, we included studies from the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. Unfortunately, nearly all of these studies were conducted exclusively in the United States. Also, South Africa was the only nation besides the United States to feature multiple studies. Together, these factors prohibited us from making meaningful comparisons among countries included in the analysis. We were also unable to include a number of studies from across the globe because they measured national or ethnic identity instead of White racial identity.

We do not mean to suggest that social scientists from other nations are not interested in issues of racial privilege or inequality. European social scientists have extensively studied these issues using measures of national or ethnic identities (e.g., Meeus et al., 2010; Pehrson et al., 2009; Smeekes et al., 2011; 2012; Reijerse et al., in press; Verkuyten, 1995, 2005). The study of White racial identity is less prevalent for many reasons. First, Western Europe has avoided the use of race since its association with the Holocaust horrors of the Second World War (Goldberg,

2006). Instead, the societal divide between immigrants and mainstream in Western Europe is, and has historically been, marked by ethnicity and religion, rather than race (Foner & Alba, 2008; Phalet & Kosic, 2006; Verkuyten & Zaremba, 2005).

White identity and, in particular, national identity are confounded in many nations. For example, in the Netherlands, people who identify as Dutch may be considering only ethnic-Dutch White people or also Dutch citizens of a different race depending on how inclusively they define their national identity (Meeus, Duriez, Vanbeselaere, & Boen, 2010; Pehrson, Brown, & Zagefka, 2009; Reijerse, van Acker, Vanbeselaere, Phalet, & Duriez, in press; Smeekes, Verkuyten, & Poppe, 2011). This national identity confound extends even to the more racially diverse United States, where many people consider the prototypical American to be White (Devos, Gavin, & Quintana, 2010); this association is particularly strong for White Americans who strongly identify as American (Devos & Banaji, 2005). Importantly, endorsing a "national identity = White" association strengthens the relationship between national identity and ethnic prejudice (Meeus et al. , 2010; Pehrson, et al., 2009; Reijerse et al., in press).

The relationship between White racial identity and particular national or ethnic identities has been studied in some of Europe's former colonies. Whites in the former colonies often have ancestors from a number of European ethnic groups due to the so-called "melting pot" (Fredrickson, 1999; Painter, 2010). Today, ethnic identities are less salient for White Americans in the United States; in fact, many White Americans are unable to name their ancestors' nations of origin (Goren & Plaut, 2012). White Americans who are more aware of their ethnic ancestry tend to have more White identity *centrality* (Goren & Plaut, 2012) and *solidarity* (Chrobot-Mason, 2004). Their more informed racial identities also tend to predict positive intergroup attitudes (Perry, 2001) and behaviors (Chrobot-Mason, 2004).

Future work should further disambiguate racial, ethnic, and national identity. Future work should also investigate whether our effects are for whatever reason specific to Whites, extend to other dominant racial groups, or even extend to all dominant groups. We have taken the perspective here that the causes and consequences of White identity are influenced by general principles of identity (Ellemers et al., 2002; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) but also by Whites' unique history and experiences with interracial contact (Fredrickson, 1999; Helms, 1984). How these processes intersect for other dominant groups – racial or otherwise – largely remains an open question.

Weak White identities. In this meta-analysis, we found considerable variance about our parameter estimates. We speculate that one reason for this variance is that many Whites have very low levels of reported racial identity. Many Whites with a weak racial identity simply do not have a clear understanding of what their race means to their identity. Typically speaking, these "racially naïve" people do not have many experiences with interracial contact and their racial identity is not a good predictor of their intergroup attitudes (Goren & Plaut, 2012; Perry, 2001). In contrast, other Whites with low levels of reported racial identity may be engaging in racial identity denial (Goren & Plaut, 2014). These Whites tend to have negative exposure to diversity and respond by endorsing negative intergroup attitudes while publically denying their racial identity.

Conclusion

In the meta-analysis, we investigated how White racial identification predicts intergroup attitudes. Informed by Social Identity Theory and *identity forms* theories, our results suggest that it is insufficient to conclude that a strong White identity is a "good thing" that predicts more

egalitarian attitudes or a “bad thing” that predicts prejudice or the endorsement of discriminatory policies. Rather, we conclude that the consequences of White identity depend on both situational and developmental factors such as experiences with interracial contact. These findings have important implications for practice. If the goal is to improve intergroup relations in the face of rising racial segregation in neighborhoods and schools, educators, diversity trainers, community leaders, and other stakeholders should encourage positive interracial contact and the development of power-cognizant White identities.

References

Aberson, C. L. & Gaffney, A. M. (2009). An integrated threat model of explicit and implicit attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 808-830. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.582

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

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), 918-932. doi: 10.1037/a0011990

Aronson, J., Lustina, M. J., Good, C., Keough, K., Steele, C. M., & Brown, J. (1999). When white men can't do math: Necessary and sufficient factors in stereotype threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*(1), 29-46. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1371

Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K. & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(1), 80-114. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.80

Arthur, W., Jr., Bennett, W., Jr., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2001). *Conducting meta-analysis using SAS*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., & Otten, S. (1995). Perceptions of relative group size and group status: Effects on intergroup discrimination in negative evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 213-247. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420250208

Block, C. J. & Carter, R. T. (1996). White racial identity attitudes theories: A rose by any other name is still a rose. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*, 326-334. doi: 10.1177/0011000096242012

Bobo, L. D., Charles, C. Z., Krysan, M., & Simmons, A. D. (2012). The real record on racial attitudes. In Marsden, P. V. (Ed). *Social trends in American life: Findings from the General Social Survey since 1972* (pp. 38-83). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyd, M. (2008). Defensive development: The role of racial conflict in gentrification. *Urban Affairs Review, 43*(6), 751-776. doi: 10.1177/1078087407313581

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

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55* (3), 429-444. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00126

Brown, S. P., Parham, T. A., & Yonker, R. (1996). Influence of a cross-cultural training course on racial identity attitudes of White women and men: Preliminary perspectives. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 510-516.

Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems, and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 745-778. doi: 10.1002/1099-0992

Brown, R. & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. (pp. 255-343). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Burkard, A. W., Juarez-Huffaker, M., & Ajmere, K. (2003). White racial identity attitudes as a predictor of client perceptions of cross-cultural working alliances. *Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31*, 226-244. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00352.x

Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity, 3*, 239-262. doi: 10.1080/13576500444000047

Card, N. A. (2012). *Applied meta-analysis for social science research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Carter, R. T. (1990). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 46-50. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01455.x

Carter, R. T. (1995). *The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racially inclusive model*. New York: Wiley.

Choney, S.K., & Behrens, J.T.. (1996). Development of the Oklahoma racial attitudes scale preliminary form (ORAS-P). In Sodowsky, G.R., & Impara, J.C. (Eds.), *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology* (pp. 225-240). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Chrobot-Mason, D. (2004). Managing racial differences: The role of majority managers' ethnic identity development on minority employee perceptions of support. *Group Organization Management, 29*, 5-31. doi: 10.1177/1059601103252102

Cohen, J (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin 112*(1), 155–159. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Corenblum, B. & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 33*, 251-268. doi: 10.1037/h0087147

Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to 'prejudice'. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88(5), 770-789. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.770

Crocker, J. & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 60-67. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.60

Croll, P. R. (2007). Modeling determinants of White racial identity: Results from a new national survey. *Social Forces, 86*, 613-642. doi: 10.1093/sf/86.2.613

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*, 332-351. doi:10.1177/1088868311411103

Devos, T. & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American= White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 447-466. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.447

Devos, T., Gavin, K., & Quintana, F. J. (2010). Say "adios" to the American Dream? The interplay between ethnic and national identity among Latino and Caucasian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*, 37-49. doi: 10.1037/a0015868

Djiker, A. J. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17*, 305-325. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420170306

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York: Routledge.

Egger, M., Davey Smith, G., Schneider, M., Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *British Medical Journal, 315*, 629–634. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629

Eichstedt, J. L. (2001). Problematic White identities and a search for racial justice. *Sociological Forum, 16*, 445-471. doi: 10.1023/A:1011900514271

Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P. & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorization, commitment to the group, and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 371–389.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 161-186. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135228

Esen, E. (2005). *2005 Workplace Diversity Practices Survey Report*. Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.

Fein, S. & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 31-44. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.31

Foner, N., & Alba, R. (2008). Immigrant religion in the U.S. and Western Europe: Bridge or barrier to inclusion? *International Migration Review, 42*(2), 360-392. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2008.00128.x

Fredrickson, G. M. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Millers (Eds.) *Cultural divides: Understanding and Overcoming group conflict*. Russell Sage Foundation: New York.

Garza Cabellero, A. A. (2003). *A theoretical approach to ethnic differences in perceptions and reactions to multicultural and assimilation strategies of prejudice reduction*. Diss. The University of Texas at El Paso.

Giles, M. W. & Evans, A. S. (1985). External threat, perceived threat, and group identity. *Social Science Quarterly, 66*(1), 50-66.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(2), 331-364. doi: 10.1080/01419870500465611

Gonsalkorale, K., Carlisle, K., & von Hippel, W. (2007). Intergroup threat increases implicit stereotyping. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 7*, 189-200.

Gonzalez, L. L. (2009). *Why Can't We All Be Friends? Do Friendships Influence a Person's Perception of Racial Teasing?* Diss. Texas A&M University.

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

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2014). Racial Denial and its Discontents: Implications for Individuals and Organizations. In Thomas, K. M., Plaut, V.C., & Tran, M. (Eds.) *Diversity Ideologies in Organizations*.

