The Colorblind, Multicultural, and Polycultural Ideological Approaches to Improving Intergroup Attitudes and Relations

Lisa Rosenthal* **and Sheri R. Levy**

Stony Brook University

Scholars have long explored the colorblind and multicultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. Polyculturalism, a newly studied ideological approach, focuses on the past and current interactions and connections among different racial and ethnic groups. Drawing on cross-disciplinary work, we critically examine the various forms that each of these ideological approaches has taken across studies, and their implications for intergroup attitudes and relations among racially and ethnically diverse children, adolescents, and adults. Although each ideological approach has been examined in several ways (often combining different forms of each approach), there is sufficient comparative work to draw some conclusions. We propose that a combined ideological approach be implemented in educational settings that maximizes the strengths and positive intergroup consequences of colorblindness, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism, while minimizes the weaknesses and negative intergroup consequences of each approach.

In diverse societies such as Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States, people of all ages are increasingly learning, living, and working in racially and ethnically integrated settings (e.g., Esses & Gardner, 1996; Verkuyten, 2009; Zirkel, 2008b). Acts of racial and ethnic discrimination and violence unfortunately persist around the world, including in settings such as schools and workplaces (e.g., Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005; Esses & Vernon, 2008; Levy & Killen, 2008). Experiences of bias and marginalization in academic and work settings contribute to the continued underrepresentation of particular racial and ethnic groups in many fields of study and careers (e.g., Zirkel, 2008a). Further, much

---

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa Rosenthal, Department of Psychology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-2500 [email: lirosenthal@notes.cc.sunysb.edu], or to Sheri Levy [email: sheri.levy@stonybrook.edu].

research suggests that being in diverse intergroup settings can have other negative consequences besides intergroup discrimination and violence; for example, in intergroup settings, people experience impaired cognitive functioning, decreased academic engagement and success, decreased job performance, and even negative health outcomes (e.g., Richeson & Shelton, 2003). Thus, identifying effective approaches to improving racial and ethnic relations has far-reaching consequences.

Scholars have proposed, implemented, and tested different ideological approaches for improving intergroup relations, primarily in educational settings. The two most popular have been the colorblind and multicultural approaches. The colorblind approach suggests that prejudice derives from people's irrelevant and superficial emphasis on group categories (e.g., race), and therefore prejudice can be decreased by de-emphasizing group memberships (e.g., Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). The multicultural approach, by contrast, suggests that race and ethnicity should be given attention because prejudice develops in part from a lack of knowledge of and appreciation for other groups and that prejudice can be decreased by recognizing and learning about diversity and the differences between racial and ethnic groups (e.g., their traditions; Ryan et al., 2007; Sleeter, 1991; Takaki, 1993; Wolsko et al., 2000).

Critics have noted theoretical weaknesses with both of these approaches. For instance, critics argue that by asserting that race and ethnicity are irrelevant, superficial, and uninformative bases for judging others, the colorblind approach ignores the rich histories of less dominant groups and also does not recognize that racism still exists, which can justify inaction through denial (e.g., Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). Critics of the multicultural approach, on the other hand, have for example noted that by emphasizing the distinctness of racial and ethnic groups, even if casting those differences in a positive light, divisions between people are maintained, resulting in continued stereotyping and discrimination (e.g., Bigler, 1999).

Recently, some historians have identified a different ideological approach, polyculturalism, which suggests prejudice derives in part from people's lack of knowledge about and attention to the historical and contemporary interactions among many different racial and ethnic groups, and that by focusing on the past and current exchanges and connections among groups, prejudice can be decreased (Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001, 2003). While polyculturalism's emphasis on the ways that different racial and ethnic groups have exchanged ideas and influenced each other (e.g., the African and Asian contributions to the creation of Kung-Fu; Prashad, 2001) may be associated with improved attitudes and be a strength of the approach, inadvertent emphasis on negative historical intergroup interactions (e.g., colonization, slavery) could increase intergroup tension or resentment and be a weakness of the approach. As a relatively new approach, there is not a long history of empirical study of this ideological approach or discussion of its

theoretical strengths and weaknesses. Taken together, each of these three ideological approaches appears to have theoretical strengths and weaknesses, which are important to examine and understand in order to inform their application to various settings, including education.

In this article, we critically examine the implications of the colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches for improving intergroup attitudes and relations among racially and ethnically diverse children, adolescents, and adults, with special attention to educational settings. We review relevant theoretical and empirical work across disciplines, including social and developmental psychology, as well as education, history, and sociology, with the hope that greater integration within and across disciplines will contribute to the identification of the most effective approaches for improving intergroup relations (e.g., Aboud & Levy, 1999; Levy, 1999; Zirkel, 2008a). It should be noted that much work on these approaches has not been evaluated or published, and hence cannot be included in this review; that is, school districts, universities, community leaders, teachers, faculty, and others sometimes provide programming relevant to these three approaches without conducting any assessment. Space constraints also preclude a thorough discussion of all studies with assessments of these approaches. Thus, we focus most of our review on studies that have directly pitted different approaches against one another because those studies generally allow for stronger conclusions about the relative effectiveness of each ideological approach.

Since the majority of comparative studies on these ideological approaches have been conducted in the United States, our review will focus largely on the United States, and to a lesser extent on Canada and the Netherlands (refer to Banks, 2004 for progress on comparing work around the world). Furthermore, our review focuses on the association of these ideological approaches with racial and ethnic attitudes and relations because the great majority of the available work has focused on race and ethnicity (as opposed to gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc.).

As an overview of the article, we begin with a brief review of each approach—colorblindness, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism. Then, we review studies that have directly pitted these approaches against one another. We conclude with a discussion of a combined ideological approach that potentially maximizes the strengths and positive intergroup consequences of colorblindness, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism, while minimizes the weaknesses and negative intergroup consequences of each approach.

The Three Ideological Approaches

In this section, we give a broad overview of each of the three ideological approaches. We describe the origins of each approach, discuss the theoretical strengths and weaknesses of each approach, and highlight a few findings on the effectiveness of each approach for facilitating positive intergroup attitudes.

The Colorblind Approach

The colorblind approach suggests that prejudice derives from people's emphasis on superficial and irrelevant group categories (e.g., race), and therefore prejudice can be decreased by de-emphasizing group memberships (e.g., Allport, 1954; Wolsko et al., 2000). For example, following a colorblind approach, some universities and organizations attempt to avoid the consideration of race and ethnicity when admitting students or hiring employees. In this way, it is hoped that potentially harmful or negative racial and ethnic stereotypes are not made salient, and therefore prejudice and discrimination are minimized and possibly eradicated. A colorblind approach is intended to promote equal treatment of all people regardless of group memberships (e.g., Ryan et al., 2007).

In its most generic form, colorblindness suggests ignoring or avoiding discussion of group categories. Although this seems to be a laudable goal of intergroup relations, ignoring or avoiding discussion of group categories has been found to have negative consequences for cognitive performance, intergroup interactions, and effective school administrating (e.g., see Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Mabokela & Madsen, 2005; Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006). This form of colorblindness is therefore unlikely desirable, or even possible in a world in which racial and ethnic group categories are important and affect people's life experiences. It is possible that people may be able to temporarily ignore and suppress their thoughts and beliefs about groups allowing a colorblind view to effectively promote short-term positive intergroup attitudes and behaviors, but in the longer term, preexisting prejudice seems likely to rebound (e.g., see Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008). Concerns about the feasibility of the colorblind approach are central to several criticisms of the approach (e.g., Park & Judd, 2005), as elaborated in this section.

Although colorblindness at its core suggests avoiding attention to race and ethnicity, implementation of this ideology has taken different forms (e.g., Levy et al., 2005). For one, colorblindness can take the form of emphasizing similarities among groups of people ("we are all members of X nationality"). The similarities message has received some empirical support in the literature because focusing on a common ingroup identity ("we"), which transcends intergroup distinctions ("us" vs. "them"), can improve intergroup attitudes (see e.g., relevant theorizing and empirical support for the Common Ingroup Model; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993).

