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ABSTRACT

As diversity becomes more common in the workplace, it is critical to understand how employees can navigate their differences and foster inclusion. My two dissertation chapters experimentally investigate how employees can cultivate inclusion through the ways that they express and conceal social identity differences during interpersonal interactions. My first chapter challenges a common assumption that minorities (e.g., Blacks, Latinos) expressing cultural-identity differences is problematic in the workplace. I demonstrate that while minorities fear cultural-identity expression in the abstract, imagining concrete instances of cultural-identity expression alleviates these fears and even leads them to expect positive outcomes from such expression. Although past research suggests that majorities (e.g., Whites) also fear cultural-identity expression by minorities, I demonstrate that when a minority expresses his or her cultural identity in a rich and meaningful way, majorities behave more inclusively toward the minority. My second chapter highlights people’s tendency to cultivate social harmony and inclusion in a previously unstudied way: by concealing relatively high status identities. I demonstrate that individuals are likely to conceal an identity – such as being college-educated – when the identity conveys higher status compared to a peer, as concealing protects the self and the peer from a multitude of interpersonal threats. I find evidence that high status identity concealment can persist in highly competitive work settings, suggesting that people from relatively privileged groups see value in cultivating workplace inclusion.
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INTRODUCTION

Scholarly research has the potential to counteract inequality by revealing how organizations can reap the benefits and minimize the costs of diversity. Increasing diversity opens the door for underrepresented groups to share new perspectives, creating opportunities for traditionally disadvantaged groups to succeed professionally while simultaneously enabling organizations to be more productive (Creary, Caza, & Roberts, 2015; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Phillips, Northcraft, & Neale, 2006). However, diversity is also perceived as risky because organizational benefits are not always realized, and in some cases diversity can introduce costly interpersonal tensions (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). So long as increasing diversity is perceived as a risk to organizational leaders and power-holders, diversity initiatives will be limited in their success and societal inequality will persist. Understanding the factors that make diversity successful is therefore a critical component to creating social change.

Inclusion is increasingly seen as a key to seizing the benefits of diversity (Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011). Inclusion occurs when employees can embrace their differences while still gaining equal access to resources, professional opportunities, and relational ties (Nishii, 2013). While organizations can invite underrepresented individuals into their doors, such entrée does not guarantee that these individuals will be included in a way that enables them to contribute meaningfully to organizational success. Even among organizations that achieve high diversity, how employees from different backgrounds are viewed and incorporated into their workgroups can play an important role in determining whether such diversity is a source of productivity versus conflict (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Nishii, 2013). Climates that encourage respect and inclusion can be critical for retaining diverse talent, and providing employees with the psychological resources needed to excel in their jobs (Hewlin, 2009; Nishii, 2013; Ramarajan,
Barsade, & Burack, 2008). Given the importance of inclusion, an important question still remains: how can organizations create inclusion in the first place?

This dissertation advances the diversity literature by illuminating pathways to achieving inclusion, highlighting micro-level processes within the context of employee interactions. Recent work has acknowledged that macro-level factors – such as organizational policies – are not the sole determinants of workplace inclusion (Nishii, 2013); micro-level processes – such as interpersonal interactions – also play a critical role in fostering inclusion. Employees may be unaware of their company’s formal diversity policies, but they are likely acutely aware of and heavily influenced by how their colleagues from different backgrounds treat them on a daily basis. Everyday employee behaviors are thus critical ingredients for shaping workplace inclusion.

Across two dissertation papers, I examine how individuals foster inclusion through the ways that they express and conceal social identity differences, such as differences in culture or social class. Understanding how people manage social identity differences is important because it is these very differences that are a common source of concern associated with diversity. Will increasing diversity introduce differences that divide us? Will differences impede our ability to work together effectively? Past research in diversity has treated differences as objective truths – a person is either different on a particular dimension or she is not, and the number of differences in a group can be tallied up and quantified (Blau, 1977; Teachman, 1980). Ironically, by treating the absence or presence of difference as quantifiable zeros and ones, all differences are treated as though they are the same. But individuals have control over how they present, downplay, or even conceal their differences (Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005; Creary et al., 2015; Goffman, 1963; Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013; Roberts, 2005; Thomas, 1993;
Yoshino, 2006), influencing others’ perceptions of whether a difference is present or absent, understandable or enigmatic, connecting or dividing. Scholars have theorized that how an individual manages her differences has interpersonal consequences, including how coworkers evaluate or socially integrate her (Clair et al., 2005; Creed & Scully, 2000; Dumas, Rothbard, & Phillips, 2008; Goffman, 1963; Phillips et al., 2009; Roberts, 2005; Yoshino, 2006). This past work has played an important role in highlighting the fact that identity management matters for individuals and organizations, and is therefore worth studying. Yet, as I show in my dissertation, the nuances of how individuals choose to manage their identities, and what the consequences are for inclusion, are underdeveloped and at times misguided.

In my first dissertation paper, I propose three ways that individuals can enact inclusive behaviors: valuing and incorporating a coworker’s professional input, engaging with a coworker socially, and showing an interest in a coworker’s unique background. I then examine the ways that members of cultural (meaning racial, ethnic, and national) minority groups express their cultural backgrounds, and the influence that such expression has on their majority-group coworkers’ inclusive behavior toward them. This paper debunks a common assumption that highlighting differences is likely to undermine inclusion (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006), instead demonstrating that minorities can express their cultural backgrounds in ways that enable their majority-group colleagues to feel closer to and less anxious around them. As a result of this increased social connection, majority-group employees are more likely to socially include and professionally promote the minority coworker who opened up to them. This paper presents a collectively beneficial approach to achieving inclusion, empowering minorities to embrace their authentic selves while achieving greater social and professional integration, enabling majority-group employees to feel more connected to their minority coworkers, and
allowing organizations to benefit from their employees interacting and working together more effectively.

My second dissertation paper highlights individuals’ tendency to foster inclusion in a previously unstudied way – by concealing relatively high status identities from their peers. This paper reveals that when an individual possesses a relatively high status identity compared to a peer – such as being college-educated when the peer is not – he is likely to conceal his identity in order to protect himself and his peer from interpersonal threats. This pattern persists in competitive work settings, indicating that even when a desire for success is salient, people from relatively high status groups see the value in preserving relationships and inclusion rather than simply prioritizing advancement. This revelation is critical because past research has suggested that individuals who belong to more advantaged groups within an organization often resist diversity initiatives (Dahling, Wiley, Fishman, & Loihle, 2016; Hideg & Ferris, 2014; Shteynberg, Leslie, Knight, & Mayer, 2011), undermining the potential for such initiatives to succeed. Conversely, engaging these members – who are often in the majority and have greater influence – in organizational inclusion efforts can be critical to the success of such initiatives (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). My research demonstrates a way to highlight the personal relevance of inclusion for members of traditionally high status groups by acknowledging ways that they too may have concerns with inclusion, and highlighting that they too feel more at ease when social harmony is achieved with others. In doing so, this work highlights a potential way to fight inequality by attracting allies in the cultivation of inclusion.