Greenberg, B., Mastro, D., & Brand, J. (2002). Minorities and the mass media: Television into the 21st century. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 333-351). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2015). Statistically small effects of the implicit association test can have societally large effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Gushue, G. V. & Carter, R T. (2000). Remembering race: White racial identity attitudes and two aspects of social memory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 199-210. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.2.199

Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review, 106*(4), 766-794. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.106.4.766

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A black and white model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 153-164. doi: 10.1177/0011000084124013

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A., Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. & Carter, R. T. (1991). Relationships of White and Black racial identity attitudes and demographic similarity to counselor preferences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 446-457. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.38.4.446

Hinkle, S., Taylor, L. A., Fox-Cardamone, D. L., & Crook, K. F. (1989). Intragroup identification and intergroup differentiation: A multidimension approach. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 28*(4), 305-317.

Holladay, C. L., Knight, J. L., Paige, D. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2003). The influence of framing on intergroup attitudes training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14*, 245-263.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(1), 204–222. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x

Hughey, M. W. (2008). The (dis)similarities of white racial identities: The conceptual framework of 'hegemonic whiteness.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 33*, 1289-1309. doi: 10.1080/01419870903125069

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jackson, J. W. (2002). Intergroup attitudes as a function of different dimensions of group identification and perceived intergroup conflict. *Self and Identity, 1*, 11–33.

Jiménez, T.,R. & Horowitz, A. L. (2013). When white is just alright: How immigrants redefine achievement and reconfigure the ethnoracial hierarchy. *American Sociological Review, 78*(5), 849-871. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122413497012

Kaiser, C. R., Dyrenforth, P. S., & Hagiwara, N. (2006). Why are attributions to discrimination interpersonally costly? A test of system- and group-justifying motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 1423-1536. doi: 10.1177/0146167206291475

Kaplan, A. M. (2004). *Factors predicting Whites' involvement in interracial relationship*. Diss. University of Connecticut.

Kling, K. C., Hyde, J. S., Showers, C. J., & Buswell, B. N. (1999). Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 470-500. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.4.470

Knowles, E. D. & Peng, K. P. (2005). White selves: Conceptualizing and measuring a dominant-group identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 223-241. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.89.2.223

Korf, L. & Malan, J. (2002). Threat to ethnic identity: The experience of White Afrikaans-speaking participants in Postapartheid South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(2), 149-169. doi: 10.1080/00224540209603892

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*, 159–174.

Leach, M. M., Behrens, J. T., & LaFleur, N. K. (2002). White racial identity and white racial consciousness: Similarities, differences, and recommendations. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30*, 66–80. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2002.tb00480.x

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vlick, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwekerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A

hierarchical (multidimension) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 144–165. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

Lee, S. M., Puig, A., Pasquarella-Daley, L., Denny, G., Rai, A. A., Dallape, A., & Parker, W. M. (2007). Revising the White Racial Consciousness Development Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 39*, 194–208.

Levin, S. & Sidanius, J. (1999). Social dominance and social identity in the United States and Israel: Ingroup favoritism or outgroup derogation? *Political Psychology, 20*, 99-126. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00138

Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological assymetry. *Political Psychology, 19*, 373-404. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00109

Lewis, A. E. (2004). "What group?" Studying Whites and Whiteness in the era of "color-blindness." *Sociological Theory, 22*, 623-646. doi: 10.1111/j.0735-2751.2004.00237.x

Linnehan, F., Chrobot-Mason, D., & Konrad, A. M. (2006). Diversity attitudes and norms: The role of ethnic identity and relational demography. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*, 419-442. doi: 10.1002/job.382

Linnehan, F., Konrad, A. M., Reitman, F., Greenhalgh, A., & London, M. (2006). Behavioral goals for a diverse organization: The effects of attitudes, social norms, and racial identity for Asian Americans and Whites. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 1331-1359. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01952.x

Loo, R. (2002).A caveat on using single-item versus multiple-item scales. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17* (1), 68-75. doi: 10.1108/02683940210415933

Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2012). Paying for positive group esteem: How inequity frames affect Whites' responses to redistributive policies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 323-336. doi: 10.1037/a0024598

Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites' motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1237-1250. doi: 10.1177/0146167207303016

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

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318. doi: 10.1177/0146167292183006

Mastro, D. E., Behm-Morawitz, E., & Kopacz, M. A. (2008). Exposure to television portrayals of Latinos: The implications of aversive racism and Social Identity Theory. *Human Communication Research, 34*, 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00311.x

Mastro, D. E. & Tropp, L. R. (2004). The effects of interracial contact, attitudes, and stereotypical portrayals on evaluations of Black television sitcom characters. *Communication Research Reports, 21*, 119-129. doi: 10.1080/08824090409359974

McConahay, J. B, Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25*, 563-579. doi: 10.1177/002200278102500401

McDermott, M., & Samson, F.L. (2005). White racial and ethnic identity in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology, 31*, 245.-261. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.31.041304.122322

McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, 31-36.

Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2010). The role of national identity representation in the relation between in-group identification and out-group derogation: Ethnic versus civic representation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*, 305-320. doi: 10.1348/014466609X451455

Miller, A.N., & Harris, T.M. (2005). Communicating to develop white racial identity in an interracial communication class. *Communication Education, 54*(3), 223-242. doi: 10.1080/03634520500356196

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. doi: 10.1177/0146167210386118

Mummendey, A., Simon, B., Dietze, C., & Grünert, M. (1992). Categorization is not enough: Intergroup discrimination in negative outcome allocation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28*(2), 125-144. doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(92)90035-I

Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012, September). *E Pluribus...Separation: Deepening Double Segregation for More Students.* Retrieved from http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield_epluribus_revised_omplete_2012.pdf.

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

Painter, N. I. (2010). *The History of White People*. New York City: W. W. Norton & Company.

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 1723–1738. doi: 10.1177/0146167210388667

Pehrson, S., Brown, R., & Zagefk, H. (2009). When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 61-76. doi: 10.1348/014466608X288827

Pendry, L. F., Driscoll, D. M., & Field, S. C. T. (2007). Diversity training: Putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 27-50.

Perry, P. (2001). White means never having to say you're ethnic: White youth and the construction of "cultureless" identities. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 30*, 56-91. doi: 10.1177/089124101030001002

Perry, P. (2007). White universal identity as a "sense of group position". *Symbolic Interaction, 30* (3), 375–393. doi: 10.1525/si.2007.30.3.375

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Phalet, K. & Kosic, A. (2006). *Acculturation in European societies*. (pp. 331-348). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 499-514. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7(2)*, 156-176. doi: 10.1177/074355489272003

Plantz, V. J. (1996). The fluidity of racial identity development. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*, 2685A.

Ponterotto, J. G. & Park-Taylor, J. (2007). Racial and ethnic identity theory, measurement, and research in counseling psychology: Present status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 282-294. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.282

Pratto, F., Liu, J. H., Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Shih, M., Bachrach, H., & Hegarty, P. (2000). Social dominance orientation and the legitimization of inequality across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31(3)*, 369-409. doi: 10.1177/0022022100031003005

Quintana, S.M. (2007). Racial and ethnic identity: Developmental perspectives and research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(3), 259-270. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.259

Quillian, L. (1996). Group threat and regional change in attitudes toward African-Americans. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(3), 816-860. DOI: 10.1086/230998

Raju, N. S., Burke, M. J., Normand, J., & Langlois, G. M. (1991). A new meta-analytic approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 432-446. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.432

Reijerse, A., Van Acker, K., Vanbeselaere, N., Phalet, K., & Duriez, B. (in press). Beyond the ethnic-civic dichotomy: Cultural citizenship as a new way of excluding immigrants. *Political Psychology*.

Renfro, C. L., Duran, A., Stephan, W. G., & Clason, D. L. (2006). The role of threat in attitudes toward Affirmative Action and its beneficiaries. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 41-74. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00003.x

Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 6*, 316-320. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00528.x

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

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romera, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*(3), 301-322.

Ross, M. H. (2007). *Cultural contestation in ethnic conflict*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rowe, W. (2007). White racial identity: Science, faith, and pseudoscience. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*, 235-243. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2006.tb00042.x

Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. *Counseling Psychologist, 22*, 129-146. doi: 10.1177/0011000094221009

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

Sachdev, I. & Bourhis, R. Y. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 1-24. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420210102

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., & Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A. J., Tabbye, M. C., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A. (1997). Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 805-815. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.73.4.805

Smeekes, A., Verkuyten, M., & Poppe, E. (2011). Mobilising opposition towards Muslim immigrants: National identification and the representation of national history. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 265-280. doi: 1874/202015

Sonnenschein, N., Bekerman, Z., & Horenczyk, G. (2010). Threat and the majority identity. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 14*(1), 47-65. doi: 10.1037/a0016872

Southern Poverty Law Center (2014). Active U.S. Hate Groups. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/hate-map

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., McNatt, P. S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The Role of Threats in the Racial Attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242-1254. doi: 10.1177/01461672022812009

Stephan, W.G., & Stephan, C.W. (2000). *An integrated threat theory of prejudice*. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), Reducing prejuice and discrimination (pp. 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sue, D.W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist, 59*(8), 761-769. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.761

Swim, J. K., & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(4), 500-514. doi: 10.1177/0146167299025004008

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations (pp. 33–48). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Tettegah, S. (2000). Stereotypes of student teachability: A study of White American beginning teachers. Diss. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*, 7-29. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000033509

Thomsen, L., Green, E. G. T., Ho., A. K., Levin, S., van Laar, C., Sinclair, S., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Wolves in sheep's clothing: SDO asymmetrically predicts perceived ethnic victimization among White and Latino students across three years. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 225-238. doi: 10.1177/0146167209348617

Thornton, A. & Lee, P. (2000). Publication bias in meta-analysis: Its causes and consequences. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 53*(2), 207-216. doi: 10.1016/S0895-4356(99)00161-4

Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 585–600. doi: 10.1177/0146167201275007

Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6-34). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Unzueta, M. M. & Binning, K. R. (2012). Diversity is in the eye of the beholder: How concern for the in-group affects perceptions of racial diversity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(1), 26-38.