Yet, the "similarities" form of colorblindness, which suggests a focus on or attention to cross-group similarities, has an offshoot often referred to as the assimilation ideology, which suggests that all groups should adopt the same ways, that is, adopt the mainstream, dominant culture (see Neville et al., 2000). The assimilation form of colorblindness seems to draw on the "melting pot" metaphor that all the differences across the diverse people immigrating to and living in a country

such as the United States melt away, such that there is "no longer any visible or psychological basis for prejudice" (Allport, 1954, p. 517). While the "similarities" and assimilation forms of colorblindness are distinct, as just described, both have been criticized for being less suited to or desirable for members of marginalized groups (however, see empirical support for Dual Identities component of Common Ingroup Identity Model: Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; and the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model: Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Downplaying group distinctions in a society still wrought with racism can also communicate that one does not notice or care about persistent racism and the marginalization of nondominant cultures (e.g., Carr, 1997; Dietrich, 2006; Prashad, 2001; Neville et al., 2000; Nieto, 1996; Schofield, 1986; Zirkel, 2008a). From a young age, disadvantaged and stigmatized group members are indeed aware that their group is viewed and treated differently and are generally more aware of race and ethnicity than more advantaged group members (e.g., McKown, 2004; McKown & Weinstein, 2003). Additionally, much work indicates that assimilation is not necessarily successful or desirable for nondominant group members (e.g., Garcia & Hurtado, 1995; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998), particularly those who have strong ethnic identities (e.g., see Gonzales & Cauce, 1995).

While colorblindness, an ideology about de-emphasizing group categories, can be implemented to emphasize similarities and assimilation, it also can be implemented to emphasize individual differences (e.g., "each person is unique"). In this vein, the colorblind approach draws on the principle of treating people as individuals, which is captured by popular sayings such as "You can't judge a book by its cover" (see Ryan et al., 2007; Schofield, 1986). Variations of this "uniqueness" message have shown some promise in children (e.g., see relevant theorizing and empirical support from Cognitive Developmental Theory; Aboud & Fenwick, 1999) and adults (e.g., see relevant theorizing and empirical support from Brewer and Miller's Decategorization Model; Brewer & Miller, 1984).

Nonetheless, the "uniqueness" form of colorblindness has still been criticized because like the "similarities" form, it does not give attention to the valued identity of members of marginalized racial and ethnic groups. Furthermore, even when attending to the unique features of outgroup members, children and adults often fail to notice stereotype-disconfirming evidence (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 1993), and when they do, are likely to view stereotype-disconfirming group members as an exception or a subcategory, leaving group stereotypes intact (for review, see Hewstone, 1996). Consequently, neither the "uniqueness" nor the "similarities" forms of colorblindness seem feasible as a long-term strategy because they work against people's needs for affiliation (e.g., see Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and to divide their world into distinct social categories (e.g., Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987; also see Brewer, 1991). Additionally, the "uniqueness" form of colorblindness has been criticized as being too cognitively taxing for

people to realistically implement in their day-to-day lives; attending to the unique qualities of all the individuals one encounters, for example, in one's classroom setting, would overload one's cognitive system and hamper social interactions (e.g., Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000).

In summary, research and theory has examined colorblindness in three distinct forms: the "similarities," assimilation, and "uniqueness" forms. 'The "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms of colorblindness seem to have some promise at both the theoretical and empirical levels in facilitating positive intergroup consequences, although also with important weaknesses. Assimilation seems to have the most clearly negative consequences, especially for members of lower status societal groups. In addition, the more generic form that suggests ignoring group memberships is not feasible and has negative consequences (American Psychological Association, 1997). We return to summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the various forms of the colorblind approach after reviewing work directly comparing colorblindness to multiculturalism and polyculturalism.

The Multicultural Approach

The multicultural approach in many respects is viewed as an alternative to the colorblind approach. Various civil rights and cultural movements have called attention to the rights of marginalized or less dominant racial and ethnic groups to maintain their own cultures and have those cultures recognized and respected (see Banks, 2004, for a review). A common thread through definitions and goals of multiculturalism is that race and ethnicity should be given attention (as opposed to being ignored) because prejudice develops in part from a lack of knowledge of and respect for other groups (e.g., Sleeter, 1991). At its core, multiculturalism asserts that through learning about different groups and developing an understanding of and appreciation for them, negative attitudes will be reduced (e.g., Takaki, 1993). Proponents argue that multiculturalism validates the cultures of marginalized, actually all racial and ethnic groups, by challenging the notion that everyone in a society shares a common culture or that one culture is superior (e.g., Banks, 2004). The most common forms of multiculturalism, then, seek to provide knowledge and understanding of diverse groups. In educational settings, this can take the form of stand-alone seminars, lectures, or dialogue groups, or can be incorporated into regular curricula. Popular examples are events, programs, or seminars in schools that highlight the history, culture, and contribution of particular racial and ethnic groups, such as for Black History Month or Hispanic Heritage Month (for a review, see Stephan & Stephan, 2001).

However, just as with colorblindness, multiculturalism can take different forms and include different elements. For one, multiculturalism can simply be about learning about and drawing attention to cultural differences between different racial and ethnic groups to help us to understand the lives, experiences,

and perspectives of diverse others ("important differences" form; e.g., Ryan et al., 2007; Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006). Multiculturalism can also take the form of learning to appreciate and value different groups' positive contributions to a diverse society in order to improve intergroup attitudes ("appreciate contributions" form; e.g., Ryan et al., 2007, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000, 2006). Finally, multiculturalism can involve a focus on groups maintaining their own cultures and traditions such as immigrants in a new country or society, or for nondominant groups in relation to the dominant culture ("maintain cultures" form; e.g., Berry & Kalin, 1995), which can be conceptualized as directly opposing the assimilation ideology. These different forms are not always easily separable in the literature, but we will try to draw attention to how these forms have been conceptualized, measured, and manipulated in various studies in order to understand the implications of these different forms of multiculturalism.

As one example of a research study on multiculturalism, Berry and Kalin (1995) explored how endorsing a multicultural ideology and supporting multicultural policies or programs was related to tolerance among adults from different ethnic groups and regions across Canada. Their measure of a multicultural ideology is somewhat of a mixture of all three forms of multiculturalism, but places a particular emphasis on the "maintain cultures," or anti-assimilation form. In fact, Ryan et al. (2010) split Berry and Kalin's measure into two separate subscales, one as a measure of multiculturalism (using the positively worded items that reflect multiculturalism), and one as a measure of assimilation (using the negatively worded items that reflect assimilation). Their measure of support for multicultural policies or programs involved attitudes toward "developing materials for all school systems in Canada to teach children and teachers about other cultures and ways of life" (Berry & Kalin, 1995, p. 305), thus appears to be a measure of support for programs emphasizing the "important differences" form of multiculturalism. Berry and Kalin found that greater agreement with their measures of a multicultural ideology and multicultural policies was each associated with more tolerance toward people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds as well as a stronger attachment and commitment to Canada.

The different forms that multiculturalism takes in applied settings can be even more complicated to tease apart, although some applications of multicultural education have been relatively well-studied among college students (see Stephan & Stephan, 2001). This work includes intergroup dialogue groups in which racially and ethnically diverse students share information about their groups and develop greater awareness of the richness of other groups and awareness of societal inequality (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2004; Lopez, 2004; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004; Nagda & Zuñiga, 2003), which seems to involve the "important differences" and "appreciate contributions" forms of multiculturalism, as well as possibly other elements (e.g., learning about inequality). Results from many of these studies indicate

that intergroup dialogue groups can be quite successful at improving intergroup attitudes; however, pinpointing which form of multiculturalism contributed to the success is not easily accomplished. Moreover, the inclusion of intergroup contact as an integral part of these programs makes it challenging to assess whether multiculturalism or intergroup contact principles are actually accounting for the success of these programs.

This concern over the possible confounding role of intergroup contact on the purported success of multiculturalism also emerged from a meta-analysis by Stephan, Renfro, and Stephan (2004) of multicultural education programs as far back as 1940. They identified 35 qualifying articles, defining multicultural education quite broadly, including all studies that focused on multicultural content (i.e., teaching about other groups; "important differences" form along with other forms), although many included studies had other elements not pure to multicultural teaching, such as intergroup contact through intergroup dialogues. Overall, Stephan et al. (2004) found significant positive effects of multicultural education on immediate as well as delayed intergroup attitudes and behavioral change. Nevertheless, one of the only significant components of the programs they identified as contributing to these positive effects was having contact with the target group. Consequently, the positive effect of multicultural education programs might simply be due to the positive effect of intergroup contact components (e.g., see Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Interestingly, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) have found that greater knowledge of other groups is not a strong mediator of the positive effects of intergroup contact; therefore, intergroup contact may account for the positive effects of multicultural programs, but not the reverse.