How to effectively navigate differences and create inclusion in diverse environments is not always intuitive, but understanding these processes on a micro level is increasingly vital for success in diverse workplaces. This knowledge is particularly pertinent in the current era – in the
wake of the 2016 United States election – when questions about inclusion percolate through our national and international dialogue. How do we encourage inclusion within the borders of countries and the walls of organizations? How do employees grapple with nation-wide conversations about difference that increasingly permeate the workplace, potentially exposing rifts along just about every social identity difference imaginable – race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, social class, religion, disability, political party, and more? In this era, questions about how people manage social identity differences and achieve inclusion are paramount. It is too easy to conclude that differences are dangerous, that inclusion is unattainable, that diversity is costly, and that the status quo is comfortable even if it perpetuates inequality. Through my dissertation research, and in future work, I hope to advance scholarly knowledge of how people can navigate their differences in ways that foster inclusion, encouraging both organizations and individuals to stand up to inequality – not only because it is right but because doing so enables us to thrive collectively.
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CHAPTER 1.

Making Diversity Win:
Cultivating Inclusion through Expressing Cultural Identity Differences at Work

Rachel D. Arnett

Abstract
The present research investigates how employees can cultivate a climate of inclusion from the bottom up within culturally diverse organizations. Specifically, six experiments examine how minority-group employees (“minorities”) express personally meaningful aspects of their cultural identities to majority-group employees (“majorities”), how minorities expect majorities to respond to such expressions (Studies 1a-1b), and how such cultural-identity expressions ultimately influence majorities’ inclusive behaviors toward minorities in terms of valuing minorities’ professional input, accepting minorities socially, and appreciating multiculturalism (Studies 2-5). Although past research suggests that both minorities and majorities fear that expressing cultural differences will have negative consequences for workplace inclusion, the present work found the opposite. Although minorities feared cultural-identity expression when considered in the abstract (Study 1b), minorities who concretely considered a specific majority-group colleague’s response to cultural-identity expression anticipated neutral or even positive reactions (Study 1a). The remaining studies reveal that minorities’ latter instinct is correct: majorities behaved more inclusively toward minorities who expressed their cultural identities, compared to minorities who discussed topics such as work (Studies 2-5). Moreover, the richer
the cultural-identity expression – i.e., the more insight it provided into a minority’s thoughts, feelings, and less-known experiences relating to her culture – the more likely it was to elicit inclusive behaviors from majorities. Compared to rich non-cultural personal expression, which has proven beneficial in past work on intergroup interactions, rich cultural expression was at least as beneficial in terms of encouraging inclusive behaviors (Studies 2-4). Rich cultural-identity expression was even effective when it involved voicing culturally-based frustrations (Study 5). The mechanisms underlying the power of rich cultural-identity expression are status perceptions, closeness, and anxiety. This research sheds light on the importance of inclusive behaviors in diverse work settings, and the capacity for minority employees to encourage inclusive behaviors through outwardly expressing their true selves.
Introduction

With increasing cultural heterogeneity in the workplace, it is important to understand the factors that make diversity a more productive and positive experience for employees. Scholars have highlighted the importance of having a climate of inclusion – in which employees from different backgrounds can express their differences and still gain equal access to resources, professional opportunities, and relational ties – for catalyzing greater workgroup productivity, social integration, emotional resilience, and employee retention in diverse workplaces (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hewlin, 2009; Nishii, 2013; Ramarajan, Barsade, & Burack, 2008; Shore et al., 2011). However, this past research has tended to focus on the consequences of having a climate of inclusion rather than how an inclusive climate is created in the first place. To the extent that scholars have investigated the antecedents of inclusive climates and related constructs like diversity climates, they have tended to focus on the effects of top-down factors such as managerial decisions, organizational policies, and company-wide programs (Bilimoria, Joy, & Liang, 2008; Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000; Kossek, Zonia, Journal, Jan, & Kossek, 1993; McKay et al., 2007; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Nishii, 2013; Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999; Roberson, 2006). While scholars have recently noted that employees’ interpersonal behaviors may also contribute to a climate of inclusion (Nishii, 2013), the nature of these behaviors, as well as their antecedents, remains unclear.

The present paper proposes a framework of inclusive behaviors, and examines the bottom-up factors that promote such behaviors during everyday workplace interactions. Inclusive behaviors are employee actions that demonstrate that a coworker is socially accepted and professionally valued for his or her unique self. Behaviors of this nature enacted by members of cultural majority groups, or “majorities” (e.g., White Americans in an American context) play an
important role in shaping the climate of inclusion for members of cultural minority groups, or “minorities” (e.g., racial minorities or non-Americans in an American context). Yet, when it comes to understanding the factors that encourage or discourage majorities’ inclusive behaviors toward minorities, false assumptions can arise.

One common assumption is that majorities will exclude, ignore, or professionally devalue minorities who bring attention to cultural identity differences (Dumas, Rothbard, & Phillips, 2008; Hewlett, Luce, & West, 2005; Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009), that is, minorities who engage in a behavior that I refer to as “cultural-identity expression.” Past work suggests that the mere thought or anticipation of a minority group member engaging in such cultural conversations elicits apprehension on the part of both minorities and majorities. Minorities fear that cultural-identity expression will provoke majorities to behave less inclusively toward them, discounting their professional value (e.g., by failing to solicit their perspectives), marginalizing them socially (e.g., by disengaging from social conversations), or undermining their ability to act authentically (e.g., by avoiding cultural topics) during everyday workplace interactions (Barron, Hebl, & King, 2011; Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005; Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Hewlett et al., 2005; Phillips et al., 2009).

Past work provides some evidence suggesting that minority cultural-identity expression may indeed prompt negative reactions from majority-group perceivers. When anticipating situations in which minorities might highlight some aspect of their cultural identity, majorities often feel threatened and excluded (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011), which prompts them to behave less inclusively in some of the exact ways that minorities fear—that is, by showing less interest in hearing diverse perspectives (Plaut et al., 2011), socially distancing themselves from their culturally dissimilar peers (Goff et al., 2008),
and avoiding cross-cultural interactions in which a minority may discuss cultural topics (Johnson, Olson, & Fazio, 2009). When majorities have a first-hand experience (rather than an anticipated experience) that involves a minority making his or her cultural identity salient, research suggests that majorities evaluate the minority negatively (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Johnson, 1999; Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Opie & Phillips, 2015), or behave more inclusively only to the extent that they are externally motivated by concerns with appearing prejudiced or discriminatory (Barron et al., 2011).

However, each of these past studies is limited in one of two ways: it either focuses on anticipated expression of a cultural identity (creating uncertainty about how an identity will actually be expressed) or focuses on highlighting a cultural identity in a surface-level way (e.g., through broadly-observable, appearance-related displays of a cultural identity). Past work has not examined the more nuanced ways that a minority may express his or her cultural background during interactions with majority-group colleagues, and whether certain ways of expressing a cultural identity may cause majorities to behave more inclusively toward minorities even in the absence of external pressures to appear egalitarian.

The present studies build on past work by investigating how minority cultural-identity expression influences three types of majority-group inclusive behaviors: professionally inclusive behaviors (i.e., valuing a minority’s professional input), socially inclusive behaviors (i.e., socially engaging with a minority), and multicultural appreciation behaviors (i.e., showing interest in a minority colleague’s cultural identity). Furthermore, I introduce a potential moderator of this relationship: richness. I define richness as the extent to which an individual shares inner thoughts, intimate feelings, and less-known experiences pertaining to a particular aspect of the self – such as a cultural identity. I predict that cultural-identity expression that is
high in richness, but not cultural-identity expression that is low in richness, will positively affect each of the three types of majority inclusive behaviors. I also predict that these effects will be driven by internal motivations stemming from a majority-group employee’s increased perceptions of a minority coworker’s status, increased sense of closeness to the minority, and decreased anxiety in the presence of the minority. To isolate the unique impact of rich cultural-identity expression, the current studies compare the effects of this particular form of self-expression to other forms of expression, such as richly expressing a non-cultural personal identity.