Utsey, S. O. & Gernat, C. A. (2002). White racial identity attitudes and the ego defense mechanisms used by White counselor trainees in racially provocative counseling situations. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 475-483. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2002.tb00214.x

Verkuyten, M. (1995). Self-esteem, self-concept stability, and aspects of ethnic identity among minority and majority youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24*, 155-175. doi: 10.1007/BF01537147

Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2006). The endorsement of minority rights: The role of group position, national context, and ideological beliefs. *Political Psychology, 27*, 527–548. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00525.x

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

Verkuyten, M. & Zaremba, K. (2005). Interethnic relations in a changing political context. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*, 375-386. doi: 10.1177/019027250506800405

Vinson, T. S. & Neimeyer, G. J. (2003). The relationship between racial identity development and multicultural counseling competency: A second look. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 31*, 262-277. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00354.x

Warren, J. T. & Hytten, K. (2004). The faces of whiteness: Pitfalls and the critical democrat. *Communication Education, 53*(4), 321-339. doi: 10.1080/0363452032000305931

White, C. L. & Burke, P. J. (1987). Ethnic role identity among Black and White college students: An interactionist approach. *Sociological Perspectives, 30*, 310-331. doi: 10.2307/1389115

Worrell, F. C., Vandiver, B. J., Schaefer, B. A., Cross, W. E., & Fhagen-Smith, P. (2006). Generalizing Nigrescence profiles: Cluster analyses of cross racial identity scale (CRIS) scores in three independent samples. *Counseling Psychologist, 34*(4), 519-547. doi: 10.1177/0011000005278281

Young, K. & Craig, L. (1997). Beyond White pride: Identity, meaning, and contradiction in the Canadian skinhead subculture. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 34*, 175-206. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-618X.1997.tb00206

Supplemental References

Argyrides, M. B. (2006). *Cross-cultural perceptual differences among African American, Caucasian, and Greek-Cypriot college students*. Diss. Tennessee State University.

Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Thomas, K. M., Johnson, C. D., & Mack, D. A. (2007). Assessing the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure for measurement equivalence across racial and ethnic groups. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *67*(5), 877-888. doi: 10.1177/0013164406299105

Barlow, F. K., Louis, W. R., & Terry, D. J. (2009). Minority report: Social identity, cognitions of rejection and intergroup anxiety predicting prejudice from one racially marginalized group towards another. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*(5), 805-818. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.651

Barlow, F. K., Sibley, C. G., & Hornsey, M. J. (2011). Rejection as a call to arms: Inter-racial hostility and support for political action as outcomes of race-based rejection in majority and minority groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*(1), 167-177. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02040.x

Brown, C. S., Alabi, B. O., Huynh, V. W., & Masten, C. L. (2011). Ethnicity and gender in late childhood and early adolescence: Group identity and awareness of bias. *Developmental Psychology*, *47*(2), 463-471. doi: 10.1037/a0021819

Brown, M., Goren, M. J., & Plaut, V. C. (2011). [Television viewership survey]. Unpublished raw data.

Burns, N., Kinder, D. R., Rosenstone, S. J., Sapiro, V., & the National Election Studies. (2001). National Election Studies, 2000: Pre-/Post-Election Study [dataset]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer and distributor].

Cakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwär, G., & Heath, A. (2011). An investigation of the social identity model of collective action and the 'sedative'effect of intergroup contact among Black and White students in South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(4), 606-627. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02075.x

Chao, R. C. L. (2012). Racial/Ethnic Identity, Gender-Role Attitudes, and Multicultural Counseling Competence: The Role of Multicultural Counseling Training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *90*(1), 35-44. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-6676.2012.00006.x

Chow, R. M., Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D. (2008). The two faces of dominance: The differential effect of ingroup superiority and outgroup inferiority on dominant-group identity and group esteem. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1073-1081. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2007.11.002

Cokley, K., Komarraju, M., Pickett, R., Shen, F., Patel, N., Belur, V., & Rosales, R. (2007). Ethnic differences in endorsement of the Protestant work ethic: The role of ethnic identity and perceptions of social class. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *147*(1), 75-89. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.147.1.75-89

Corenblum, B. & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 33*, 251-268. doi: 10.1037/h0087147

Croll, P. R. (2007). Modeling determinants of White racial identity: Results from a new national survey. *Social Forces, 86*, 613-642. doi: 10.1093/sf/86.2.613

Deaux, K., Reid, A., Martin, D., & Bikmen, N. (2006). Ideologies of diversity and inequality: Predicting collective action in groups varying in ethnicity and immigrant status. *Political Psychology*, *27*(1), 123-146. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00452.x

Duckitt, J. & Farre, B. (1994). Right-wing authoritarianism and political intolerance among whites in the future majority-rule South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*(6), 735-741. doi:10.1080/00224545.1994.9923008

Durrheim, K., Dixon, J., Tredoux, C., Eaton, L., Quayle, M., & Clack, B. (2011). Predicting support for racial transformation policies: Intergroup threat, racial prejudice, sense of group entitlement and strength of identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(1), 23-41. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.723

Elek-Fisk, E. (1998). *The effect of the salience of ethnic or racial identifications and group security on outgroup acceptance*. Diss. State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Garza Cabellero, A. A. (2003). *A theoretical approach to ethnic differences in perceptions and reactions to multicultural and assimilation strategies of prejudice reduction*. Diss. The University of Texas at El Paso.

Gibson, James L., & Amanda Gouws. (2000). Social identities and political intolerance: Linkages within the South African mass public. *American Journal of Political Science, 44*, 278–292. doi: 10.2307/2669310

Gloria, A. M., & Hird, J. S. (1999). Influences of Ethnic and Nonethnic Variables on the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy of College Students. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *48*(2), 157-174. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1999.tb00282.x

Gonsalkorale, K., Carlisle, K., & von Hippel, W. (2007). Intergroup threat increases implicit stereotyping. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 7*, 189-200.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2007). [White identity survey]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2008). [Intergroup threats to White identity experiment]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2009). [White identity and threat perceptions experiment]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2010). [Students and parents attitudes survey]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2009). [Demographics questionnaire and White identity experiment]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2010). [White identity essays experiment]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2010). [Racial identity denial experiment]. Unpublished raw data.

Goren, M. J. & Plaut, V. C. (2011). [Racial identity denial study]. Unpublished raw data.

Greene, S. R. (2008). *Converging Frameworks: Examining the Impact of Diversity-related College Experiences on Racial/ethnic Identity Development*. Diss. University of Michigan.

Hartmann, T. A. (2004). *Becoming good Whites: Dissonance, coping and identity processes among White Christian adults working on racial healing*. Diss. University of Pennsylvania.

Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Is pluralism a viable model of diversity? The benefits and limits of subgroup respect. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *9*(3), 359-376. doi: 10.1177/1368430206064639

Kaiser, C. R., Dyrenforth, P. S., & Hagiwara, N. (2006). Why are attributions to discrimination interpersonally costly? A test of system- and group-justifying motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 1423-1536. doi: 10.1177/0146167206291475

Kaplan, A. M. (2004). *Factors predicting Whites' involvement in interracial relationship*. Diss. University of Connecticut.

Korf, L. & Malan, J. (2002). Threat to ethnic identity: The experience of White Afrikaans-speaking participants in Postapartheid South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(2), 149-169. doi: 10.1080/00224540209603892

Levin, S. & Sidanius, J. (1999). Social dominance and social identity in the United States and Israel: Ingroup favoritism or outgroup derogation? *Political Psychology, 20*, 99-126. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00138

Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological assymetry. *Political Psychology, 19*, 373-404. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00109

Linnehan, F., Chrobot-Mason, D., & Konrad, A. M. (2006). Diversity attitudes and norms: The role of ethnic identity and relational demography. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*, 419-442. doi: 10.1002/job.382

Linnehan, F., Konrad, A. M., Reitman, F., Greenhalgh, A., & London, M. (2006). Behavioral goals for a diverse organization: The effects of attitudes, social norms, and racial identity for Asian Americans and Whites. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 1331-1359. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01952.x

Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2012). Paying for positive group esteem: How inequity frames affect Whites' responses to redistributive policies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 323-336. doi: 10.1037/a0024598

Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites' motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1237-1250. doi: 10.1177/0146167207303016

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

Mack, D. A., Johnson, C. D., Green, T. D., Parisi, A. G., & Thomas, K. M. (2002). Motivation to control prejudice as a mediator of identity and Affirmative Action attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(5), 934-964. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00249.x

Major, B., Gramzow, R. H., McCoy, S. K., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(3), 269-282. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.3.269

Mastro, D. E., Behm-Morawitz, E., & Kopacz, M. A. (2008). Exposure to television portrayals of Latinos: The implications of aversive racism and Social Identity Theory. *Human Communication Research, 34*, 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00311.x

Meyer-Lee, E. E. (1999). *Understanding change in white adult students' racial identity and attitudes: the contribution of a developmental-contextual approach.* Diss. Harvard Graduate School of Education.

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. doi: 10.1177/0146167210386118

Negy, C., Shreve, T. L., Jensen, B. J., & Uddin, N. (2003). Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and ethnocentrism: a study of social identity versus multicultural theory of development. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology; Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *9*(4), 333-344. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.9.4.333

O'Brien, L.T. & Blodorn, A. (2014). *White identity, system justifying beliefs, and attitudes towards African Americans.* Unpublished raw data.