Additionally, many of the most popular multicultural practices in schools in the United States, such as Black History Month, which seem to focus on the "appreciate contributions" form of multiculturalism, are often not evaluated. Zirkel (2008b) recently conducted a review of high-quality representations of multicultural education, examining their effects on student achievement and race relations. Zirkel (2008b, p. 1169) noted that "the inclusion of more multicultural content in the curriculum is the most widely implemented aspect of multicultural education, and yet it is probably the least well-studied component of multicultural educational practice" (for a similar observation, see Stephan & Stephan, 2001).

The lack of assessment is troubling, as many critics worry that multicultural programming in schools and elsewhere may have unintended negative social effects. Critics note that by emphasizing the distinctness of racial and ethnic groups ("important differences" form), even if casting those differences in a positive light in these programs (including "appreciate contributions" form), perceptions about substantial differences and divisions between groups are maintained, ultimately resulting in continued stereotyping and discrimination (e.g., Bigler, 1999; Prashad, 2001). Indeed, Wittig and Molina (2000) found that a multicultural program that highlighted the positive contributions of various groups ("appreciate

contributions" form) led to greater racial bias among racially and ethnically diverse middle and high school students in the United States. Helping illuminate why this might be so, Bigler and colleagues (Bigler, 1995; Bigler, Jones, & Lobliner, 1997) have demonstrated in the United States that the use of perceptually salient social categories (such as gender or race) results in the development of biased attitudes. This occurs, for example, when a teacher uses that group category to differentiate people. Educational curricula that focus specifically on the history of certain racial and ethnic groups within a diverse society may, by highlighting race and racial differences suggest that cultures are separate, bounded, and unchanging entities, which is an inaccurate portrayal and can inadvertently increase students' racial biases (e.g., Prashad, 2001). Although this may particularly apply to younger children lacking cognitive sophistication, multiculturalism's relationship to stereotyping has been documented in college students as well (as reviewed in the comparison section below; e.g., see Wolsko et al., 2000). Moreover, some critics of the multicultural approach further contend that multiculturalism (especially in its "important differences" form, but possibly also in other forms) can support nationalism and racism by using cultural explanations to legitimize beliefs about the differences between racial and ethnic groups, as a replacement for the biological explanations that were used in the past and have been scientifically invalidated (e.g., Prashad, 2003).

To summarize, multiculturalism is popular, particularly in schools and universities and appears to have three forms: "important differences," "appreciate contributions," and "maintain cultures." Research and theory suggest that all three forms of multiculturalism have promise for improving intergroup attitudes for both high and low status groups, but also may have some weaknesses such as increasing stereotyping, particularly the "important differences" and possibly even "appreciate contributions" forms. Also, systematic assessments are not widespread in educational settings, and at least some assessments of programs confound intergroup contact with multicultural content. We return to summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the multicultural approach after reviewing work directly comparing it to the other approaches.

The Polycultural Approach

While supporters and critics continue to debate and test positive and negative intergroup consequences of the colorblind and multicultural approaches, historians Kelley (1999) and Prashad (2001, 2003) have suggested consideration of a different ideological approach, polyculturalism. The polycultural approach recognizes people's racial and ethnic backgrounds (similar to the multicultural approach in all of its forms), but instead of focusing on the differences among different cultural groups ("important differences," as well as other forms of multiculturalism), focuses on the many connections among groups due to past and present interactions

and mutual influence. Here, Kelley (1999) and Prashad (2001, 2003) are not referring to commonalities as in the "similarities" form of colorblindness (e.g., all being Americans), but rather different racial and ethnic groups' connected pasts that have shaped those cultures and groups of people. Polyculturalism emphasizes that there are no "pure" cultures belonging to particular racial or ethnic groups, and that culture should not be understood or used as a way to divide up and distinguish between groups, as may be inadvertently promoted by multiculturalism's focus on group differences, particularly in its "important differences" form, but also possibly in its other forms (Prashad, 2001). Instead, polyculturalism highlights that all cultures and people are in fact the products of historical and contemporary interactions among many different racial and ethnic groups (Kelley, 1999), and we are all deeply connected to people of other cultures by our intersecting histories (Prashad, 2003). As Kelley (1999) stated, "All of us, and I mean ALL of us, are the inheritors of European, African, Native American, and even Asian pasts, even if we can't exactly trace our blood lines to all of these continents" (p. 81). Polyculturalism could suggest, for example, interactions and influences through bloodlines (with increasing scientific evidence of mixed ancestries), but can also be simply referring to shared cultural influences.

Polyculturalism proposes that if we better understand and appreciate the ways that cultures are constantly interacting, influencing, and sharing with each other, that people's appreciation and respect for, as well as attitudes toward other racial and ethnic groups will be improved. As just one example of polyculturalism, Prashad's (2001) book titled *Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity* documents the African and Asian connections exemplified in Kung Fu. Prashad details historical evidence that this martial art form is indeed the product of influences from African and Asian cultures, and even extending beyond those cultures as it became popular worldwide. Polyculturalism, then, can help individuals see the links between their own racial or ethnic group and other groups rather than the distinctions and differences that may enhance intergroup conflict and stress. Polyculturalism emphasizes the interconnectedness rather than the separateness of racial and ethnic groups, helping to blur boundaries and allowing people to feel more connected to each other; yet, it does not require ignoring one's racial or ethnic identity or assimilating into or adopting a dominant or common cultural identity in place of one's own identity. Polyculturalism also does not require the creation of common goals or interdependency, as mutual cultural influence already exists and would simply need to be highlighted.

Examinations of race, ethnicity, and culture outside of the field of psychology have highlighted a polycultural perspective, even if they do not directly identify themselves with this approach. For instance, although not directly naming polyculturalism, hooks and Mesa-Bains (2006), two well-respected cultural critics and academics, recently published a book titled *Homegrown: Engaged Cultural*

Criticism, in which they document the connections between Black and Latino peoples. Through discussions of families, work, culture, as well as resistance and struggle against discrimination and inequality, they assert that emphases on differences between Black and Latino people are incorrect and damaging, and that these groups have much more shared history and culture than is often acknowledged. Throughout this book, hooks and Mesina-Bains criticize what they refer to as "superficial" multiculturalism that has led to divisions between Black and Latino people and the perpetuation of stereotypes, while underscoring that Black and Latino communities are "intertwined and interdependent" and that "we are connected" (p. 3).

Flint (2006), a historian, wrote an article exploring the polycultural connections between African and Indian peoples in South Africa, particularly focusing on the historical interactions and sharing of ideas and practices related to health and medicine. Flint (2006) argues that there has mistakenly been a focus on the conflicts, divisions, and differences between, for example, Zulu and Indian people in South Africa, even though their connected, polycultural history is quite evident in various aspects of life, including the ways that these groups' ideas about health and medical practices have influenced each other and been incorporated into contemporary medical ideas and practices.

All in all, polyculturalism as an ideological approach suggests that learning and focusing on the historical and continued connections between different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups can improve people's understanding of history and the present, and also has the potential to improve intergroup attitudes and relations. Polyculturalism may specifically address some of the weaknesses of both the multicultural and colorblind approaches while not contradicting their strengths, and help individuals feel more positively about and greater comfort with learning, working, and living with diverse others.

Possible weaknesses of the polycultural approach have not yet been raised by critics, likely because it is a relatively newly introduced ideological approach. People's recognition of the interactions and influence between cultures could be associated with resentment toward outgroups if people focus on current or past negative interactions. For instance, members of marginalized groups (e.g., Latino and Black Americans) who endorse polyculturalism could have negative attitudes toward dominant groups (e.g., White Americans) and not want to interact with them because of perceiving that dominant group or culture as being forced upon their racial or ethnic group (e.g., slavery and colonization). Indeed, such issues were mentioned by a few participants in our pilot studies in which we asked college student participants for open-ended responses to the ways they think different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups have influenced each other. One Latina woman wrote "I consider myself Latina, Puerto Rican, and we have been greatly influenced by the American culture. English is mandatory in all schools in Puerto Rico and Spanish is becoming 'Spanglish.'" An African American woman while

noting that "Our music-African drums can be found in all music" also said, "I'm African American so I would say that my ethnic group has been influenced in numerous ways. Specifically how we wear our hair, it has been influenced by the dominant American (White) culture." Thus, polyculturalism may bring to mind negative interactions and influence among groups, which requires study.