To the extent that minority cultural-identity expression (rich or otherwise) positively affects majorities’ inclusive behaviors, the current research takes a meaningful step forward in the search for ways of harnessing the benefits and mitigating the potential pitfalls of cultural diversity in organizations. In essence, rich cultural-identity expression offers the possibility of a collectively beneficial “win-win” for all relevant parties: minorities can feel empowered to vocalize their unique differences, majorities can feel less anxious and closer to their minority coworkers as a result of such expressions, and together—from the bottom up—they can cultivate a climate of inclusion that increases their commitment to and productivity within their organization. By illuminating three major types of inclusive behavior and identifying how minorities expressing their cultural backgrounds can encourage such behaviors in their majority-group coworkers, this paper makes significant contributions to research on diversity and inclusion, intergroup relations, and identity management at work.

**Inclusive Behaviors**

Inclusive behaviors are actions that demonstrate that an individual is socially accepted and professionally valued for his or her unique self. This overarching definition encompasses
three types of inclusive behaviors proposed in the present research: 1) professionally inclusive behaviors, 2) socially inclusive behaviors, and 3) multicultural appreciation behaviors. This typology builds on past literature that has typically focused on constructs of feelings of inclusion and climates of inclusion and, in doing so, converges on the notion that employees care about being professionally valued, socially accepted, and appreciated for their unique cultural backgrounds (Ferdman, Avigdor, Braun, Konkin, & Kuzmycz, 2010; Nishii, 2013; Roberson, 2006; Shore et al., 2011). For example, past research has proposed that an individual’s feelings of inclusion are shaped by two dimensions (belonging and uniqueness, which relate to socially inclusive behavior and multicultural appreciation behavior in the present work, respectively; Shore et al., 2011) and that an organization’s overall climate of inclusion is shaped by two interpersonal factors (employees’ involvement in decision making and integration of differences, which relate to professionally inclusive behavior and multicultural appreciation behavior in the present work, respectively; Nishii, 2013). Thus, past work focuses on, at most, two interpersonal elements relating to inclusion, although such work often alludes to whichever third element of inclusion has been omitted. The present research is the first to bring all three types of inclusion to the forefront in one framework. Moreover, rather than measuring feelings and perceived climates of inclusion, the current work directly examines inclusive behaviors enacted by employees, which are often the building blocks that shape others’ feelings and perceptions of inclusion.

In everyday interactions, employees have ample opportunity to enact or withhold each of the three types of inclusive behavior. Regarding professionally inclusive behaviors, employees may choose whether or not to seek out, incorporate, or otherwise value another employee’s professional contributions, opinions, and decisions (Ferdman et al., 2010; Lirio, Lee, Williams,
Haugen, & Kossek, 2008; Nishii, 2013; Roberson, 2006). For example, an employee can omit her coworker’s name when making decisions about whom to promote or whom to invite to a client meeting (professional exclusion), or she can include his name when recommending employees for such work-related opportunities (professional inclusion). Employees may also vary in their enactment of socially inclusive behaviors, which are behaviors that demonstrate social engagement with and acceptance of another employee (Shore et al., 2011). For example, when running into a coworker in the hallway, an employee can give his coworker a dismissive glance (social exclusion), or he can stop to ask how her day is going and invite her to lunch (social inclusion). Finally, employees may engage in multicultural appreciation behaviors, which involve showing sincere interest in and openness to other employees’ cultural backgrounds (Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011). After an employee shares that he is looking forward to celebrating a cultural holiday over the weekend, a coworker may quickly change the subject and choose not to ask about his weekend the following Monday morning (conveying lack of multicultural appreciation), or she may show sincere interest in the topic and follow up the next week to ask how he enjoyed the festivities (conveying multicultural appreciation). More broadly, an employee can convey multicultural appreciation by choosing to support organizational ideologies and initiatives that encourage employees to celebrate their cultural differences (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008).

In order to foster a true sense of inclusion, research suggests that all three types of inclusive behavior must be present. For example, if a person is socially accepted and professionally valued, but only because he is assuming a false identity or hiding a major aspect of himself, then he has not been fully included (Hewlin, 2003; Shore et al., 2011). Similarly, if an employee is accepted and well-liked for her true self, but she is not taken seriously or valued
for her professional contributions, then she is not truly included in the work environment (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004).

Inclusive behaviors have valuable benefits for individuals, groups, and organizations. Professionally including employees, particularly those from underrepresented groups, enables other employees to learn from diverse perspectives and gain valuable resources that can increase workgroup functioning (Creary, Caza, & Roberts, 2015; Ely & Thomas, 2001). Social inclusion is a fundamental human need that, when present, provides employees with essential cognitive resources for performing well in their jobs (Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005; Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Appreciation of a colleague’s identities can help her feel valued and psychologically engaged, rather than marginalized and psychologically exhausted (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hewlin, 2009; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009), which in turn increases productivity, retention, and profitability (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Hewlin, 2009; Nishii, 2013). In sum, the three types of inclusive behavior (professional, social, and multicultural appreciation) improve employees’ experiences at work and enable them to contribute significant value to their organizations.

Given the importance of inclusion for organizations and employees alike, investigating the factors that encourage such behaviors is a worthwhile endeavor. With that premise in mind, the studies in this paper examine the impact of minority cultural-identity expression on majorities’ inclusive behaviors.

**Cultural-Identity Expression**

Cultural-identity expression is the act of voluntarily bringing one’s cultural (i.e., racial, ethnic, or national) identity to others’ attention during an interpersonal interaction. For example, while having lunch with a colleague, an African-American may choose to share that he sings in a
gospel choir, highlighting his involvement in Black cultural activities. Notably, I define cultural-identity expression is defined as a “voluntary” action that takes place “during an interpersonal interaction,” which is in contrast to information that is broadly and involuntarily observable, such as the color of one’s skin or an accent.

Past research suggests that minorities have a preference for and benefit from expressing their cultural backgrounds at work (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Dumas et al., 2008; Hewlin, 2009; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008) but have apprehensions about whether such expressions will adversely influence majority coworkers’ inclusive behaviors toward them (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Phillips et al., 2009; Yoshino, 2006). This assumed negative impact of cultural-identity expression on majority-group coworkers’ inclusive behaviors is often theorized as a mechanism underlying minorities’ tendency to “cover” or downplay their authentic selves at work (Goffman, 1963; Hewlett et al., 2005; Yoshino, 2006), oftentimes to the detriment of themselves and their organizations (Creary et al., 2015; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hewlin, 2009; Ramarajan & Reid, 2013).