O'Brien, L. T. & Major, B. (2005). System-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being: The roles of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1718-1730. doi: 10.1177/0146167205278261

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

Phinney, J., Cantu, C., & Kurtz, D. (1997). Ethnic and American identity as predictors of self-esteem among African American, Latino, and White adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*, 165–185. doi: 10.1023/A:1024500514834

Phinney, J. S., Jacoby, B., & Silva, C. (2007). Positive intergroup attitudes: The role of ethnic identity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *31*(5), 478-490. doi: 10.1177/0165025407081466

Plaut, V. C. & Goren, M. J. (2008). [Organizational consequences of White identity survey]. Unpublished raw data.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2007). [Diversity climate survey]. Unpublished raw data.

Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4), 508-521. doi: 10.1177/0146167204271713

Quinton, W. J., Cowan, G., & Watson, B. D. (1996). Personality and attitudinal predictors of support of Proposition 187—California's anti-illegal immigrant initiative. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 2204-2223. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01796.x

Renfro, C. L., Duran, A., Stephan, W. G., & Clason, D. L. (2006). The role of threat in attitudes toward Affirmative Action and its beneficiaries. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 41-74. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00003.x

Richeson, J. A., & Trawalter, S. (2005). On the categorization of admired and disliked exemplars of admired and disliked racial groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*(4), 517-530. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.89.4.517

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

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Rabinowitz, J. L. (1994). Gender, Ethnic Status, and Ideological Asymmetry A Social Dominance Interpretation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *25*(2), 194-216. doi: 10.1177/0022022194252003

Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus: the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology; Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*(1), 96-110. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.1.96

Simmons, S. J., Wittig, M. A., & Grant, S. K. (2010). A mutual acculturation model of multicultural campus climate and acceptance of diversity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(4), 468. doi: 10.1037/a0020237

Smith, Tom W., Peter V. Marsden, and Michael Hout. General Social Survey, 1972-2010 [Cumulative File]. ICPSR31521-v1. Storrs, CT: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut/Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributors], 2011-08-05. doi:10.3886/ICPSR31521.v1

Snyder, L. A., Cleveland, J. N., & Thornton, G. C. (2006). Support for affirmative action initiatives among diverse groups: The role of ethnic identity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*(2), 527-551. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00018.x

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., McNatt, P. S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The Role of Threats in the Racial Attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242-1254. doi: 10.1177/01461672022812009

Thomsen, L., Green, E. G. T., Ho., A. K., Levin, S., van Laar, C., Sinclair, S., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Wolves in sheep's clothing: SDO asymmetrically predicts perceived ethnic victimization among White and Latino students across three years. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 225-238. doi: 10.1177/0146167209348617

Tables

Table 1
White Identity and Intergroup Attitudes Main Effects

						95% Confidence Interval		
Variable	***K***	***N***	***R***	ρ	**SE_ρ**	**Lower**	**Upper**	***Q***
Evaluation	71	20,291	0.155	**0.196**	0.007	0.183	0.209	535.36*
Centrality	36	9,878	0.146	**0.190**	0.010	0.171	0.209	280.41*
Solidarity	43	12,053	0.144	**0.180**	0.009	0.162	0.197	269.96*
Aggregate	175	44,069	-0.033	**-0.043**	0.005	-0.052	-0.033	746.78*
Centrality	61	22,525	-0.087	**-0.108**$_a$	0.006	-0.120	-0.095	193.64*
Solidarity	118	21,585	-0.009	-0.013$_b$	0.007	-0.027	0.000	268.08*
Evaluation	65	17,065	0.088	**0.110**$_c$	0.007	0.096	0.125	262.27*
Affect	130	25,222	0.033	**0.041**	0.006	0.029	0.053	577.55*
Centrality	41	10,535	-0.082	**-0.101**$_a$	0.010	-0.120	-0.082	136.87*
Solidarity	96	15,787	-0.013	**-0.017**$_c$	0.008	-0.032	-0.001	96.43
Evaluation	59	17,344	0.223	**0.279**$_b$	0.007	0.265	0.293	580.95*
Awareness	32	5,029	0.054	**0.064**	0.014	0.036	0.091	90.27*
Centrality	25	4,639	0.046	**0.056**$_{ab}$	0.015	0.027	0.085	83.98*
Solidarity	10	1,335	0.089	**0.105**$_b$	0.027	0.052	0.159	42.00*
Evaluation	19	3,110	0.011	0.014$_a$	0.018	-0.021	0.049	17.56
Intentions	59	7,899	-0.015	-0.018	0.011	-0.040	0.004	174.62*
Centrality	17	1,516	-0.080	**-0.098**$_a$	0.026	-0.148	-0.048	25.77
Solidarity	42	6,383	-0.005	-0.005$_b$	0.013	-0.030	0.019	152.68*
Evaluation	9	417	-0.022	-0.029$_{ab}$	0.049	-0.126	0.068	14.28
Policy Attitudes	145	35,553	-0.050	**-0.063**	0.005	-0.074	-0.053	422.54*
Centrality	51	17,223	-0.086	**-0.108**$_a$	0.008	-0.123	-0.093	146.03*
Solidarity	98	18,413	-0.014	**-0.019**$_b$	0.007	-0.033	-0.004	181.91*
Evaluation	62	15,933	-0.018	**-0.021**$_b$	0.008	-0.037	-0.006	115.79*
Threat Perceptions	72	19214	0.062	**0.079**	0.007	0.093	0.065	320.98*
Centrality	17	7,044	0.099	**0.124**$_a$	0.012	0.147	0.101	109.40*
Solidarity	58	12,089	0.016	**0.019**$_b$	0.009	0.037	0.001	72.29
Evaluation	15	4,295	-0.022	-0.029$_c$	0.015	-0.001	-0.059	85.32*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained.

Table 2
Aggregate White Identity and Aggregate Intergroup Attitudes

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	175	44,069	-0.033	**-0.043**	0.005	-0.052	-0.033	746.78*
Unthreatened	168	43,732	-0.033	**-0.042**	0.005	-0.052	-0.033	742.80*
Threatened	7	337	-0.054	-0.071	0.055	-0.178	0.037	3.70
Low Conflict	101	26,713	-0.022	**-0.026**	0.006	-0.038	-0.014	336.43*
High Conflict	49	8,698	-0.042	**-0.056**	0.011	-0.077	-0.035	143.39*
Young Adult	68	14,173	-0.112	**-0.138**$_a$	0.008	-0.155	-0.122	194.00*
Older Adult	105	29,566	0.003	0.002$_b$	0.006	-0.009	0.014	360.00*
Anonymous	59	17,885	-0.027	**-0.037**$_a$	0.007	-0.052	-0.023	341.82*
Face-to-Face	100	20,396	-0.006	-0.008$_b$	0.007	-0.021	0.006	230.02*
Convenience	78	14,380	-0.098	**-0.122**$_a$	0.008	-0.138	-0.106	234.68*
Representative	97	29,689	-0.002	-0.004$_b$	0.006	-0.015	0.008	384.44*
Unpublished	34	13,478	-0.024	**-0.029**$_a$	0.009	-0.046	-0.012	121.94*
Published	59	15,412	-0.080	**-0.103**$_b$	0.008	-0.119	-0.088	472.49*
Database	82	15,179	0.006	0.007$_c$	0.008	-0.009	0.023	65.47
Publication Date	157	38,659	-0.066/ 0.002	-0.08/ **0.002**	0.002	0.000	0.004	711.16*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 3
Centrality Definition of White Identity and Aggregate Intergroup Attitudes

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	61	22,525	-0.087	**-0.108**	0.006	-0.120	-0.095	193.64*
Unthreatened	55	22,253	-0.086	**-0.107**	0.007	-0.120	-0.094	191.58*
Threatened	6	272	-0.112	**-0.135**	0.060	-0.253	-0.017	1.84
Low Conflict	23	12,973	-0.073	**-0.089**	0.009	-0.106	-0.072	99.83*
High Conflict	28	3,456	-0.077	**-0.098**	0.017	-0.131	-0.065	50.83*
Young Adult	38	9,333	-0.127	**-0.158**$_a$	0.010	-0.178	-0.138	86.62*
Older Adult	23	13,192	-0.058	**-0.071**$_b$	0.009	-0.088	-0.054	67.05*
Anonymous	28	13,394	-0.079	**-0.098**$_a$	0.009	-0.115	-0.081	66.73*
Face-to-Face	22	3,924	-0.033	**-0.041**$_b$	0.016	-0.072	-0.010	47.55*
Convenience	42	9,268	-0.117	**-0.145**$_a$	0.010	-0.165	-0.125	107.08*
Representative	19	13,257	-0.066	**-0.081**$_b$	0.009	-0.098	-0.064	66.04*
Unpublished	27	12,713	-0.068	**-0.084**$_a$	0.009	-0.101	-0.067	61.43*
Published	22	7,129	-0.140	**-0.174**$_b$	0.011	-0.197	-0.152	66.52*
Database	12	2,683	-0.032	**-0.040**$_a$	0.019	-0.078	-0.002	15.91
Publication Date	55	21,782	-0.178/ 0.006	-0.217/ **0.007**	0.002	0.002	0.012	160.05*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 4
Solidarity Definition of White Identity and Aggregate Intergroup Attitudes