It is also possible that attempting to teach or promote polyculturalism could be met with resistance and have negative consequences if people perceive this approach as de-emphasizing the unique and noteworthy aspects of their culture's history and traditions. Group members may attribute a particular product solely to their own racial or ethnic group or attribute it more to their own group than the other "contributing" groups, which could result in them seeing the outgroup(s) as deviant and different rather than as positively interconnected to their own group (e.g., see work on the Ingroup Projection Model; Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). If a certain amount of pride is involved in believing that one's ethnic group made a particularly significant contribution and a polycultural perspective is perceived as de-emphasizing the contribution of that specific group, this could result in anger or resentment as well. Particularly, for marginalized racial and ethnic groups who may feel that their groups' contributions to society have already been undervalued and even ignored, a focus on the ways that other groups have influenced their own group may seem to further devalue their strengths and contributions. On the other hand, if polyculturalism helps people to feel that their group's contributions to other cultural products are acknowledged along with other groups' contributions to their culture, this could reduce defensiveness or resentment.

In addition to unexplored weaknesses, the different forms that polyculturalism can take have not yet been examined. Polyculturalism might only take the form of highlighting positive interactions and influences between groups, such as ones that have led to improvements in knowledge, science, and technology or the formation of well-regarded cultural products such as beloved foods, music, and dance. Another form of polyculturalism could simply focus on the negative interactions among groups and how these have shaped history and current societies. While a focus on only negative interactions could possibly intensify intergroup resentment and hostility, it is also possible that a focus on only positive interactions could be viewed as superficial and therefore backfire as well. It is also possible that polyculturalism could take a more neutral form, recognizing and highlighting the interactions and connections between racial and ethnic groups without placing a value on those connections, or recognizing and highlighting both positive and negative connections, which may be the most successful and realistic form.

We have attempted the first empirical tests of polyculturalism, with a focus on a neutral form that addresses the belief that different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups have interacted and influenced each other and continue to do so, without an inherent positive or negative valence to the belief. Particularly, we have

tested whether endorsement of a polycultural ideology is associated with positive intergroup attitudes while controlling for and comparing to endorsement of several forms of multicultural, colorblind, and assimilation ideologies. These studies are reviewed toward the end of the next section, and we return to examining the strengths and weaknesses of polyculturalism after reviewing these comparative studies.

Comparing the Three Ideological Approaches

Although the multicultural and colorblind approaches have been considered for decades across different settings and age groups, there are relatively few studies that have systematically compared these approaches to each other in the same study. In this section, we review studies that have directly pitted these two ideological approaches against each other (in different forms) as well as our recent studies comparing polyculturalism to these two approaches. Because ideological approaches can have different associations for different racial and ethnic groups, our review is organized in a way that draws attention to any racial and ethnic differences. We begin with studies comparing multiculturalism to colorblindness that included White Americans or Canadians only and next turn to studies including other racial and ethnic groups in the United States and Canada (including with the additional study of assimilation ideology), and then to studies conducted in the Netherlands with both dominant and marginalized groups. We also group together studies that use the same or similar experimental inductions and/or measures of the ideologies, helping to organize around and draw conclusions about the different forms that each of the ideological approaches can take. Finally, we review findings from our own studies with a variety of racial and ethnic groups in the United States, which compare several forms of the other ideological approaches to polyculturalism.

Wolsko et al. (2000) conducted a series of studies comparing the effects of multiculturalism and colorblindness among White American college students, randomly assigning participants to read one of two paragraphs that exposed them to either the colorblind or multicultural approach. The colorblind paragraph incorporated two forms of colorblindness; that is, the paragraph seemed to focus on both the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms, suggesting that "intergroup harmony can be achieved if we recognize that at our core we are all the same, that all men and women are created equal, and that we are first and foremost a nation of individuals" (Wolsko et al., 2000; p. 638). The multicultural message instead emphasized recognizing racial or ethnic group differences and their contributions to society; that is, the paragraph seemed to focus on the "important differences" and "appreciate contributions" forms, suggesting that "intergroup harmony can be achieved if we better appreciate our diversity and recognize and accept each group's positive and negative qualities" (p. 638). Across studies, Wolsko et al.

found that priming the combined form of multiculturalism or the combined form of colorblindness reduced racial ingroup bias or ethnocentrism as compared to a control, and that colorblindness encouraged more ethnocentrism than multiculturalism, but multiculturalism encouraged more stereotyping than colorblindness.

Building on Wolsko et al.'s (2000) findings and using their ideological priming paragraphs, Richeson and Nussbaum (2004), in their investigation also with White American undergraduates, found that the combined form of multiculturalism ("appreciate contributions" and "important differences") reduced both explicit and implicit pro-White or ingroup bias (measured by an implicit associations test) more than priming the combined form of colorblindness ("similarities" and "uniqueness").

Correll, Park, and Smith (2008) also studied White American college students and used the same ideological manipulations as those used by Wolsko et al. (2000) and Richeson and Nussbaum (2004), but additionally manipulated whether participants perceived high or low conflict. Level of conflict was manipulated by telling students that there was a proposed change to the process for registering for classes, either one that would involve expanding the number of students that could enroll in popular classes to increase the number of racial and ethnic "minority" students that would be able to register, or one that would involve giving "minority" students (and not White students) an early registration period for popular classes, but not expanding the number of students that could register. In three studies, they found that when perceived conflict was low, both colorblindness and multiculturalism reduced prejudice, but that when conflict was high, only colorblindness reduced prejudice. However, colorblindness led to greater implicit prejudice at a later time point. This finding suggests colorblindness may have more negative effects for implicit prejudice, and may also have a negative "rebound" effect, with it first having positive effects, but later negative effects.

Vorauer and Sasaki (2010) used almost identical inductions to prime multiculturalism versus colorblindness in White Canadian college students. They found that these ideological approaches can have differing effects based on the level of prejudice of the respondent. Specifically, they found that colorblindness generally had negative effects for everyone (reducing feelings of similarity to an outgroup partner, no moderation by prejudice level). Multiculturalism led everyone to perceive greater cultural differences between themselves and their outgroup partners, and had positive effects for low-prejudice individuals (increased warmth toward outgroup partner) but negative effects for high-prejudice individuals (viewing cultural differences as more disturbing).

Vorauer, Gagnon, and Sasaki (2009) used the same inductions used by Vorauer and Sasaki (2010), testing the effects on both White and Aboriginal Canadian undergraduates. They found in two studies that multiculturalism resulted in both White and Aboriginal Canadian participants making more "positive other-directed remarks" toward a different-race partner, explained by a more "outward focus."

On the other hand, colorblindness resulted in increased negative affect in White Canadian participants, explained by a "prevention orientation."

There have also been correlational studies of multiculturalism and colorblindness that use similar conceptualizations of these ideologies as those in the Wolsko et al. (2000) manipulations and in the aforementioned experimental studies that built on Wolsko et al. (2000). Ryan et al. (2007) developed a measure of multiculturalism, which seems to involve the "important differences" and "appreciation contributions" forms as well as a measure of colorblindness that seems to involve a combination of the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms. Ryan et al.'s (2007) studies were conducted with both Black and White American participants, the first with community members attending a diversity program, and the second with college students. In both studies, they found that the tendency to endorse the multicultural approach more than the colorblind approach was stronger among Black Americans, and that White Americans were more likely than Black Americans to endorse the colorblind approach. Additionally, they found that Black Americans who more strongly endorsed multiculturalism than colorblindness demonstrated greater stereotyping, but White Americans who more strongly endorsed colorblindness than multiculturalism demonstrated greater stereotyping. In their second study, they also found that for all participants, endorsing multiculturalism more than colorblindness was associated with less ethnocentrism.

Ryan et al. (2010) then examined these same measures (with an additional item in each scale) of the multicultural and colorblind ideologies as well as a measure of assimilation ideology among Latino and White American participants. Their assimilation measure was adapted from Berry and Kalin's (1995) measure of multiculturalism, in which Ryan et al. (2010) selected the reversed-scored items from Berry and Kalin's multicultural ideology scale, which were worded in a way that supported the assimilation ideology (endorsing that minority group members should adopt the mainstream culture) and then slightly adapted the wording of those items for the United States context. Ryan et al. found that these three ideological approaches were distinct; the weak correlation between the assimilation and colorblind ideologies is notable because it suggests that the assimilation ideology is indeed distinct from the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms of colorblindness. Ryan et al. also found that assimilation was only negatively associated with the combined "important differences" and "appreciation contributions" form of multiculturalism for White but not for Latino Americans, which was somewhat unexpected. This suggests assimilation may not be an ideology directly opposed to multiculturalism for all groups; however, this may be because the measure of multiculturalism used does not include the "maintain cultures" form of multiculturalism. All participants endorsed multiculturalism to a greater extent than both assimilation and colorblindness, and as expected, preference for multiculturalism over assimilation was greater for Latino Americans, consistent with assimilation being less favored by members of nondominant groups. Multiculturalism

was associated with Latino Americans perceiving less variability among White Americans, but White Americans perceiving greater variability among Latino Americans. For both Latino and White Americans, multiculturalism was generally associated with greater stereotyping but less ingroup bias or ethnocentrism, although the relationship with stereotyping was stronger for Latino participants. Additionally, for both Latino and White Americans, assimilation was associated with lower perceived variability or stronger stereotypes as well as less reported warmth toward Latino Americans compared to White Americans. Colorblindness did not have any significant associations in this sample. These results highlight that these approaches can have different associations for dominant versus nondominant groups in a society, and that while multiculturalism is associated with less ethnocentrism, it can also be associated with greater stereotyping (although this may vary by group). This study further showed that assimilation is not equivalent to the other forms of colorblindness and that assimilation is related to negative intergroup outcomes.