Yet, the literature on identity management may have overlooked an important moderator of the assumed relationship between cultural identity-expression and inclusive behavior: the richness of expression. Richness is defined as the extent to which an individual shares inner thoughts, intimate feelings, and less-known experiences pertaining to a particular aspect of the self. Past research has largely focused on the benefits of personal expression that is high in richness, such as sharing inner thoughts, intimate feelings, and less-known experiences that are personal in nature but unrelated to one’s cultural background. For example, Ensari & Miller (2002) found that secular individuals showed less prejudice toward a Muslim interaction partner after the Muslim individual expressed emotions relating to her personal life, such as discussing
the happiness that she experienced after her father became engaged several years after the death of her mother (Ensari & Miller, 2002). This information was rich because it involved sharing intimate feelings and less-known experiences relating to the Muslim individual’s personal life, but was not explicitly linked to her cultural background in any way.

While this past work suggests that rich expression can be beneficial in intergroup interactions, an open question remains as to whether rich expression is beneficial when it involves explicitly highlighting a cultural identity difference. For example, would the Muslim woman’s expression be as powerful if she highlighted the significance of her father’s engagement as it relates to her background as a Muslim or other parts of her cultural identity? Alternatively, would she undermine the benefits of opening up in a rich and meaningful way if she highlights aspects of her background that differentiate her from her secular interaction partner? Given that scholars in this realm have typically focused on solutions that they anticipate will decrease intergroup prejudice, the omission of solutions that involve highlighting cultural difference suggests that such forms of expression defy scholars’ expectations regarding how to improve intergroup relations. Moreover, an additional complication in the present work is that interventions that reduce prejudice – the focus of past work – may not necessarily increase inclusive behaviors. For example, past research has shown that a focal individual communicating novel information to an outgroup member – such as how the outgroup member has behaved in a biased manner – can be successful in reducing the outgroup members’ prejudice toward the focal individual’s ingroup as a whole, but may have the unfortunate side effect of triggering negative reactions toward the focal individual (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). Thus, despite promising evidence from past literature on non-cultural sharing and prejudice, one cannot assume that rich
expression by a minority will be effective when highlighting cultural differences nor when investigating majority-group members’ inclusive behavior as an outcome.

The present paper investigates the consequences of minorities engaging in rich expression that highlights their racial, ethnic, or national identity (“rich cultural-identity expression”). Rich cultural-identity expression provides insight into less-known experiences and psychological information that stem from one’s cultural background, such as the personal significance of certain foods, one’s thoughts about wearing certain clothing or hairstyles, or emotional experiences associated with certain activities. For example, when discussing her participation in a cultural event over the weekend, an employee may describe why she associates that event with a sense of happiness, nostalgia, or pride. In contrast, cultural-identity expression that is low in richness (i.e., “less-rich cultural-identity expression”) operates on a more superficial level, focusing on well-known or surface-level cultural information, such as simply stating the foods one eats, the hairstyles one wears, or the activities in which one participates. For example, an employee may mention a cultural event but only state where the event was held and with whom she went. Thus, richer cultural-identity expressions provide more meaningful and in-depth details about an individual’s cultural background and, in doing so, may have consequences for others’ inclusive behaviors.

**Influence of Cultural-Identity Expression on Inclusive Behaviors**

This section outlines how minority cultural-identity expression influences majority-group employees’ inclusive behaviors (professional, social, and multicultural appreciation), and delineates the important moderating role of richness of cultural-identity expression. I identify three mechanisms – status perceptions, closeness, and anxiety – that may play a role in how cultural-identity expression influences inclusive behaviors. For each mechanism, I outline past
research that suggests that cultural-identity expression may decrease majority coworkers’ inclusive behaviors through the focal mechanism, and propose how rich cultural-identity expression has the potential to increase inclusive behaviors by influencing the same mechanism. I also consider how the effects of rich cultural-identity expression may differ depending on the valence of the rich expression (focusing on the consequences of voicing culturally-based frustrations, which are negative in valence). The influence of each form of cultural-identity expression is considered in relation to a baseline of simply discussing work. Figure 1 provides a model summarizing the mechanisms through which cultural-identity expression is expected to influence inclusive behaviors, as well as key moderators.
Figure 1. The influence of cultural-identity expression on inclusive behaviors.

**Status Perceptions as a Mechanism**

Past research provides evidence that cultural-identity expression can decrease a majority’s status perceptions of a minority, meaning the extent to which a majority perceives a minority as admirable and deserving of respect (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015; Blader & Chen, 2014). Members of minority cultural groups are typically conferred lower status (Berger,
Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), in part because such groups are associated with commonly-held negative stereotypes – such as low competence – that are used to justify a relatively less advantaged position in society (Berger et al., 1972; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). By making these group-based stereotypes more salient, cultural-identity expression can cause majorities to perceive a minority as having a lower level of status (Phillips et al., 2009). This effect may be particularly pronounced when cultural-identity expression is low in richness because such superficial expressions focus on well-known information about a minority cultural group and may activate a cognitive schema of default associations and negative stereotypes about that minority group (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002).

Making a cultural identity salient need not, however, always lead to negative downstream consequences such as lower status perceptions (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004), and rich cultural-identity expression may be particularly effective at disrupting this relationship. By giving majorities access to deeper, more personal information about one’s cultural background, rich cultural-identity expression has the potential to provide novel information that disrupts common assumptions about the relative status of cultural minorities (Clair et al., 2005; Phillips et al., 2009; Roberts, 2005; Shih et al., 2013). Moreover, even if a majority member continues to hold beliefs about status differences between groups, the personalized, individuating information shared through rich cultural-identity expression may make the majority member less likely to view the minority through this group-based lens (Miller, 2002). Additionally, majorities may recognize that a minority is taking a personal risk by sharing more intimate aspects of his cultural background (Miller, 2002), suggesting a level of interpersonal boldness and self-confidence that garners respect in the eyes of majority-group employees (Anderson, Brion, Moore, & Kennedy, 2012).
To the extent that rich cultural-identity expression triggers a thought process that leads majorities to view minorities as higher status, majorities are more likely to value minorities’ professional contributions and engage in professionally inclusive behaviors toward them (Berger et al., 1972). In addition, people value relationships with those who have greater social standing (Anderson, Kraus, Galinsky, & Keltner, 2012; Leary, Jongman-Sereno, & Diebels, 2014), making it likely that increased status perceptions will lead majority-group members to socially include minorities and show appreciation of a minority’s cultural background during such interactions.

**Closeness as a Mechanism**

Cultural-identity expression is often assumed to undermine a sense of closeness – a subjective feeling of interconnectedness between the self and another person (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991) – and instead create social distance due to a focus on differences (Dumas et al., 2008). This argument has roots in past research demonstrating that similarity increases social attraction (Byrne, 1971), leading to the assumption that highlighting a dissimilarity will decrease feelings of attraction and interpersonal closeness (Dumas et al., 2008). Yet, highlighting similarities may be just one of many paths to fostering closeness.

Another promising route to increasing closeness is opening up and sharing meaningful, intimate information about the self. Recipients of intimate non-cultural sharing feel closer to the person who opened up in this manner (Collins & Miller, 1994) and, in intergroup interactions, become less prejudiced toward the person’s broader group (Ensari & Miller, 2002; Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007). While this past work provides a foundation to expect that intimate, non-cultural self-sharing will increase closeness, there remains an open question as to whether meaningful sharing about one’s cultural differences will accrue similar benefits or will ultimately detract from a sense of closeness due to perceived dissimilarity.
I propose that rich cultural-identity expression may be a particularly potent way of sharing intimate and meaningful aspects of one’s self, leading to a net positive effect on closeness despite highlighting a source of difference. For sharing to be considered personal and intimate, it must include sharing information that is not typically disclosed to others (Miller, 2002; Reis & Shaver, 1988). Discussions of cultural difference are often considered taboo in the workplace and are avoided in intergroup interactions (Phillips et al., 2009). For this very reason, however, choosing to discuss one’s cultural background may be perceived as a particularly intimate gesture and is thus likely to be a strong signal of closeness.