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	118	21,585	-0.009	-0.013	0.007	-0.027	0.000	268.08*
Unthreatened	117	21,520	-0.009	-0.013	0.007	-0.026	0.000	267.96*
Threatened	1	65	-0.043	-0.056	0.124	-0.300	0.188	0.00
Low Conflict	82	13,913	-0.020	**-0.025**	0.008	-0.041	-0.008	102.08
High Conflict	22	5,169	-0.033	**-0.041**	0.014	-0.068	-0.014	18.12
Young Adult	25	3,346	-0.078	$\mathbf{-0.095}_a$	0.017	-0.128	-0.061	62.63*
Older Adult	92	18,173	0.004	0.002_b	0.007	-0.012	0.017	179.15*
Anonymous	26	3,156	0.082	$\mathbf{0.089}_a$	0.018	0.054	0.124	85.99*
Face-to-Face	89	18,082	-0.023	$\mathbf{-0.028}_b$	0.008	-0.043	-0.013	136.65*
Convenience	29	3,293	-0.055	$\mathbf{-0.069}_a$	0.017	-0.103	-0.035	71.69*
Representative	89	18,291	-0.001	-0.003_b	0.007	-0.018	0.011	185.45*
Unpublished	9	953	-0.017	-0.022_{ab}	0.032	-0.085	0.042	18.5*
Published	27	5,484	0.030	$\mathbf{0.030}_a$	0.014	0.003	0.056	203.49*
Database	82	15,148	-0.023	$\mathbf{-0.028}_b$	0.008	-0.044	-0.012	33.53
Publication Date	101	15,873	-0.071/ 0.007	-0.086/ **0.009**	0.001	0.006	0.012	240.96*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 5
Evaluation Definition of White Identity and Aggregate Intergroup Attitudes

						95% Confidence Interval		
Variable	***K***	***N***	***R***	ρ	**SE_ρ**	**Lower**	**Upper**	***Q***
Main Effect	65	17,065	0.088	**0.110**	0.007	0.096	0.125	262.27*
Unthreatened	60	16,845	0.089	**0.112**	0.008	0.097	0.127	238.66*
Threatened	5	220	0.012	-0.005	0.068	-0.139	0.128	20.53*
Low Conflict	33	12,127	0.102	**0.128**$_a$	0.009	0.110	0.146	148.53*
High Conflict	30	4,851	0.060	**0.074**$_b$	0.014	0.046	0.102	84.72*
Young Adult	23	1,795	0.092	**0.112**	0.023	0.066	0.158	48.07*
Older Adult	42	15,271	0.088	**0.110**	0.008	0.095	0.126	214.20*
Anonymous	24	6,646	0.117	**0.147**$_a$	0.012	0.124	0.171	78.83*
Face-to-Face	39	10,186	0.072	**0.090**$_b$	0.010	0.071	0.109	148.95*
Convenience	26	2,152	0.049	**0.055**$_a$	0.022	0.013	0.098	85.40*
Representative	39	14,914	0.094	**0.118**$_b$	0.008	0.102	0.134	168.58*
Unpublished	21	6,307	0.124	**0.157**$_a$	0.012	0.133	0.181	55.48*
Published	8	777	0.019	0.018$_b$	0.036	-0.053	0.089	42.73*
Database	36	9,982	0.071	**0.088**$_b$	0.010	0.069	0.108	137.84*
Publication Date	48	11,638	0.021/ 0.006	0.024/ **0.008**	0.001	0.006	0.010	116.00*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Supplemental Tables

Table 6
Aggregate White Identity and Interracial Affect

						95% Confidence Interval		
Variable	***K***	***N***	***R***	ρ	**SE_ρ**	**Lower**	**Upper**	***Q***
Main Effect	130	25,222	0.033	**0.041**	0.006	0.029	0.053	577.55*
Unthreatened	124	24,932	0.035	**0.042**	0.006	0.030	0.055	564.07*
Threatened	6	290	-0.057	-0.077	0.059	-0.193	0.038	9.66
Low Conflict	73	16,207	0.066	**0.081**$_a$	0.008	0.066	0.097	232.58*
High Conflict	42	7,385	-0.004	-0.005$_b$	0.012	-0.028	0.018	192.51*
Young Adult	40	3,944	-0.039	**-0.048**$_a$	0.016	-0.080	-0.017	155.54*
Older Adult	90	21,277	0.047	**0.058**$_b$	0.007	0.044	0.071	387.72*
Anonymous	44	8,254	0.018	**0.021**$_a$	0.011	0.000	0.043	204.93*
Face-to-Face	79	15,357	0.064	**0.079**$_b$	0.008	0.063	0.095	224.99*
Convenience	47	4,182	-0.009	-0.012$_a$	0.016	-0.042	0.019	134.59*
Representative	83	21,039	0.042	**0.051**$_b$	0.007	0.038	0.065	429.92*
Unpublished	29	7,132	0.063	**0.077**$_a$	0.012	0.054	0.100	58.29*
Published	23	3,588	-0.160	**-0.200**$_b$	0.016	-0.231	-0.168	108.53*
Database	78	14,501	0.067	**0.083**$_a$	0.008	0.067	0.100	183.36*
Publication Date	112	19,129	0.012/ 0.000	0.014/ 0.000	0.002	-0.003	0.003	435.67*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 7
Centrality Component of White Identity and Interracial Affect

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	41	10,535	-0.082	**-0.101**	0.010	-0.120	-0.082	136.87*
Unthreatened	36	10,310	-0.080	**-0.098**	0.010	-0.117	-0.079	129.64*
Threatened	5	225	-0.194	**-0.236**	0.064	-0.361	-0.111	3.17
Low Conflict	13	6,832	-0.055	**-0.067**$_a$	0.012	-0.090	-0.043	59.43*
High Conflict	24	2,626	-0.107	**-0.132**$_b$	0.019	-0.170	-0.094	37.82*
Young Adult	28	3,058	-0.129	**-0.159**$_a$	0.018	-0.194	-0.124	70.97*
Older Adult	13	7,477	-0.063	**-0.077**$_b$	0.012	-0.100	-0.055	53.49*
Anonymous	21	6,398	-0.072	**-0.087**	0.012	-0.111	-0.062	38.63*
Face-to-Face	15	2,804	-0.048	**-0.061**	0.019	-0.098	-0.024	51.13*
Convenience	30	2,905	-0.095	**-0.116**	0.018	-0.152	-0.080	70.63*
Representative	11	7,630	-0.077	**-0.095**	0.011	-0.118	-0.073	65.74*
Unpublished	24	6,522	-0.061	**-0.074**$_a$	0.012	-0.098	-0.050	51.08*
Published	9	2,061	-0.185	**-0.229**$_b$	0.021	-0.270	-0.188	16.54*
Database	8	1,952	-0.044	**-0.054**$_a$	0.023	-0.099	-0.010	26.75*
Publication Date	35	9,781	-0.191/ -0.007	-0.243/ **-0.009**	0.003	0.003	0.015	103.47*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 8
Solidarity Component of White Identity and Interracial Affect

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	96	15,787	-0.013	**-0.017**	0.008	-0.032	-0.001	136.87*
Unthreatened	95	15,722	-0.013	-0.016_a	0.008	-0.031	0.000	129.64*
Threatened	1	65	-0.215	$\mathbf{-0.284}_b$	0.115	-0.509	-0.058	0.00
Low Conflict	66	10,649	-0.013	-0.016	0.010	-0.035	0.003	59.43
High Conflict	20	4,644	-0.021	-0.026	0.015	-0.055	0.003	37.82*
Young Adult	13	920	0.000	-0.001	0.033	-0.066	0.064	70.97*
Older Adult	83	14,867	-0.014	**-0.018**	0.008	-0.034	-0.002	53.49
Anonymous	21	1,056	-0.021	-0.029	0.031	-0.090	0.032	38.63*
Face-to-Face	74	14,606	-0.012	-0.015	0.008	-0.031	0.001	51.13
Convenience	17	1,251	0.025	0.028	0.028	-0.028	0.083	70.63*
Representative	79	14,536	-0.017	**-0.021**	0.008	-0.037	-0.004	65.74
Unpublished	7	798	0.036	0.043	0.035	-0.027	0.112	51.08*
Published	11	520	0.013	0.013	0.044	-0.073	0.100	16.54
Database	78	14,469	-0.017	**-0.021**	0.008	-0.037	-0.005	26.75
Publication Date	79	9,659	-0.041/ 0.005	-0.050/ **0.006**	0.002	0.002	0.010	69.9

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 9
Evaluation Component of White Identity and Interracial Affect

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	59	17,344	0.223	**0.279**	0.007	0.265	0.293	580.95*
Unthreatened	55	17,171	0.223	**0.279**	0.007	0.265	0.293	559.91*
Threatened	4	173	0.235	**0.305**	0.070	0.168	0.441	21.73*
Low Conflict	32	12,661	0.236	**0.294**$_a$	0.008	0.278	0.310	451.94*
High Conflict	27	4,682	0.190	**0.238**$_b$	0.014	0.211	0.265	120.49*
Young Adult	20	1,574	0.267	**0.335**$_a$	0.023	0.290	0.379	50.96*
Older Adult	39	15,770	0.219	**0.274**$_b$	0.007	0.259	0.288	523.98*
Anonymous	22	6,580	0.196	**0.243**$_a$	0.012	0.221	0.266	116.20*
Face-to-Face	36	10,609	0.238	**0.299**$_b$	0.009	0.282	0.317	457.78*
Convenience	21	1,843	0.209	**0.261**	0.022	0.219	0.304	119.64*
Representative	38	15,501	0.225	**0.281**	0.007	0.267	0.296	458.84*
Unpublished	21	6,307	0.199	**0.247**$_a$	0.012	0.224	0.270	113.12*
Published	2	221	0.401	**0.500**$_b$	0.051	0.401	0.600	6.32*
Database	36	10,816	0.234	**0.293**$_c$	0.009	0.275	0.310	447.99*
Publication Date	42	11,195	0.133/ 0.006	0.164/ **0.008**	0.002	0.005	0.011	273.31*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 10
Aggregate White Identity and Racial Awareness