Wolsko et al. (2006) also conducted correlational work, including developing a measure of multiculturalism that follows from their operationalization of multiculturalism from their influential manipulations (Wolsko et al., 2000), incorporating the "important differences" and "appreciate contributions" forms, with an addition of one item that seems to addresses the "maintain cultures" form. Wolsko et al. (2006) developed a measure of assimilation ideology (endorsing that minority group members should adopt the mainstream culture), which is similar to Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure. Across two large samples of adults from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds across the United States, Wolsko et al. (2006) found that marginalized racial and ethnic group (Asian, Black, and Latino American) participants endorsed multiculturalism to a greater extent than do White American participants. Overall, multiculturalism was associated with perceiving greater differences between groups but also less evaluative bias (operationalized in one study with a desired social distance or interest in intergroup contact measure, and in another study with a temperature rating measure, which has been referred to as ingroup bias or ethnocentrism in previous studies); assimilation was associated with greater perceived differences between groups as well as greater evaluative bias. However, multiculturalism was more strongly associated with less evaluative bias, and assimilation was more strongly associated with greater evaluative bias for White American participants than for other participants. Additionally, multiculturalism was associated with greater collective self-esteem (ethnic identification, belonging) for marginalized racial and ethnic group participants, but not for White American participants; assimilation was positively associated with collective self-esteem for White American participants but not for other participants. Finally, for all participants, multiculturalism was associated with greater support for affirmative action, more lenient immigration policy, and more lenient policies toward expectations for English-speaking, but the opposite associations were found for

assimilation. For all participants, assimilation was significantly associated with greater social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), or support for social inequality, and multiculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO.

Based on the findings of the studies reviewed thus far in the United States and Canada assessing similar forms of the multicultural and colorblind ideologies, we can draw some preliminary conclusions. Multiculturalism in a combined form ("important differences" and "appreciate contributions" forms combined, as well as possibly with the additional "maintain cultures" form) is associated with numerous positive intergroup attitudes, including lower explicit and implicit ingroup bias or ethnocentrism, more positive feelings toward an outgroup interaction partner, and even more support for some liberal public policies. Moreover, multiculturalism seems to be associated with ethnic collective self-esteem for members of marginalized groups. Still, multiculturalism is also, as critics have argued, associated with greater perceived differences between groups and greater stereotyping. Colorblindness, in its combined form ("similarities" and "uniqueness") is associated with lower explicit ingroup bias or ethnocentrism in some samples compared to a control condition, but is also associated with greater stereotyping and ingroup bias as compared to multiculturalism, and especially with implicit measures of bias. Assimilation (which was shown to be distinct from other forms of colorblindness) seems to have the most clear negative intergroup consequences, as it is associated with greater ethnocentrism, stereotyping, and less support for liberal public policies.

In the Netherlands, Verkuyten (2005, 2009) has compared these ideologies using measures and manipulations of multiculturalism that are slightly different than those used in the aforementioned set of studies. Verkuyten (2005) conducted a series of correlational and experimental studies exploring multicultural and assimilation ideological approaches in both Dutch and Turkish-Dutch adolescents and college students. One multiculturalism measure used in the correlational studies focuses on the "appreciate contributions" form of multiculturalism, while also incorporating some other elements, such as how easy it is to "understand people from another culture" and whether groups should "mix as much as possible" (Verkuyten, 2005; p. 123). Another measure was based on Berry and Kalin's (1995) measure of multiculturalism and is a mixture of different forms but seems to focus on the "maintain cultures" form of multiculturalism. The experimental manipulations involved completing a set of either multiculturalism items (from Berry and Kalin's measure, focusing on the "maintain cultures" form) or assimilation items (also from Berry and Kalin's measure, worded to focus on adapting to mainstream Dutch culture, which is similar to the assimilation measures used by Ryan et al. (2010) and Wolsko et al. (2006)). Across studies, Verkuyten found that Turkish-Dutch students endorsed multiculturalism more than did Dutch students, and the reverse was true for assimilation. Among Dutch students, endorsement of multiculturalism led to lower identification with or sense of belonging to their

own ethnic group and more positive outgroup evaluation, while assimilation was associated with greater identification with their own ethnic group and less positive outgroup evaluation. Among Turkish-Dutch students, endorsement of multiculturalism led to higher identification with their own ethnic group and more positive ingroup evaluation, while assimilation was associated with lower identification with their own group.

In another series of experimental and correlational studies in the Netherlands, Verkuyten (2009) examined the relationship between multiculturalism and self-esteem. Multiculturalism was measured correlationally in the first two studies with two scales that seem to focus on the "maintain cultures" form. In these first two studies, with Dutch compared to Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch participants, multiculturalism was found to be associated with greater self-esteem for nondominant group members as well as for dominant group members who reported strong identification with their own ethnic group (no association for dominant group members with low ethnic identification). In the third study with Dutch and Turkish-Dutch participants, priming multiculturalism versus colorblindness was tested. Multiculturalism was experimentally manipulated with a priming paragraph that seems to focus on the "appreciate contributions" form of multiculturalism, and colorblindness was experimentally manipulated with a priming paragraph that seems to focus on the "uniqueness" form of colorblindness. Results revealed that the experimental priming did not affect Dutch and Turkish-Dutch participants' identification with their respective ethnic groups, but Turkish-Dutch participants did report greater ethnic identification than did Dutch participants. Interaction effects revealed that ethnic identification was positively associated with self-esteem when multiculturalism was primed, but the two were not associated when colorblindness was primed; these effects were consistent across both groups. Overall, these two sets of studies in the Netherlands suggest multiculturalism promotes ethnic identification and self-esteem for nondominant groups, particularly for both nondominant and dominant group members who have high identification with their own ethnic groups, and furthermore, multiculturalism leads to lower ingroup bias or improved evaluations of outgroups among dominant group members.

The next set of studies (Rosenthal & Levy, under review) involved what we believe are the first empirical tests of polyculturalism; in all studies, we tested polyculturalism as well as the two other ideological approaches among a variety of racial and ethnic groups in the United States (e.g., Asian, Black, Latino, and White Americans). We first conducted a series of pilot studies that resulted in the development of a measure of polyculturalism, which focuses on the underlying ideology or endorsement of historical and contemporary interactions, connections, and mutual influence among different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. The polyculturalism scale was designed to fit with Prashad's (2001) and Kelley's (1999) original conceptualizations and not to focus on or highlight positive or negative

interactions, therefore making it free of valence issues (e.g., "Different cultural groups impact one another, even if people in those groups are not completely aware of the impact" and "Different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups influence each other"). Our initial work predated the publication of Ryan et al.'s (2007, 2010) and Wolsko et al.'s (2006) ideological measures, so we developed our own. To parallel the polyculturalism measure already developed, we designed the multiculturalism and colorblind measures also to be free of any positive or negative valence issues.

In our first three studies (Rosenthal & Levy, under review), we used our three ideological measures, which reflect a "neutral" form of polyculturalism, the "important differences" form of multiculturalism, and the combined "uniqueness" and "similarities" forms of colorblindness. The first study was conducted with a large sample of racially and ethnically diverse undergraduates (including Asian, Black, Latino, and White Americans). Polyculturalism was significantly related to lower SDO (support for social inequality), greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity, and greater willingness for intergroup contact, even when controlling for the contributions of multiculturalism and colorblindness to these outcome variables. Multiculturalism in its "important differences" form was significantly associated with greater appreciation for diversity but less willingness to have contact with outgroups when controlling for the contributions of color-blindness and polyculturalism. Colorblindness in its combined "similarities" and "uniqueness" form was significantly related to lower SDO, even when taking into account the contributions of multiculturalism and polyculturalism. Additionally, when controlling for SDO as well as right-wing authoritarianism in predicting all the other outcomes, polyculturalism's positive associations remained significant. Further, with analyses conducted separately for different racial and ethnic groups, polyculturalism remained significantly associated with all of the outcomes for Asian, Black, Latino, and White Americans. Colorblindness was significantly associated with lower SDO for only White Americans, and also marginally significantly associated with less comfort with differences for White Americans. Multiculturalism was marginally significantly associated with greater interest in diversity for White Americans, and significantly greater appreciation for diversity among Asian and Black Americans.