To the extent that rich cultural-identity expression causes majorities to feel closer and more socially attracted to minorities, majorities are likely to behave more inclusively toward minorities. Social attraction and interest have been shown to increase professionally inclusive behaviors toward less advantaged groups when it comes to hiring and promotion decisions (Rudman, 1998), interest in socially connecting with members of cultural outgroups (Brannon & Walton, 2013; Shelton & Richeson, 2005), and appreciation for an outgroup member’s cultural background (Brannon & Walton, 2013).

**Anxiety as a Mechanism**

Intergroup anxiety – negative arousal and distress experienced when interacting with a person of a different group (Stephan & Stephan, 1985) – is also pertinent to understanding the relationship between cultural-identity expression and inclusive behavior. Past research has shown that individuals would like to have more interaction with people who differ from them culturally (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). Despite these sentiments, a history of intergroup tensions between majority and minority cultural groups often leads members of both groups to experience anxiety stemming from the possibility of rejection during intergroup interactions (Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Plant, 2004; Plant & Devine, 2003; Shelton
& Richeson, 2005). When these intergroup interactions involve discussing race, majorities tend to be particularly anxious relative to their minority counterparts (Trawalter & Richeson, 2008).

However, a majority-group coworker is likely to interpret a minority’s sharing of meaningful and intimate information as a signal that the minority likes and trusts him (Miller, 2002), directly counteracting concerns with rejection and attenuating feelings of anxiety (Turner & Feddes, 2011). While such anxiety-reducing effects have not been specifically examined in the context of meaningful sharing regarding cultural differences, rich cultural-identity expression is likely to have at least as strong of an effect due to its ability to uniquely address an anxiety-producing question otherwise present in an intergroup interaction: what is the significance of cultural differences for our relationship? By bringing a cultural identity to the forefront in the context of meaningful and intimate sharing, minorities help reassure majorities that culture will not be a source of division and may even be a fruitful basis for connection.

Majorities are likely to behave more inclusively toward minorities to the extent that they feel less anxious around them. The less anxious a majority-group member feels in the presence of a minority, the more likely he or she is to behave in a socially inclusive manner by, for example, choosing to interact with or sit close to the minority (Goff et al., 2008; Plant, 2004). Because professionally including a person often involves socially interacting with that person—such as when a person decides to include a colleague in a work project – decreased anxiety may also make majority-group members more inclined to professionally include minorities. Finally, past work provides suggestive evidence that decreased anxiety due to rich cultural-identity expression may increase multicultural appreciation behaviors. Although majority-group members often avoid broaching cultural topics with minorities, majorities become less anxious and more willing to engage in culturally-based conversations when a minority signals that he is
comfortable with such conversations by, for example, initiating or leading the conversation (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Johnson et al., 2009). A minority expressing aspects of his cultural identity may be another means of alleviating majorities’ anxieties about discussing culture, causing majorities to be more interested in and engaged during discussions about a minority’s background.

**Valence of Cultural-Identity Expression**

While past research provides evidence suggesting that rich cultural-identity expression may elicit inclusive behaviors from majority-group coworkers, one potential boundary condition of this effect is the valence of the information expressed. As stated previously, rich cultural-identity expression involves sharing culturally-relevant thoughts, feelings, and experiences. However, because minorities are often less advantaged than their majority-group peers and may face unique challenges, such rich expressions may include negatively-valenced thoughts or emotions associated with their experience and treatment as members of disadvantaged groups. I refer to these negatively-valenced expressions as culturally-based frustrations. For example, a Black woman may voice her frustration with how Black women are portrayed in limited ways in the media, and how these depictions cause people to make certain assumptions about her in her daily life. Alternatively, a Colombian man may express his exasperation with people assuming that he participates in the Mexican celebration of Cinco de Mayo, elaborating on the many ways that Mexican and Colombian cultures differ.

Given that minorities’ thoughts and feelings are likely to include frustrations associated with their less advantaged group membership, it is important to test whether voicing such frustrations will undermine, or perhaps enhance, the benefits of rich cultural-identity expression. On the one hand, expressing frustrations associated with a minority-group identity may highlight and normalize the perception that the minority’s group is lower status in society (Duguid &
Thomas-Hunt, 2015), activate an us-versus-them intergroup psychology that encourages majorities to see themselves as higher status than and socially distant from minorities (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and trigger anxiety associated with being seen as prejudiced (Goff et al., 2008). On the other hand, expressing frustrations may be viewed as a sign of dominance and assertiveness that increases the perceived status of the minority (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Tiedens, 2001), a sign of closeness given the particularly intimate nature of such content (Miller, 2002), and an anxiety-reducing signal that the minority views the majority as an open-minded ally worth confiding in rather than a biased outgroup member (Miller, 2002). Depending on which of these response patterns unfolds, rich cultural-identity expression that involves voicing frustrations may either decrease or increase majorities’ inclusive behaviors. I do not make a priori predictions about the effects of voicing cultural frustrations, but rather test majority-group members’ behavioral reactions in order to adjudicate between these two possible reactions.

Summary of Predictions

In summary, rich cultural-identity expression – relative to a baseline of having work discussions – is expected to increase majorities’ status perceptions of minorities, make majorities feel closer to minorities, and decrease majorities’ sense of anxiety when interacting with minority colleagues. As a result of these mechanisms, rich cultural-identity expression is expected to increase majorities’ professionally inclusive behaviors, socially inclusive behaviors, and multicultural appreciation behaviors. Rich cultural-identity expression that is negative in valence, such as expression that highlights culturally-based frustrations, may have similarly positive effects or may introduce new barriers that undermine the benefits of rich expression. Unlike rich cultural-identity expression, less-rich forms of cultural-identity expression are expected to lack the intimacy and depth needed to disrupt stereotypes and convey higher status,
induce closeness, and mitigate anxiety, and therefore are not predicted to positively influence majorities’ inclusive behaviors. Figure 1 provides a summary of these relationships.

Overview of Studies

The effects of cultural-identity expression on inclusive behavior were tested in six studies – two from the perspective of minorities and four from the perspective of majorities. Studies 1a and 1b tested a common assumption that minorities expect to encounter fewer inclusive behaviors from their majority-group colleagues after expressing a cultural identity, and therefore avoid cultural-identity expression (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006). Studies 2-5 examined the actual consequences of cultural-identity expression by testing whether majorities’ inclusive behaviors were influenced by a minority coworker engaging in cultural-identity expression, relative to a control condition of simply focusing on work or small talk. Specifically, I tested whether – relative to discussing work – rich cultural-identity expression by a minority would positively influence majorities’ professionally inclusive behaviors, socially inclusive behaviors, and multicultural appreciation behaviors. For each dependent variable, I tested the mediating role of increased status perceptions, increased closeness, and decreased anxiety. In Study 5, I also explored the boundary conditions of rich cultural-identity expression by testing whether such expression can increase inclusive behavior if it involves voicing culturally-based frustrations.