Variable	*k*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	32	5,029	0.054	**0.064**	0.014	0.036	0.091	90.27*
Unthreatened	27	4,791	0.054	**0.063**	0.015	0.034	0.091	88.33*
Threatened	5	238	0.071	0.086	0.065	-0.042	0.213	1.79
Low Conflict	8	1,715	0.026	0.035	0.024	-0.013	0.082	17.17*
High Conflict	18	1,782	0.054	**0.060**	0.024	0.014	0.107	37.52*
Young Adult	22	2,483	0.040	**0.045**	0.020	0.006	0.085	42.94*
Older Adult	9	2,281	0.061	**0.072**	0.021	0.031	0.113	43.56*
Anonymous	21	1,786	0.122	$\mathbf{0.140}_a$	0.023	0.094	0.186	66.69*
Face-to-Face	9	2,575	0.020	0.026_b	0.020	-0.013	0.065	9.14
Convenience	23	2,171	0.073	**0.087**	0.021	0.045	0.129	50.00*
Representative	9	2,858	0.040	**0.046**	0.019	0.010	0.083	38.37*
Unpublished	17	1,187	0.110	$\mathbf{0.134}_a$	0.029	0.078	0.191	14.04
Published	11	2,163	0.062	$\mathbf{0.069}_{ab}$	0.021	0.027	0.111	63.41*
Database	4	1,679	0.005	0.006_b	0.024	-0.041	0.054	2.01
Publication Date	31	5,029	-0.131/ 0.013	-0.144/ **0.015**	0.004	0.008	0.022	82.7*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 11
Centrality Component of White Identity and Racial Awareness

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	25	4,639	0.046	**0.056**	0.015	0.027	0.085	83.98*
Unthreatened	21	4,466	0.044	**0.053**	0.015	0.024	0.082	80.18*
Threatened	4	173	0.111	0.125	0.076	-0.023	0.274	2.95
Low Conflict	4	1,564	0.005	0.006_a	0.025	-0.043	0.056	1.47
High Conflict	18	1,936	0.097	$\mathbf{0.116}_b$	0.022	0.072	0.160	69.66*
Young Adult	19	2,273	0.075	**0.090**	0.021	0.049	0.131	75.64*
Older Adult	6	2,366	0.019	0.023	0.021	-0.017	0.064	4.58
Anonymous	17	1,341	0.124	$\mathbf{0.147}_a$	0.027	0.094	0.199	65.27*
Face-to-Face	6	2,630	0.018	0.022_b	0.020	-0.016	0.061	5.74
Convenience	19	1,732	0.100	$\mathbf{0.120}_a$	0.024	0.073	0.167	70.61*
Representative	6	2,907	0.014	0.017_b	0.019	-0.019	0.054	4.63
Unpublished	17	1,187	0.181	$\mathbf{0.225}_a$	0.028	0.171	0.280	27.96*
Published	4	1,298	-0.021	-0.035_b	0.028	-0.089	0.020	10.70*
Database	4	2,154	0.012	0.015_b	0.021	-0.027	0.057	1.64
Publication Date	24	4,639	-0.110/ 0.012	-0.125/ **0.014**	0.004	0.006	0.022	86.49*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 12
Solidarity Component of White Identity and Racial Awareness

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	10	1,335	0.089	**0.105**	0.027	0.052	0.159	42.00*
Unthreatened	9	1,270	0.087	**0.102**	0.028	0.048	0.157	41.65*
Threatened	1	65	0.129	0.165	0.122	-0.073	0.404	0.00
Low Conflict	6	703	0.003	0.007	0.038	-0.068	0.081	11.57*
High Conflict	1	239	0.020	0.025	0.065	-0.102	0.152	0.00
Young Adult	3	210	0.074	0.096	0.069	-0.039	0.231	2.89
Older Adult	7	1,125	0.092	**0.107**	0.030	0.049	0.165	39.13*
Anonymous	4	445	0.287	**0.335**	0.042	0.252	0.418	4.56
Face-to-Face	6	890	-0.013	-0.015	0.033	-0.081	0.050	1.58
Convenience	3	174	0.208	**0.269**	0.071	0.130	0.408	2.67
Representative	7	1,161	0.071	**0.080**	0.029	0.023	0.138	33.79*
Unpublished	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Published	6	600	0.217	0.256_a	0.038	0.181	0.331	18.14*
Database	4	735	-0.018	-0.022_b	0.037	-0.094	0.051	0.83
Publication Date	9	1,335	-0.373/ 0.035	-0.425/ **0.041**	0.007	0.028	0.054	11.48

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 13
Evaluation Component of White Identity and Racial Awareness

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	19	3,110	0.011	0.014	0.018	-0.021	0.049	17.56
Unthreatened	15	2,937	0.012	0.016	0.019	-0.021	0.052	17.27
Threatened	4	173	-0.009	-0.011	0.077	-0.162	0.139	0.17
Low Conflict	4	1,517	-0.015	-0.019	0.026	-0.069	0.031	3.17
High Conflict	15	1,593	0.036	0.046	0.025	-0.004	0.095	11.20
Young Adult	14	895	0.029	0.038	0.034	-0.028	0.104	11.05
Older Adult	5	2,215	0.004	0.004	0.021	-0.037	0.046	5.83
Anonymous	13	805	0.027	0.034	0.035	-0.035	0.104	10.96
Face-to-Face	6	2,305	0.006	0.007	0.021	-0.034	0.048	6.18
Convenience	14	895	0.029	0.038	0.034	-0.028	0.104	11.05
Representative	5	2,215	0.004	0.004	0.021	-0.037	0.046	5.83
Unpublished	14	895	0.029	0.038	0.034	-0.028	0.104	11.05
Published	1	67	-0.070	-0.094	0.122	-0.333	0.146	0.00
Database	4	2,148	0.006	0.008	0.022	-0.035	0.050	5.17
Publication Date	18	3,110	-0.013/ 0.002	-0.018/ 0.003	0.006	-0.009	0.015	17.33

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 14
Aggregate White Identity and Pro-Diversity Behavioral Intentions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	59	7,899	-0.015	-0.018	0.011	-0.040	0.004	174.62*
Unthreatened	56	7,811	-0.014	-0.017	0.011	-0.039	0.005	172.17*
Threatened	3	88	-0.072	-0.089	0.107	-0.300	0.121	2.05
Low Conflict	35	4,445	0.015	0.018_a	0.015	-0.011	0.048	107.79*
High Conflict	19	2,156	-0.046	$\mathbf{-0.055}_b$	0.021	-0.097	-0.013	36.48*
Young Adult	21	3,219	-0.089	$\mathbf{-0.108}_a$	0.018	-0.143	-0.074	50.50*
Older Adult	37	4,615	0.039	$\mathbf{0.048}_b$	0.015	0.019	0.077	78.96*
Anonymous	25	1,181	-0.032	-0.038	0.029	-0.096	0.019	34.28
Face-to-Face	32	6,495	-0.007	-0.008	0.013	-0.033	0.016	129.78*
Convenience	21	2,716	-0.083	$\mathbf{-0.103}_a$	0.019	-0.140	-0.065	42.35*
Representative	38	5,183	0.021	$\mathbf{0.027}_b$	0.014	0.000	0.054	104.19*
Unpublished	12	814	-0.087	$\mathbf{-0.105}_a$	0.035	-0.174	-0.037	10.57
Published	13	3,271	-0.035	$\mathbf{-0.043}_{ab}$	0.017	-0.077	-0.009	94.62*
Database	34	3,814	0.018	0.023_b	0.016	-0.009	0.055	55.81*
Publication Date	58	7,899	-0.084/ 0.005	-0.106/ **0.007**	0.003	0.002	0.013	178.88*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 15
Centrality Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Behavioral Intentions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	17	1,516	-0.080	**-0.098**	0.026	-0.148	-0.048	25.77
Unthreatened	14	1,428	-0.078	**-0.096**	0.027	-0.148	-0.044	25.42*
Threatened	3	88	-0.115	-0.136	0.106	-0.344	0.073	0.18
Low Conflict	4	220	-0.027	-0.037	0.068	-0.170	0.097	11.57*
High Conflict	11	717	-0.136	**-0.163**	0.037	-0.235	-0.091	8.40
Young Adult	11	1,047	-0.109	**-0.133**	0.030	-0.192	-0.073	13.41
Older Adult	6	469	-0.017	-0.021	0.046	-0.112	0.070	8.44
Anonymous	11	835	-0.107	**-0.128**	0.034	-0.196	-0.061	11.20
Face-to-Face	6	682	-0.047	-0.061	0.038	-0.136	0.014	12.87*
Convenience	12	1,064	-0.107	**-0.130**	0.030	-0.190	-0.071	13.78
Representative	5	452	-0.018	-0.022	0.047	-0.115	0.070	8.42
Unpublished	10	591	-0.123	**-0.144**	0.041	-0.224	-0.065	10.81
Published	3	668	-0.066	**-0.085**	0.039	-0.161	-0.010	3.91
Database	4	258	-0.020	-0.025	0.063	-0.148	0.098	8.42*
Publication Date	16	1,516	-0.038/ -0.003	-0.060/ -0.003	0.007	-0.018	0.012	252.66 *

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 16
Solidarity Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Behavioral Intentions