The next two studies were conducted with a community sample of Black and White American adults and a United States-wide telephone survey sample of Black and White American adults. Across these two studies, we again found endorsement of polyculturalism to be associated with lower SDO, greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity and differences, and additionally with greater support for related policy attitudes in the telephone survey sample, including support for affirmative action and an immigration policy that would legalize the status of undocumented immigrants in the United States. Race of participant was a significant moderator only of the effect between polyculturalism and interest in diversity in both samples, with follow-up regressions revealing that

polyculturalism's association with greater interest in diversity was only significant for White Americans in these samples (nonsignificant for Black Americans).

After these studies were already underway, the works of Ryan et al. (2007, 2010) and Wolsko et al. (2006) were published, providing useful measures of colorblindness and multiculturalism in slightly different forms, as well as measures of assimilation ideology. In a fourth study of racially and ethnically diverse college students, we tested our measure of polyculturalism along with three other measures of multiculturalism (Ryan et al.'s measure, Ryan et al.'s adaptation of Berry and Kalin's measure, and Wolsko et al.'s measure), another measure of colorblindness (Ryan et al.'s measure), and two measures of assimilation (Ryan et al.'s adaptation of Berry and Kalin's measure, and Wolsko et al.'s measure). Polyculturalism was significantly associated with lower SDO, greater appreciation for and comfort with diversity, and lower evaluative bias (similar to willingness for intergroup contact measure in Study 1) even when controlling for the contributions of the other ideological approaches (using all of the measures described above from the literature). The measures of multiculturalism, which all reflected combined forms of multiculturalism, also demonstrated positive associations with these intergroup outcomes, and Ryan et al.'s (2010) measure of colorblindness was significantly associated with lower SDO and lower evaluative bias. All three ideologies, then, account for unique amounts of variance in intergroup attitudes. Assimilation ideology, however, was associated with higher SDO, less interest in and comfort with differences, and greater evaluative bias, which along with findings from other studies as previously discussed (Ryan et al., 2010; Wolsko et al., 2006) suggest that this ideology has consistently negative implications for intergroup attitudes.

Across all four studies, participants tended to endorse both polyculturalism and multiculturalism (in all of its different forms and measurements) but disagree slightly with colorblindness (although agreement with Ryan et al.'s measure of colorblindness was greater than with the Rosenthal and Levy measure). Also, polyculturalism and multiculturalism were consistently significantly positively correlated with each other, illustrating their shared emphasis on acknowledging groups, although factor analyses established that they were indeed distinct constructs.

Summary of Studies Comparing the Approaches

Although there is not space to review all of the innovative research on ideological approaches, it is clear from this selective review that researchers have made tremendous gains in understanding the implications of these approaches. Below we briefly summarize the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Overall, multiculturalism, especially in combined forms (including "important differences," "appreciate contributions," and "maintain cultures" forms), tends to be related to many positive intergroup attitudes as well as increased self-esteem

for marginalized group members. The "important differences" form by itself does not seem to have as many positive consequences. Additionally, multicultural- ism, even in its combined forms, is associated with perceiving greater differences between groups and increased stereotyping, which are noteworthy weaknesses. Colorblindness in a combined form ("similarities" and "uniqueness" form) has some positive consequences for intergroup attitudes, but also has some negative consequences, especially when compared directly to multiculturalism or using implicit measures of bias, and as anticipated by critics, is less endorsed by mem- bers of disadvantaged groups. Assimilation ideology, which although linked to colorblindness is distinct from the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms, seems to have fairly consistent negative effects on intergroup attitudes and also is less endorsed by disadvantaged groups. In a similar vein, the more generic form of colorblindness involving simply ignoring and avoiding discussion of racial and ethnic group memberships has negative consequences for intergroup attitudes and relations, and is not a promising approach in educational or other settings. Some of the effects and associations of colorblindness and multiculturalism also vary by other variables, such as multiculturalism's positive relationship with self-esteem for members of marginalized but not dominant groups, and multiculturalism's pos- itive effects for low-prejudice individuals but negative effects for high-prejudice individuals.

Endorsement of polyculturalism, the newest and least studied approach, seems so far to be associated with consistently positive intergroup attitudes for both domi- nant and marginalized groups. Polyculturalism studied in its "neutral" form relates to greater interest in, appreciation for, and comfort with diversity and people from different backgrounds, less support for social dominance or inequality, greater willingness to have contact with people from different racial and ethnic groups, and greater support for related policy attitudes, including support for affirmative action and immigration policy that would legalize the status of undocumented immigrants in the United States. Future work is needed to shed light on the weaknesses of the polycultural approach (e.g., making people defensive of their culture's traditions or bringing up past negative intergroup interactions resulting in tension) and the consequences of possible different forms polyculturalism.

In terms of endorsement of each of the ideological approaches, people seem to endorse polyculturalism and multiculturalism (regardless of the form) strongly and to about equivalent degrees but to endorse colorblindness less, especially assimilation. As noted earlier, when differences are found, advantaged groups (e.g., Dutch, White Americans) endorse colorblindness or assimilation more than marginalized groups (e.g., Turkish-Dutch, Black Americans), who instead show greater preference for multiculturalism.

It also is clear from this review that these ideological approaches are not necessarily at odds with one another and can even have positive correlations. For example, Ryan et al. (2007) have found the combined "important differences" and

"appreciate contributions" form of multiculturalism and the combined "similarities" and "uniqueness" form of colorblindness to be positively correlated with each other, and we (Rosenthal & Levy, under review) have found polyculturalism and the "important differences" form of multiculturalism to be positively correlated with each other. Even when they are not positively correlated with each other, they are not necessarily negatively correlated with each other and may be simultaneously endorsed and implemented together in applied settings. Further, work on all three ideological approaches (Rosenthal & Levy, under review) demonstrates that each of these ideologies can have unique contributions to intergroup attitudes. Building on the strengths and weaknesses of each of these ideological approaches for improving intergroup attitudes and relations, we suggest that the promising elements of each of these approaches be combined to create a more effective approach in applied settings, such as schools.

Implications for Policies, Programs, and Interventions: Applying a Combined Ideological Approach

As noted from the outset, the colorblind and multicultural approaches have been and continue to be widely implemented in various settings in Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States, as well as other places around the world. A large amount of money continues to be invested into ideology-inspired policies, programs, and interventions each year. Our review of the strengths and weaknesses of each form of the ideological approaches highlights that no ideological approach alone is likely to be completely effective, but programs and policies guided by a combined ideological approach that maximizes the strengths of each approach while minimizing the weaknesses of each approach are likely to be more effective in improving intergroup attitudes and relations.

There are many possible ways that a combined ideological approach could be implemented. As one example, the promising elements of each ideology could be presented separately but sequentially resulting in a combined approach. We suspect that the most promising strategy is to present information that draws attention to the promising aspects of all of the ideologies together in a lesson or workshop so that the weaknesses of the individual ideologies are balanced by each other's strengths. Combating the weaknesses of the approaches head on while simultaneously highlighting the strengths of the approaches also seems necessary to help increase the chances that the strengths rather than the weaknesses of the approaches are additive. Thus, below, we focus on examples that represent this fully integrated type of combined approach.

First, we consider examples of the combined ideological approach that could be included in extra-curricular activities or add-ons to school curricula. Here we take the example of a popular multiculturalism add-on program in the United States, and discuss the ways that it could be modified to include elements of the

other ideological approaches to create a fully integrated combined approach. Many schools have programs or activities designed to celebrate Black History Month, which is driven by multiculturalism, specifically aimed at highlighting the important contributions that Black Americans have made to society and teaching about some of the historical discrimination that Black Americans have experienced. By having this sort of add-on program driven only by multiculturalism, it can inadvertently draw attention to Black Americans and Black American history as being separate and different from other Americans and their history, and may be seen as only important or relevant to Black American students as critics have noted (e.g., Bigler, 1999; Prashad, 2001). However, with the incorporation of effective elements of colorblindness and polyculturalism, this type of program may have a more positive influence on intergroup attitudes and relations. For one, this program could additionally incorporate an emphasis on similarities between Black Americans and other groups in their experiences, both with discrimination and otherwise, and in their contributions to society; moreover, there could be an emphasis on the great variation and individual differences among Black Americans ("similarities" and "uniqueness" forms of colorblindness). There could also be a focus on the many and varied interactions and connections between Black Americans and other racial and ethnic groups throughout history that have influenced and shaped Black American as well as all other American cultures (polyculturalism).