In addition to examining rich cultural-identity expression, Study 1a and Studies 3-5 also test the effect of less-rich cultural-identity expression (relative to a baseline of discussing work) on inclusive behaviors. Notably, however, while “less-rich” cultural-identity expressions in the present paper are indeed less rich than “rich” cultural-identity expression, they still provide a modest amount of information about a minority’s culturally-relevant experiences. Thus, the
examination of these less-rich cultural-identity expressions shed light on the lower limits of richness, providing a sense of how much richness of cultural-identity expression is needed to increase inclusive behavior relative to a baseline of simply discussing work.

To examine whether any effects of cultural-identity expression were specific to discussing cultural background, or if they may be driven by general benefits associated with opening up to one’s coworkers, I also examined whether majorities’ inclusive behaviors were influenced by a minority engaging in rich personal expression, meaning expression that is personal in nature but does not highlight a cultural identity. There are a variety of non-cultural approaches to opening up to one’s colleagues and thus I operationalize rich personal expression in different ways across studies, such as expressing emotions (Studies 2 and 3) or expressing personal identities (Study 4). Similar to rich cultural-identity expression, rich personal expression has the potential to increase status perceptions (by disrupting stereotypes, individuating the minority, demonstrating self-confidence), increase closeness (as shown in past work on intimate non-cultural sharing; Collins & Miller, 1994), and decrease anxiety (through conveying liking and trust), and is thus predicted to increase professionally and socially inclusive behaviors. However, in contrast to rich cultural-identity expression, rich personal expression may reinforce majorities’ perspective that they can connect to minorities without discussing cultural differences (Plaut et al., 2011; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007), and thus is not expected to increase majorities’ multicultural appreciation behaviors.
Study 1a

Minorities’ Concrete Expectations Regarding Cultural-Identity Expression

Prior to investigating the primary research question in the present work – how majority-group employees respond to cultural-identity expression by minority-group coworkers – Study 1a sought to test a common assumption in the literature that minorities expect to be less included by their majority-group coworkers when they express their cultural identities and therefore choose to downplay these identities (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006).

To investigate this assumption, Study 1a tested whether minority employees were less willing to express a cultural identity, compared to discussing work, and whether such identity expression decisions were mediated by minorities’ expectations that cultural-identity expression causes majority-group colleagues to behave less inclusively toward them. Given the interest in this paper in differentiating between the effects of rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression, I examined minorities’ expectations regarding both forms of cultural expression relative to work discussions; however, I did not make a priori predictions about whether minorities would distinguish between these two forms of cultural expression. Figure 2 summarizes predictions regarding minorities’ expectations of and reactions to cultural-identity expression.

I also examined minorities’ expectations regarding rich personal-identity expression (relative to discussing work) in order to examine whether minorities’ expectations regarding cultural-identity expression (particularly when rich in content) could be attributed to concerns about discussing personal life in general, or were specific to the idea of divulging details regarding their cultural backgrounds. Thus, overall, Study 1a followed a 4-condition (rich cultural-identity expression, less-rich cultural-identity expression, rich personal-identity expression, work discussion / control) between-subjects design.
Figure 2. Studies 1a and 1b tested the common assumption that minorities who anticipate engaging in cultural-identity expression (relative to discussing work) expect majorities to behave less inclusively and, as a result, are less willing to express their cultural identities.

**Method**

**Participants.** Participants were recruited online through a panel of adults managed by ClearVoice. In order to qualify for participation, individuals were required to meet the following eligibility criteria: pass an initial attention check, select at least one non-White racial/ethnic group or select Other Race (participants were allowed to select more than one race/ethnicity),
and indicate that they work in a white-collar job. Of the 403 participants who passed this initial criteria, 4 were excluded for not indicating that they are a cultural minority (e.g., they selected “Other Race (please specify)” but wrote “choose not to answer”), 33 were excluded for not providing answers to the manipulation questions, and 52 were excluded for indicating that the coworker with whom they imagined interacting was not White or did not actually exist. This left 314 participants for data analysis (73% Women; 12% White/Caucasian, 46% Black/African-American, 26% Hispanic/Latino, 22% Asian, 5% Native American, 1% Pacific Islander, 3% Other Race).

Procedure. After completing a demographic questionnaire, participants who met our inclusion criteria were asked to recall and describe a recent experience based on one of four randomly assigned experimental conditions: work discussion / control (participants described when and where a recent work activity or experience occurred), less-rich cultural-identity expression (participants described when and where a recent cultural activity or experience occurred), rich cultural-identity expression (participants described their thoughts and feelings about a recent cultural activity or experience), or rich personal-identity expression (participants described their thoughts and feelings about a recent non-work activity or experience). See Supplemental Materials for full experimental manipulations.

---

1 White-collar workers were those who indicated that their work can be best described as “white collar (professional work, often in an office setting),” as opposed to blue collar “(manual work, often in a field or factory setting),” or “customer service (non-white-collar service work, often in a retail or restaurant setting).”
Participants were then asked to list the initials of five White coworkers. The system randomly selected one of the five coworkers\(^2\) and asked participants to imagine telling the coworker the exact experience and details that they had just described. To make this potential interaction more concrete and vivid, participants were asked to complete a free-response question and “describe in detail what you think he/she would think, feel, do, and say in response.”

The system then instructed participants to “imagine that the experience you wrote about earlier was an experience you actually shared with [coworker initials] (including the same details as what you wrote previously), and that he/she actually responded in the ways that you just described.” Participants then completed mediation measures assessing how inclusively they expected their coworker to behave toward them in the days following this interaction. Afterward, they completed dependent measures indicating their willingness to express their identity by sharing the experience with their coworker, manipulation checks, and a question confirming their coworker’s race. Participants also completed exploratory measures at different points during the study (see Supplemental Materials for a complete list of exploratory measures).

**Measures**

- **Expected inclusive behaviors by coworker.** On a scale from 1 to 9 (extremely unlikely – extremely likely), participants indicated their expectations about their coworkers’ reactions in terms of three inclusive behaviors: *professionally inclusive behaviors* (3 items: e.g., how likely the coworker would be to “actively seek your input on work-related projects,” \(\alpha = .94\)), *socially*  

\(^2\) The coworker was randomly selected to reduce the possibility that participants would simply select the coworker to whom they are closest.
inclusive behaviors (4 items: e.g., how likely the coworker would be to “make an effort to spend time with you socially,” \( \alpha = .91 \)), multicultural appreciation behaviors (2 items: e.g., how likely the coworker would be to “show interest if you share details about your cultural (i.e., racial or ethnic) background,” \( \alpha = .95 \)).