						95% Confidence Interval		
Variable	***K***	***N***	***R***	ρ	**SE_ρ**	**Lower**	**Upper**	***Q***
Main Effect	42	6,383	-0.005	-0.005	0.013	-0.030	0.019	152.68*
Unthreatened	42	6,383	-0.005	-0.005	0.013	-0.030	0.019	152.68*
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	31	4,226	0.017	0.020	0.016	-0.010	0.051	97.09*
High Conflict	8	1,439	-0.025	-0.029	0.027	-0.081	0.023	28.89*
Young Adult	10	2,172	-0.096	**-0.116**$_a$	0.021	-0.158	-0.075	43.36*
Older Adult	31	4,146	0.045	**0.056**$_b$	0.016	0.025	0.086	68.18*
Anonymous	8	380	-0.001	-0.003	0.052	-0.104	0.099	11.45
Face-to-Face	1	38	-0.226	-0.288	0.152	-0.585	0.010	0.00
Convenience	9	417	-0.022	-0.029	0.049	-0.126	0.068	14.28
Representative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unpublished	8	380	-0.001	-0.003	0.052	-0.104	0.099	11.45
Published	1	38	-0.226	-0.288	0.152	-0.585	0.010	0.00
Database	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Publication Date	41	6,383	-0.109/ 0.008	-0.137/ **0.010**	0.003	0.004	0.016	140.61*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 17
Evaluation Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Behavioral Intentions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	9	417	-0.022	-0.029	0.049	-0.126	0.068	14.28
Unthreatened	6	329	-0.020	-0.026	0.056	-0.135	0.083	7.60
Threatened	3	88	-0.029	-0.038	0.108	-0.250	0.174	6.68*
Low Conflict	1	38	-0.226	-0.288	0.152	-0.585	0.010	0.00
High Conflict	8	380	-0.001	-0.003	0.052	-0.104	0.099	11.45
Young Adult	9	417	-0.022	-0.029	0.049	-0.126	0.068	14.28
Older Adult	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anonymous	8	380	-0.001	-0.003	0.052	-0.104	0.099	11.45
Face-to-Face	1	38	-0.226	-0.288	0.152	-0.585	0.010	0.00
Convenience	9	417	-0.022	-0.029	0.049	-0.126	0.068	14.28
Representative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unpublished	8	380	-0.001	-0.003	0.052	-0.104	0.099	11.45
Published	1	38	-0.226	-0.288	0.152	-0.585	0.010	0.00
Database	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Publication Date	8	417	-0.31/ 0.017	-0.398/ 0.022	0.012	-0.002	0.046	173.72*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 18
Aggregate White Identity and Pro-Diversity Policy Endorsements

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	145	35,553	-0.050	**-0.063**	0.005	-0.074	-0.053	422.54*
Unthreatened	140	35,333	-0.049	**-0.063**	0.005	-0.073	-0.053	420.33*
Threatened	5	220	-0.111	**-0.137**	0.067	-0.268	-0.006	0.98
Low Conflict	87	24,234	-0.048	**-0.060**	0.006	-0.073	-0.048	186.34*
High Conflict	47	7,846	-0.070	**-0.091**	0.011	-0.113	-0.069	112.87*
Young Adult	47	8,108	-0.127	**-0.158**$_a$	0.011	-0.180	-0.137	113.73*
Older Adult	98	27,445	-0.027	**-0.035**$_b$	0.006	-0.047	-0.023	220.04*
Anonymous	53	17,069	-0.056	**-0.073**$_a$	0.008	-0.088	-0.058	224.15*
Face-to-Face	82	17,141	-0.031	**-0.039**$_b$	0.008	-0.054	-0.024	121.03*
Convenience	52	8,500	-0.129	**-0.160**$_a$	0.011	-0.181	-0.139	128.02*
Representative	93	27,053	-0.025	**-0.033**$_b$	0.006	-0.045	-0.021	197.50*
Unpublished	25	9,537	-0.041	**-0.051**$_a$	0.010	-0.071	-0.031	28.21
Published	38	11,656	-0.084	**-0.108**$_b$	0.009	-0.126	-0.091	321.98*
Database	82	14,361	-0.028	**-0.035**$_a$	0.008	-0.051	-0.018	41.78
Publication Date	127	30,413	-0.056/ 0.000	-0.067/ 0.000	0.001	-0.002	0.002	424.19*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 19
Centrality Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Policy Endorsements

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	51	17,223	-0.086	**-0.108**	0.008	-0.123	-0.093	146.03*
Unthreatened	46	17,003	-0.085	**-0.108**	0.008	-0.123	-0.093	144.30*
Threatened	5	221	-0.117	**-0.136**	0.067	-0.267	-0.005	1.55
Low Conflict	18	12,319	-0.079	**-0.100**	0.009	-0.117	-0.082	63.20*
High Conflict	26	2,802	-0.099	**-0.128**	0.019	-0.164	-0.091	67.65*
Young Adult	30	4,967	-0.143	**-0.178**$_a$	0.014	-0.205	-0.151	65.63*
Older Adult	21	12,256	-0.062	**-0.080**$_b$	0.009	-0.097	-0.062	48.97*
Anonymous	27	13,126	-0.087	**-0.111**$_a$	0.009	-0.128	-0.094	76.49*
Face-to-Face	17	3,111	-0.039	**-0.048**$_b$	0.018	-0.083	-0.013	19.45
Convenience	34	5,191	-0.143	**-0.178**$_a$	0.013	-0.204	-0.151	82.47*
Representative	17	12,032	-0.061	**-0.078**$_b$	0.009	-0.096	-0.060	31.47*
Unpublished	23	9,206	-0.066	**-0.085**$_a$	0.010	-0.106	-0.065	31.41
Published	16	5,499	-0.142	**-0.178**$_a$	0.013	-0.204	-0.152	58.90*
Database	12	2,518	-0.031	-0.038$_c$	0.020	-0.077	0.001	13.70
Publication Date	45	16,489	-0.174/ 0.006	-0.197/ **0.006**	0.002	0.001	0.010	122.51*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 20
Solidarity Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Policy Endorsements

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	98	18,413	-0.014	**-0.019**	0.007	-0.033	-0.004	181.91*
Unthreatened	98	18,413	-0.014	**-0.019**	0.007	-0.033	-0.004	181.91*
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	73	12,200	-0.021	**-0.026**	0.009	-0.044	-0.009	77.26
High Conflict	21	4,841	-0.039	**-0.048**	0.014	-0.076	-0.019	25.26
Young Adult	10	1,460	-0.078	**-0.097**$_a$	0.026	-0.148	-0.046	23.09*
Older Adult	88	16,953	-0.008	-0.012$_b$	0.008	-0.027	0.003	149.72*
Anonymous	22	2,654	0.057	**0.058**$_a$	0.019	0.020	0.096	62.49*
Face-to-Face	75	15,635	-0.025	**-0.030**$_b$	0.008	-0.046	-0.015	99.59*
Convenience	11	1,628	-0.080	**-0.100**	0.025	-0.148	-0.052	26.36*
Representative	87	16,785	-0.007	-0.011	0.008	-0.026	0.004	144.56*
Unpublished	2	331	-0.057	-0.072$_{a,b}$	0.055	-0.179	0.036	2.20
Published	14	3,683	0.051	**0.054**$_a$	0.016	0.022	0.087	107.72*
Database	82	14,400	-0.029	**-0.036**$_b$	0.008	-0.053	-0.020	48.21
Publication Date	81	13,062	-0.058/ 0.006	-0.070/ **0.007**	0.001	0.004	0.010	155.17*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 21
Evaluation Component of White Identity and Pro-Diversity Policy Endorsements