Hispanic Heritage Month is yet another popular example of multiculturalism-inspired add-on programs in educational settings in the United States. Similar additions that were described for Black History Month including the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms of colorblindness as well as polyculturalism would be needed to strengthen this program. To elaborate on the polyculturalism piece because it is the least studied ideology that likely has not yet been formally implemented, students could be exposed to Latino histories and cultural products that have been greatly influenced by people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, such as different Latin American styles of music, dance, dress, types of food, or forms of language. One event or class unit might focus on how salsa dancing and music are the result of the collective influence of many cultures including the African, Indigenous, and European cultures that interacted and blended in places like Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico.

A common and important theme across existing multiculturalism-driven add-on programs like Black History Month and Hispanic Heritage Month is addressing marginalized groups' experiences with oppression and inequality. For instance, the discussion of slavery, segregation, and movements to end racial and ethnic oppression and inequality are often incorporated into these programs. Following from Zirkel's (2008a) assertion that a critical part of multicultural education is teaching about slave resistance as opposed to simply slave victimization, such as to frame this history in a way that is more empowering to diverse students, we suggest that an incorporation of the strengths of colorblindness and polyculturalism

can further contribute to the framing of this history in a more empowering way. A discussion on the ways in which Black Americans had unique experiences based on the history of being captured, stolen from Africa, and enslaved in the Americas, as well as their valiant struggles against slavery and oppression, is essential to this history. An additional incorporation of the strengths of colorblindness involving discussion of the commonalities across different racial and ethnic groups in terms of their experiences with oppression and their efforts at struggling against that oppression may increase the effectiveness of the teaching of this history. One could draw on the experiences of Native Americans with colonization and being forced onto land reservations, the experiences of indentured servants of European descent who often worked in similar situations or even alongside enslaved people of African descent, and the experiences of Asians who were enslaved or recruited to come to the Americas as another source of cheap labor. Polyculturalism could be infused into the lesson by drawing students' attention to the ways that Black, Native, and White Americans many times worked closely together in slave revolts, escapes, and rebellions, and that indeed many members of these different groups interacted and influenced each other in countless ways, and further were friends, comrades, and even lovers, even resulting in more mixed bloodlines than are often recognized (e.g., see Zinn, 1980).

As another concrete example of how to incorporate polyculturalism, as the newest and least applied approach, similar connections can be highlighted in learning about the civil rights movement, as members of all racial and ethnic groups (including Asian, Black, Latino, and White Americans) participated in struggles for equality and an end to racial discrimination. To name a few examples, the Black Panthers, the Young Lords, the Brown Berets, the American Indian movement, and the Red Guard Party tend to be discussed as operating as separate, nationalist organizations, when in fact they communicated, exchanged ideas, and influenced each other greatly, which had a lasting effect on the communities in which those organizations were active (e.g., see Prashad, 2003). Drawing from the strengths of the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms of colorblindness, the commonalities in terms of experiences during the civil rights movement across different racial and ethnic groups, in addition to the wide variety within racial and ethnic groups in terms of experiences and attitudes toward different approaches to struggling for equality, can also be incorporated into these originally multiculturalism-focused programs.

Although there is reason to believe that a fully integrated combined approach to the widely popular Black History or Hispanic Heritage Month types of add-on programs at schools could improve intergroup attitudes and relations, generally there is a concern that relatively brief add-on programs, by nature, are done in a mostly superficial way (see Stephan & Stephan, 2001) and are far too minimal of a strategy to be effective (e.g., Banks, 1995, 2004). Banks (1995, 2004) and Zirkel (2008a,b), among others, have suggested that for ideology-driven programs

to be effective (here they are specifically referring to multicultural education), the total school environment, including curricula, pedagogies, and cultures, among other things, need be transformed to reflect the diversity of a society and to help all students, and particularly students of color, experience educational equality. Accordingly, we next consider how a combined ideological approach can be incorporated into educational settings in more comprehensive ways.

The combined ideological approach could be incorporated into all aspects of curricula development for greater effectiveness, such as in the teaching of history, art, and English. The way history is written in textbooks and taught in classrooms would need to change substantially to clearly incorporate elements of polyculturalism, multiculturalism, and colorblindness into the understanding of history. Drawing from multiculturalism, it is crucial to include history that is relevant to and includes the experiences of people from all different racial and ethnic groups, and despite the popularity of multiculturalism, the diversity of history that is taught in most educational settings is not nearly sufficient (e.g., Banks, 1995, 2004; Zirkel, 2008a,b). Drawing from the strengths of colorblindness, it is also crucial to highlight similarities across societies throughout history and differences among people within societies and cultures. Drawing on polyculturalism, it is crucial to focus on the interactions and connections between different countries, and racial and ethnic groups across different countries and societies, including their mutual influences and shared contributions to historical events, not just examples such as wars between countries. An art class curriculum could include a discussion of the different interactions and cultural influences during particular time periods or for particular artists from different places and backgrounds (polyculturalism), while also highlighting different types of art produced by people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds around the world (multiculturalism) and highlighting commonalities across artists and unique aspects of art to different individuals (colorblindness). An English class curriculum could highlight the mutual influences between cultures and writers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds that have been a part of the creation of works of literature (e.g., Kelley, 1999) in addition to reading literature by authors of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and highlighting common literary techniques and unique styles within individual writers. Indeed, it seems that any and all subjects could include a combination of the most effective forms of polycultural, multicultural, and colorblind messages in their curricula across different age groups.

Regardless of the form it takes, when implementing a combined ideological approach, it is important to reiterate that the weaknesses of each of the approaches need to be addressed. As one example, when incorporating polyculturalism, it would be important to highlight the contributions both to and from various different cultures, so as not to suggest one group contributes to all others but not the reverse, which could result in defensiveness and rejection of the ideas. Additionally, it will be particularly important to make sure marginalized groups' contributions

to dominant groups' cultures are emphasized, in addition to the reverse, such as Asian, Latino, and Black Americans' numerous and varied contributions to dominant, White American cultural products, in order to prevent the perpetuation of and resentment toward ideas that dominant groups have contributed more to historical events and cultural products than nondominant groups. Similarly, while highlighting the commonalities among different racial and ethnic groups (colorblindness), it is essential to make sure the importance of people's racial and ethnic identities or their experiences with discrimination are not undermined or ignored. As well, while recognizing and celebrating important differences and contributions of different racial and ethnic groups (multiculturalism), it is important to make sure that a stereotyping message that all members of a racial and ethnic group have the same ideas or lifestyles, or the message that cultures are points of great difference and division between groups are not inadvertently communicated.

The above series of examples only scratch the surface of the ways in which the three approaches can be combined to move toward improving intergroup relations and academic engagement among students from diverse backgrounds. Hopefully, these examples provide a sufficient overview of implementing a combined ideological approach to educational settings, including the pitfalls to avoid. It is worth noting that an essential consideration when implementing a combined ideological approach is tailoring the policies, programs, or interventions to the setting and population. For instance, if a particular event or cultural product is known to be prominent in the media at a particular moment, but the polycultural aspects of it have not been highlighted, one might want to address this and present a more combined approach to understanding that event or cultural product to counteract or add to the other messages that are being received from other sources. Or, a particular cultural product, such as a popular type of music for a certain age group or population, might be chosen for discussion based on a combined polycultural, multicultural, and colorblind understanding of it.

There are many other practical issues that would need to be considered in implementing the combined approach or any ideological approach, and there is not space to review all of those nontrivial issues here. We nonetheless highlight that implementing a combined ideological approach as policy would require in-depth training that helps staff such as teachers and administrators understand how to carry it out (e.g., see Zirkel, 2008a). A crucial component of this training would be trouble-shooting about potential pitfalls or problems such as inadvertently accentuating the weaknesses rather than the strengths of the approaches. As is the case with any intervention, it will be most effective when it is carried out by individuals who both support the approach and feel supported by their organization to implement the approach.

It is important to note that work settings are another relevant application of these ideological approaches about racial and ethnic diversity. Some work on

colorblindness and multiculturalism has been explored in work settings (e.g., see Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008), and the possible application of a combined ideological approach seems worthwhile in these settings.