**Participant willingness to express experience to coworker.** On a scale from 1 to 5 (not at all - very much so), participants answered two questions: “If the opportunity actually arose for you to tell [coworker initials] about the experience you wrote about previously, to what extent would you be willing to do so?” and “If the opportunity actually arose for you to tell [coworker] about the experience you wrote about previously, to what extent would you avoid doing so?” (reverse coded). On a scale from 1 to 9 (very unwilling - very willing), participants also completed two behavioral items in which they indicated their willingness to let the research team send the message to their coworker, and their willingness to send the message to their coworker via their personal or work email account (see Supplemental Materials for a complete description of these two behavioral items). These four items were standardized and averaged to form a composite measure of willingness to express, \( \alpha = .78 \).³

**Manipulation checks.** Using a 1 to 5 (not at all - very much so) scale, participants completed three manipulation check measures regarding the experience they imagined sharing with their coworker: salience of their cultural identity (2 items, e.g., “To what extent did you make him/her aware of your racial background,” \( \alpha = .90 \)), richness of cultural-identity expression (3 items, e.g., “To what extent did you provide him/her with insight into personal

³ Participants also completed two additional behavioral items, but a factor analysis suggested that these two items loaded on a separate factor from the other four. These two items were therefore dropped from the composite. However, including these items in the composite did not meaningfully change the results.
thoughts and perspectives that are shaped by your racial background,” \( \alpha = .93 \) and richness of personal expression (3 items, e.g., “To what extent did you share intimate feelings and emotions,” \( \alpha = .88 \)). This latter manipulation check was included as a way of differentiating the rich cultural- and rich personal-identity expression conditions: only the former is expected to increase perceived richness of cultural-identity expression, whereas both are expected to increase perceived richness of personal expression.

**Exploratory measures.** Participants completed exploratory measures (see Supplemental Materials for a complete list), including measures assessing how they expected their coworker to think and feel in response to the information that the participant expressed. Specifically, using a scale of 1 to 5 (not at all – extremely), participants completed the following measures: expected coworker status perceptions (2 items: e.g., “In the days following the interaction, to what extent do you think that [coworker initials] would respect you”), expected coworker closeness (5 items: e.g., “In the days following the interaction, to what extent do you think that [coworker initials] would feel closer to you than he/she feels toward other coworkers,” “In the days following the interaction, how likely is [coworker initials] to feel comfortable sharing information with you about his/her intimate emotions and feelings;” this latter item and two similar items were asked on a 1 to 9 scale ranging from extremely unlikely to extremely likely), and expected coworker anxiety (3 items: e.g., “To what extent do you think he/she would have felt anxious during the interaction”). Using a similar scale of 1 to 5 scale, participants also completed a measure of expressed positivity (2 items: e.g., “How positive was the information that you shared with [coworker initials]”).

Additional exploratory measures were created by coding participants’ free-response answers. Specifically, a White research assistant – who was blind to condition – read the
experiences that participants described for the experimental manipulation and coded these responses for strength of impression (i.e., the extent to which the person would be leaving a positive versus negative impression of themselves if they shared this experience with others, coded on a scale of 1 to 7 – *very negative impression* to *very positive impression*). In addition, a Black research assistant who was blind to condition read the experiences that participants described during the experimental manipulation as well as participants’ descriptions of how their majority-group colleagues were likely to respond to hearing about the experience. These latter responses were coded for the level of expected coworker supportiveness (i.e., how supportive the participant expects the majority-group colleague to respond, coded on a scale of 1 to 9 – *very unsupportive* to *very supportive*).

**Analysis**

All analyses were conducted by submitting the four experimental conditions to a univariate ANOVA. Because the predicted mediators in this study are inclusive behaviors – a source of significant theoretical interest in the present paper – I begin the main analyses by reporting ANOVA analyses involving these variables as dependent variables.

When applicable, mediation analyses were conducted using Hayes bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Hayes, 2013a).

**Results**

**Manipulation check: Salience of cultural identity.** Perceived salience of the participant’s cultural identity differed significantly across conditions, $F(3,310) = 43.69, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .30$. As expected, compared to when they discussed work ($M = 1.60, SD = 1.01$), participants perceived their cultural identity as significantly more salient in the less-rich cultural-
identity expression condition \((M = 2.99, SD = 1.19), p < .001\), and the rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 3.19, SD = 1.27), p < .001\), but not in the rich personal-identity expression condition \((M = 1.67, SD = 1.04), p = .67\).

**Manipulation check: Richness of cultural-identity expression.** Perceived richness of cultural-identity expression differed significantly across conditions, \(F(3,310) = 33.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .24\). Compared to participants in the rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 3.14, SD = 1.04)\), participants perceived less cultural richness in the rich personal-identity expression condition \((M = 1.90, SD = 1.23), p < .001\), in the work discussion condition \((M = 1.65, SD = 1.02), p < .001\), and – to a marginally significant extent – in the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 2.81, SD = 1.06), p = .07\).

**Manipulation check: Richness of personal expression.** Perceived richness of personal expression differed significantly across conditions, \(F(3,310) = 5.11, p = .002, \eta^2 = .05\). Compared to participants in the rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 3.17, SD = 1.02)\), participants perceived less personal richness in the work discussion condition \((M = 2.51, SD = 1.19), p < .001\). However, participants perceived no difference in personal richness between the rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 3.17, SD = 1.02)\) and either the rich personal-identity expression condition \((M = 2.93, SD = 1.19), p = .20\), or the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 3.01, SD = 1.00), p = .42\). Thus, while rich cultural-identity expression conveyed the most meaningful information about participants’ cultural backgrounds, the three forms of expression (rich cultural, rich personal, less-rich cultural) conveyed similar levels of rich content regarding participants’ personal lives in general.
**Expected professionally inclusive behavior.** Expected professionally inclusive behavior trended toward differing across all four conditions but did not reach significance, $F(3,310) = 1.73, p = .16, \eta^2_p = .02$ (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3. Mean expected professionally inclusive behavior in Study 1a. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.](image)

**Expected socially inclusive behavior.** Expected socially inclusive behavior differed significantly across conditions, $F(3,310) = 2.78, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .03$ (see Figure 4). Planned contrasts revealed that, relative to when participants discussed work ($M = 5.20, SD = 2.17$), participants expected their White coworker’s socially inclusive behavior to be significantly greater after they engaged in less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 6.00, SD = 1.90$), $p = .02$, rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 5.95, SD = 2.22$), $p = .02$, or rich personal-identity expression ($M = 5.90, SD = 2.02$), $p = .03$. 
**Expected multicultural appreciation behavior.** Expected multicultural appreciation behavior differed marginally across conditions, $F(3,310) = 2.30, p = .08, \eta^2_p = .02$ (see Figure 5). Planned contrasts revealed that, relative to when participants discussed work ($M = 5.62, SD = 2.41$), participants expected their White coworker’s multicultural appreciation behavior to be significantly greater after they engaged in less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 6.53, SD = 2.17$), $p = .01$, and – to a marginal extent – rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 6.32, SD = 2.30$), $p = .06$, but not rich personal-identity expression ($M = 6.11, SD = 2.30$), $p = .16$. 
Willingness to express experience to coworker. Across conditions, participants did not differ in their willingness to express the experience that they described, $F(3,310) = 0.15, p = .93, \eta_p^2 = .001$ (see Figure 6). No planned contrasts were significant, $ps > .50$. Given these null effects, I did not examine the mediating role of minorities’ expectations regarding majorities’ inclusive behaviors.
Figure 6. Mean willingness to express in Study 1a. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.