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	62	15,933	-0.018	**-0.021**	0.008	-0.037	-0.006	115.79*
Unthreatened	57	15,713	-0.017	**-0.020**	0.008	-0.035	-0.004	104.46*
Threatened	5	220	-0.106	**-0.150**	0.067	-0.281	-0.020	8.47
Low Conflict	31	11,308	-0.005	-0.005_a	0.009	-0.023	0.014	45.19*
High Conflict	29	4,538	-0.047	$\mathbf{-0.058}_b$	0.015	-0.087	-0.028	51.36*
Young Adult	21	1,632	-0.049	**-0.060**	0.025	-0.109	-0.011	28.90
Older Adult	41	14,302	-0.014	**-0.017**	0.008	-0.033	-0.001	84.47*
Anonymous	23	6,348	0.007	0.010_a	0.013	-0.014	0.035	25.97
Face-to-Face	37	9,353	-0.031	$\mathbf{-0.038}_b$	0.010	-0.058	-0.018	68.7*
Convenience	23	1,720	-0.057	**-0.073**	0.024	-0.121	-0.026	37.69*
Representative	39	14,214	-0.013	-0.015	0.008	-0.032	0.001	73.65*
Unpublished	18	5,850	0.011	0.016_a	0.013	-0.010	0.041	13.66
Published	8	802	-0.063	$\mathbf{-0.084}_b$	0.035	-0.153	-0.015	31.57*
Database	36	9,282	-0.032	$\mathbf{-0.039}_b$	0.010	-0.060	-0.019	57.67*
Publication Date	45	10,932	-0.032/ 0.003	-0.040/ 0.003	0.002	-0.000	0.006	66.42*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 22
Aggregate White Identity and Interracial Threat Perceptions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	72	19,214	0.062	**0.079**	0.007	0.065	0.093	320.98*
Unthreatened	72	19,214	0.062	**0.079**	0.007	0.065	0.093	320.98*
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	46	9,217	0.041	**0.051**	0.010	0.031	0.072	97.79*
High Conflict	20	5,685	0.039	**0.056**	0.013	0.031	0.082	157.40*
Young Adult	11	5,715	0.138	**0.172**$_a$	0.013	0.147	0.198	24.01*
Older Adult	61	13,499	0.029	**0.039**$_b$	0.009	0.022	0.056	223.79*
Anonymous	18	1,713	0.167	**0.232**$_a$	0.023	0.187	0.277	77.93*
Face-to-Face	50	13,280	0.027	**0.033**$_b$	0.009	0.016	0.050	141.36*
Convenience	10	5,157	0.127	**0.158**$_a$	0.014	0.131	0.185	12.78
Representative	62	14,057	0.037	**0.050**$_b$	0.008	0.033	0.066	261.53*
Unpublished	3	3,212	0.113	**0.140**$_a$	0.017	0.106	0.174	1.37
Published	11	4,045	0.143	**0.190**$_a$	0.015	0.160	0.219	141.87*
Database	58	11,957	0.020	**0.024**$_b$	0.009	0.006	0.042	88.52*
Publication Date	67	17,135	0.039/ 0.003	0.043/ **0.005**	0.001	0.002	0.008	303.07*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 23
Centrality Component of White Identity and Interracial Threat Perceptions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	17	7,044	0.099	**0.124**	0.012	0.101	0.147	109.40*
Unthreatened	17	7,044	0.099	**0.124**	0.012	0.101	0.147	109.40*
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	7	1,411	0.076	**0.094**	0.027	0.042	0.146	6.93
High Conflict	6	1,549	0.008	0.010	0.026	-0.040	0.060	55.26*
Young Adult	7	4,355	0.138	**0.174**$_a$	0.015	0.145	0.202	15.41*
Older Adult	10	2,689	0.035	**0.041**$_b$	0.019	0.004	0.079	63.92*
Anonymous	2	161	0.099	**0.151**	0.077	0.000	0.303	0.84
Face-to-Face	11	2,662	0.054	**0.066**	0.019	0.029	0.104	77.84*
Convenience	6	3,797	0.123	**0.154**$_a$	0.016	0.123	0.185	4.08
Representative	11	3,247	0.071	**0.088**$_b$	0.018	0.053	0.122	95.98*
Unpublished	3	3,212	0.116	**0.145**	0.017	0.111	0.179	0.85
Published	6	1,892	0.096	**0.121**	0.023	0.077	0.166	97.46*
Database	8	1,940	0.073	**0.091**	0.023	0.046	0.135	7.16
Publication Date	16	7,044	-0.020/ 0.009	-0.031/ **0.012**	0.004	0.004	0.020	116.66*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 24
Solidarity Component of White Identity and Interracial Threat Perceptions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	58	12,089	0.016	**0.019**	0.009	0.001	0.037	72.29
Unthreatened	58	12,089	0.016	**0.019**	0.009	0.001	0.037	72.29
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	42	7,943	0.017	0.021	0.011	-0.001	0.043	62.00*
High Conflict	14	3,919	0.014	0.017	0.016	-0.015	0.048	9.91
Young Adult	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Older Adult	58	12,089	0.016	**0.019**	0.009	0.001	0.037	72.29
Anonymous	13	324	-0.034	-0.043	0.057	-0.154	0.068	25.06*
Face-to-Face	45	11,765	0.017	**0.021**	0.009	0.003	0.039	46.18
Convenience	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Representative	58	12,089	0.016	**0.019**	0.009	0.001	0.037	72.29
Unpublished	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Published	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Database	58	12089	0.016	**0.019**	0.009	0.001	0.037	72.29
Publication Date	53	9,763	0.050/ -0.003	0.062/ **-0.004**	0.002	-0.008	-0.001	65.88

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 25
Evaluation Component of White Identity and Interracial Threat Perceptions

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	15	4,295	-0.022	-0.029	0.015	-0.059	0.001	85.32*
Unthreatened	15	4,295	-0.022	-0.029	0.015	-0.059	0.001	85.32*
Threatened	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low Conflict	9	2,691	0.017	0.021_a	0.019	-0.017	0.059	4.11
High Conflict	6	1,604	-0.086	$\mathbf{-0.112}_b$	0.025	-0.160	-0.063	66.21*
Young Adult	2	161	0.020	0.024	0.079	-0.132	0.179	0.14
Older Adult	13	4,134	-0.023	-0.031	0.016	-0.061	0.000	84.78*
Anonymous	2	161	0.020	0.024	0.079	-0.132	0.179	0.14
Face-to-Face	13	4,134	-0.023	-0.031	0.016	-0.061	0.000	84.78*
Convenience	2	161	0.020	0.024	0.079	-0.132	0.179	0.14
Representative	13	4,134	-0.023	-0.031	0.016	-0.061	0.000	84.78*
Unpublished	2	161	0.020	0.024_a	0.079	-0.132	0.179	0.14
Published	1	247	-0.305	$\mathbf{-0.398}_b$	0.054	-0.503	-0.293	0.00
Database	12	3,887	-0.005	-0.006_a	0.016	-0.037	0.026	48.81*
Publication Date	10	2,463	0.073/ -0.003	0.077/ **-0.011**	0.004	-0.018	-0.004	51.57*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 26
Aggregate White Identity and White In-Group Evaluation

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	71	20,291	0.154	**0.196**	0.007	0.183	0.209	535.36*
Unthreatened	65	20,032	0.155	**0.195**	0.007	0.182	0.208	499.93*
Threatened	6	259	0.164	**0.243**	0.059	0.127	0.359	37.23*
Low Conflict	37	14,271	0.140	**0.173**$_a$	0.008	0.157	0.189	281.70*
High Conflict	32	5,932	0.193	**0.254**$_b$	0.012	0.230	0.278	232.64*
Young Adult	27	3,334	0.307	**0.376**$_a$	0.015	0.347	0.405	131.29*
Older Adult	44	16,957	0.124	**0.158**$_b$	0.007	0.144	0.173	285.19*
Anonymous	29	7,194	0.144	**0.182**	0.011	0.160	0.205	104.64*
Face-to-Face	41	12,943	0.162	**0.204**	0.008	0.188	0.221	431.34*
Convenience	32	3,771	0.291	**0.362**$_a$	0.014	0.334	0.390	188.83*
Representative	39	16,520	0.123	**0.156**$_b$	0.008	0.141	0.171	244.81*
Unpublished	23	6,590	0.153	**0.190**$_a$	0.012	0.167	0.214	81.06*
Published	12	2,113	0.391	**0.501**$_b$	0.016	0.469	0.533	257.13*
Database	36	11,588	0.110	**0.136**$_c$	0.009	0.118	0.154	101.57*
Publication Date	54	14,281	-0.084/ 0.005	0.178/ **0.005**	0.001	0.002	0.008	1083.60*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 27
Centrality Component of White Identity and White In-Group Evaluation

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	36	9,878	0.146	**0.190**	0.010	0.171	0.209	280.41*
Unthreatened	31	9,659	0.148	**0.193**	0.010	0.174	0.212	264.15*
Threatened	5	219	0.066	0.079	0.068	-0.054	0.212	13.46*
Low Conflict	10	6,954	0.107	**0.132**$_a$	0.012	0.108	0.155	36.12*
High Conflict	24	2,836	0.246	**0.335**$_b$	0.017	0.303	0.368	207.99*
Young Adult	23	1,847	0.257	**0.330**$_a$	0.021	0.289	0.371	53.26*
Older Adult	13	8,031	0.120	**0.157**$_b$	0.011	0.136	0.178	178.71*
Anonymous	23	6,469	0.142	**0.178**	0.012	0.155	0.202	66.03*
Face-to-Face	13	3,409	0.154	**0.213**	0.016	0.181	0.245	220.72*
Convenience	26	2,204	0.227	**0.292**$_a$	0.020	0.254	0.331	78.09*
Representative	10	7,674	0.123	**0.160**$_b$	0.011	0.138	0.182	171.07*
Unpublished	6	686	0.427	**0.599**$_a$	0.025	0.550	0.647	182.23*
Published	8	2,809	0.066	**0.082**$_b$	0.019	0.045	0.119	19.71*
Database	3	806	0.091	**0.114**$_b$	0.035	0.046	0.182	12.09*
Publication Date	31	9,227	0.244/ -0.005	0.420/ **-0.013**	0.003	-0.019	-0.007	724.41*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.

Table 28
Solidarity Component of White Identity and White In-Group Evaluation

Variable	*K*	*N*	*R*	ρ	SE_ρ	95% Confidence Interval		*Q*
						Lower	Upper	
Main Effect	43	12,053	0.144	**0.180**	0.009	0.162	0.197	269.96*
Unthreatened	42	12,013	0.142	**0.176**$_a$	0.009	0.159	0.194	251.10*
Threatened	1	40	0.610	**0.824**$_b$	0.051	0.724	0.925	0.00
Low Conflict	32	8,108	0.138	**0.173**	0.011	0.152	0.194	192.61*
High Conflict	11	3,945	0.155	**0.193**	0.015	0.163	0.223	76.23*
Young Adult	4	757	0.317	**0.386**$_a$	0.031	0.325	0.446	29.46*
Older Adult	39	11,296	0.132	**0.165**$_b$	0.009	0.147	0.183	212.52*
Anonymous	6	725	0.159	**0.219**	0.035	0.150	0.289	39.79*
Face-to-Face	37	11,328	0.143	**0.177**	0.009	0.159	0.195	231.04*
Convenience	6	837	0.343	**0.434**$_a$	0.028	0.378	0.489	50.19*
Representative	37	11,216	0.128	**0.159**$_b$	0.009	0.141	0.177	181.07*
Unpublished	3	395	0.384	**0.476**$_a$	0.039	0.400	0.553	26.29*
Published	4	509	0.259	**0.335**$_a$	0.040	0.258	0.413	35.72*
Database	36	11,149	0.129	**0.161**$_b$	0.009	0.142	0.179	176.78*
Publication Date	26	5,771	0.040/ 0.021	0.038/ **0.030**	0.003	0.024	0.036	236.65*

Note. See the method section for a glossary of terms and their interpretation. At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, bolded parameter estimates indicate significant differences from zero, different subscripts indicate significant moderation, and * aside Q statistics suggest significant variance remains unexplained. For publication date, calculate yearly parameter estimates by adding the intercept (the number before the slash) to the average yearly change (the number after the slash) multiplied by that year minus 1992.