Another key point to consider is while research on ideological approaches to intergroup relations has been almost exclusively conducted in racially and ethnically diverse societies, ideological approaches, unlike other successful approaches to improving intergroup relations (e.g., intergroup contact theory; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), do not necessarily require diverse settings. Ideological approaches are flexible approaches that can be used in many environments. Thus, the implementation of a combined ideological approach could be tailored to the diversity of one's environment, particularly how diverse classmates or coworkers are. Future work could be directed toward testing how the approaches play out and can be utilized in more homogeneous settings for improving attitudes toward groups that are more distal (e.g., attitudes toward people as distal as in another country, such as a country one's own nation is at war with).

Limitations of This Review and Work on Ideological Approaches

Although there is a growing literature directly comparing colorblindness to multiculturalism, there is still a somewhat limited set of studies in terms of groups tested (e.g., in terms of age, race/ethnicity, etc.) and settings (e.g., laboratories, classrooms, work settings) comparing different ideological approaches to one another in controlled ways. Additionally, multiculturalism and colorblindness have been manipulated and measured in various ways, often combining different forms that these ideological approaches can take. Taken together, these limitations restrict our ability to draw completely clear conclusions about which elements of each of the ideological approaches work or not and for which outcomes and which groups of people.

Most of the studies reviewed were conducted in the United States and to a lesser extent in Canada and the Netherlands, making our conclusions best fitted to those contexts. There may be some universal principles involved in the implications of these approaches, but as others have pointed out (e.g., Banks, 2004), there are key differences that necessitate comparing the approaches in different countries.

As we noted from the outset, the majority of research on these approaches has focused on the impact on racial and ethnic attitudes and relations and hence was the focus of this article. Yet, each of these approaches has implications for attitudes across a wide variety of social categories (e.g., race, gender, social class, sexual orientation), which requires greater study.

Also, few studies have directly tested the mechanisms or processes through which these ideological approaches are successful or not successful. As noted above, ideological teachings are likely unsuccessful when they make groups feel

defensive or promote guilt. On the other hand, ideological teachings such as those that highlight the history of marginalized groups through those groups' perspectives may be successful when they facilitate feelings of empathy or increase knowledge about different groups (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 2001).

As well, the success of ideological approaches can be thwarted by mixed messages from different sources. For one, a particular school could implement a combined approach drawing on the strengths of the colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural approaches, but parents or peers in one's neighborhood could endorse a strictly colorblind approach, thus undermining the effectiveness of the combined approach. A related problem, not surprisingly, is that many of the schools and organizations that are most willing to participate in interventions or adopt new ways of addressing intergroup relations and diversity are the schools that are already implementing prejudice-reducing strategies and, relative to other schools, have fewer race-related problems (e.g., Gimmestad & de Chiara, 1983). This limits the conclusions that can be drawn from studies and in some sense fails to accomplish the goal of the interventions—to reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relations in society at large. Researchers have long lamented the difficulty of securing participation from schools (Verma & Bagley, 1979), particularly those truly needing to address intergroup tensions. This will continue to be a problem for policies and interventions based on these ideological approaches as well as policies and interventions based on other approaches.

Conclusion

Ideological approaches have been and will likely remain popular and well-funded approaches to improving intergroup relations. Based on our critical review of the literature across disciplines, we suggest that educational settings move toward using a combined ideological approach, adding promising elements of the multicultural (a combination of all three forms) and colorblind (a combination of the "similarities" and "uniqueness" forms but not the assimilation or general ignoring of group memberships forms) approaches that have already been implemented, and then adding promising elements of the polycultural approach (possibly particularly in a "neutral" form). We hope the connections between basic and applied work across different disciplines in the area of ideological approaches will continue to blossom and contribute to even greater progress in improving intergroup relations and the lives of people from all backgrounds.

References

Aboud, F. E., & Fenwick, V. (1999). Evaluating school-based interventions to reduce prejudice in preadolescents. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 767–785.

Aboud, F. E., & Levy, S. R. (1999). Introduction: Are we ready to translate research into programs? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 621–625.

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

American Psychological Association. (1997). *Can or should Americans be color-blind? Psychological research reveals fallacies in a color-blind response to racism* [Pamphlet]. Washington, DC.

Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Ambady, N., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Learning (not) to talk about race: When older children underperform on social categorization. *Developmental Psychology, 44*, 1513–1518.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education for young children: Racial and ethnic attitudes and their modification. In W. D. Hawley & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America* (pp. 236–250). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

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

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

Bigler, R. S. (1995). The role of classification skill in moderating environmental influences on children's gender stereotyping: A study of the functional use of gender in the classroom. *Child Development, 66*, 1072–1087.

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

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1993). A cognitive-developmental approach to racial stereotyping and reconstructive memory in Euro-American children. *Child Development, 64*, 1507–1518.

Bigler, R. S., Jones, L. C., & Lobliner, D. B. (1997). Social categorization and the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development, 6*, 530–543.

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.

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

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 255–343.

Carr, L. G. (1997). *"Color-blind" racism*. London: Sage Publications.

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

Dietrich, D. (2006). *A postmodern analysis of contemporary racial ideology*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, Canada.

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

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Stewart, T. L., Esses, V. M., ten Vergert, M., & Hodson, G. (2004). From intervention to outcome: Processes in the reduction of bias. In W. G. Stephan & W. P. Vogt (Eds.), *Education programs for improving intergroup relations: Theory*, *research*, *and practice* (pp. 243–265). New York: Teachers College Press.

Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P. G., & Rudman, L. (Eds.). (2005). *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Esses, V. M., & Vernon, R. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Explaining the breakdown of ethnic relations: Why neighbors kill*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

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

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

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorisation and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–26). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

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

Gimmestad, B. J., & de Chiara, E. (1983). Dramatic plays: A vehicle for prejudice reduction in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Research, 76*, 45–49.

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

Hewstone, M. (1996). Contact and categorization: Social psychological interventions to change inter-group relations. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotype and stereotyping* (pp. 323–368). New York: Guilford.

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

hooks, b., & Mesa-Bains, A. (2006). *Homegrown: Engaged cultural criticism*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

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

Levy, S. R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Lessons from social-cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 745–766.

Levy, S. R., & Killen, M. (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levy, S. R., West, T., Bigler, R., Karafantis, D., Ramirez, L., & Velilla, E. (2005). Messages about the uniqueness and similarities of people: Impact on U.S. Black and Latino youth. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 714–733.

Lopez, G. E. (2004). Interethnic contact, curriculum, and attitudes in the first year of college. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(1), 75–94.

Mabokela, R. O., & Madsen, J. A. (2005). 'Color-blind' and 'color-conscious' leadership: A case study of desegregated suburban schools in the USA. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 8*, 187–206.

McKown, C. (2004). Age and ethnic variation in children's thinking about the nature of racism. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25*, 597–617.

McKown, C., & Weinstein, R. S. (2003). The development and consequences of stereotype-consciousness in middle childhood. *Child Development, 74*, 498–515.

Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup rela-tions: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 158–174.

Nagda, B. A., Kim, C., & Truelove, Y. (2004). Learning about difference, learning with others, learning to transgress. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*, 195–214.

Nagda, B. A., & Zuñiga, X. (2003). Fostering meaningful racial engagement through intergroup dialogues. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 111–128.

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the color-blind racial attitudes scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 59–70.

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

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

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

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922–934.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). When prejudice does not pay: Effects of interracial contact on executive function. *Psychological Science, 14*, 287–290.

Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (under review). The relation between polyculturalism and intergroup attitudes among racially and ethnically diverse adults.

Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*, 29–44.

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.

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

Sleeter, C. E. (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stephan, C. W., Renfro, L., & Stephan, W. G. (2004). The evaluation of multicultural education programs: Techniques and meta-analysis. In W. G. Stephan & P. G. Vogt, (Eds.), *Education programs for improving intergroup relations: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 227–242). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown.

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

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

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

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

Verma, G. K., & Bagley, C. (1979). Measured changes in racial attitudes following the use of three different teaching methods. In G. K. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Race, education and identity* (pp. 133–143). New York: St. Martin's Press.

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

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

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 18, pp. 331–372). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Wittig, M. A., & Molina, L. E. (2000). Moderators and mediators of prejudice reduction in multicultural education. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 295–318). Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research, 19*, 277–306.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgments of groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 536–654.

Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: Harper.

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

Zirkel, S. (2008b). The influence of multicultural educational practice on student outcomes and intergroup relations. *Teachers College Record, 110*, 1147–1181.