**Exploratory analyses.** To investigate why cultural-identity expression unexpectedly increased minorities’ expectations regarding certain types of inclusive behavior (social, multicultural appreciation), I conducted several analyses using exploratory measures completed by participants (expected coworker status perceptions, expected coworker closeness, expected coworker anxiety, and expressed positivity) and exploratory measures coded by external raters (strength of impression, expected coworker supportiveness). Specifically, I conducted mediation analyses for each significant relationship found in the main analyses (e.g., for the positive effect of rich cultural-identity expression, relative to work discussion, on expected socially inclusive behavior), both examining indirect effects via each exploratory measure entered as the sole mediator and examining indirect effects via all exploratory measures entered simultaneously. Across all of these analyses, I found no evidence that the significant effects of identity expression (less-rich cultural, rich cultural, rich personal) on inclusive behaviors (social, multicultural appreciation) could be explained by an indirect effect via any of the exploratory
measures (expected coworker status perceptions, expected coworker closeness, expected coworker anxiety, expected supportiveness, expressed positivity, strength of impression).

**Discussion**

Contrary to expectations, Study 1a found that minorities who anticipated sharing (both richly and less richly) aspects of their cultural background with a majority-group coworker did not expect the coworker to behave less inclusively toward them and, in fact, expected the coworker to behave *more* socially inclusively toward them and more appreciative of their cultural background. These results suggest that, contrary to what past research has suggested (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006), minorities may not necessarily expect negative repercussions from expressing a cultural identity and may even expect positive outcomes. Minorities’ expectations regarding rich non-cultural personal expression suggest that they expect many types of personal sharing to increase majorities’ interest in social interaction, but may uniquely expect cultural sharing to increase interest in their cultural backgrounds.

Exploratory analyses were unable to pinpoint precisely why minorities expected their colleagues to behave more inclusively in response to cultural-identity expression. Specifically, participants’ expectations regarding their coworkers’ status perceptions, feelings of closeness, feelings of anxiety, and likely supportiveness could not account for their belief that cultural-identity expression (both rich and less-rich) would lead to more inclusive behavior. Furthermore, neither the valence of information shared nor the strength of the impression that they would likely make could account for these effects. It may be that minorities have an intuition about their coworker’s behavior but they themselves are unable to identify the source of such intuitions. Alternatively, it may be that the measures in this study are insufficient for tapping into minorities’ intuitions. For example, minorities may believe that cultural-identity expression disrupts majorities’ implicit biases toward them but does not substantially influence majorities’
explicit perceptions of or feelings toward them. Future studies are needed to isolate an explanation for these effects.

Also contrary to expectations, minorities did not actively avoid expressing their cultural backgrounds, and instead were equally likely to express a cultural experience and a work experience. This result is surprising in two ways. First, this result is surprising in light of the present study’s finding that minorities expect their coworkers to behave more inclusively in response to cultural-identity expression relative to work. Given minorities’ expectations regarding inclusion, one would expect minorities to be more willing to discuss their cultural backgrounds relative to discussing work.

Second, this null finding is surprising in light of past work suggesting that minorities engage in cultural “covering” in which they often hide or downplay their cultural backgrounds (Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006). Given this past work, why were minorities in the present study similarly willing to express their cultural and work-related experiences? One possibility is that when minorities concretely describe a specific coworker’s potential response to cultural-identity expression (as they were asked to do in the present study), they realize that their coworker may actually respond favorably to learning about their background. However, when minorities simply imagine cultural-identity expression in the abstract, they may fear engaging in such expression – consistent with what past work has suggested. Study 1b explores this possibility.

Study 1b

Minorities’ Abstract Expectations Regarding Cultural-Identity Expression

Study 1b investigated minorities’ expectations of and reactions to identity expression in a more abstract sense compared to Study 1a. Whereas participants in Study 1a answered concrete questions about a specific instance of identity expression when interacting with a particular
majority-group coworker, participants in Study 1b answered questions about identity expression in general when interacting with majority-group coworkers in a broad sense.

Study 1b followed a within-subjects design, such that all participants answered questions regarding three forms of identity expression (cultural, personal, work). The primary objective of this study was to examine whether, in the context of such abstract identity expression, minorities would feel less willing to express a cultural identity compared to a work identity. Moreover, Study 1b examined whether these findings would be mediated by minorities’ expectations that cultural-identity expression would cause their majority-group colleagues to engage in less inclusive behavior (professional, social, and multicultural appreciation). These key predictions are summarized in Figure 2. In addition to the three mechanisms of primary interest, a fourth mechanism of personal appreciation behavior was also added to the model, as this mechanism may be more relevant to the dependent measure of willingness to express a personal (non-cultural) identity.

Study 1b also investigated minorities’ preferences for engaging in different forms of identity expression. The purpose of including this measure was to assess whether participants would ideally prefer to be able to discuss cultural topics as much as non-cultural topics, regardless of the extent that minorities feel comfortable with cultural-identity expression or actually engage in cultural-identity expression.

Personal-identity expression was included in order to examine whether minorities’ expectations regarding cultural-identity expression could be attributed to their expectations about discussing personal life in general, or were specific to the idea of expressing their cultural backgrounds. Because one of the goals of Study 1b was to keep the concept of identity
expression abstract, participants were not asked to differentiate between different forms of cultural-identity expression (i.e., rich vs. less-rich), as forming these types of concrete distinctions may make it difficult to assess minorities’ instinctive reactions to the general idea of cultural-identity expression.

**Method**

**Participants.** Participants were recruited online through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. In order to qualify for participation, individuals were required to meet the following eligibility criteria: pass an initial attention check, select at least one non-White racial/ethnic group or select Other Race, and indicate that they are working either full-time or part-time. Ninety-three participants passed this initial criteria and were entered into the study (50% Women; 12% White/Caucasian, 36% Black/African-American, 14% Hispanic/Latino, 45% Asian, 4% Native American, 1% Pacific Islander, 2% Other Race).

**Procedure.** After completing a demographic questionnaire, participants who met our inclusion criteria continued on to answer questions about identity expression when interacting with their White coworkers. The study followed a within-subjects design such that all participants answered a series of questions regarding each of the following identities: culture (race/ethnicity), personal (personal life), and work. The questions were all asked using a 1 to 5 (not at all – very much) Likert-scale and included their preference for identity expression (3 items for each identity: e.g., “When interacting with White coworkers at your job, to what extent would you like to be able to talk to them about something on your mind that relates to your race/ethnicity or that highlights your race/ethnicity in some way,” $\alpha \geq .94$ for each identity),

---

$^4$ Prior to answering questions about preference for identity expression, participants were informed that the questions are intended to assess “what you would like to be able to talk about with your White coworkers (regardless of whether you do or don't actually talk about these
willingness to express as assessed by their comfort with identity expression (3 items for each identity: e.g., “When interacting with White coworkers at your job, to what extent would you feel comfortable talking about an experience that relates to your race/ethnicity or that highlights your race/ethnicity in some way”), and willingness to express as assessed by their identity expression in the recent past (3 items for each identity: e.g., “In the past 2 weeks, when interacting with White coworkers at your job, to what extent have you talked to them about an activity that you are involved in that relates to your race/ethnicity or that highlights your race/ethnicity in some way”). For each identity, combining the willingness to express items (3 items for comfort with expression, 3 items for past identity expression) resulted in high reliability ($\alpha \geq .92$). Items regarding personal identity and work identity were phrased the same as the items regarding cultural identity, but replaced the term “race/ethnicity” with “personal life” or “work,” respectively. The order of the first two measures (preference for identity expression, comfort with identity expression) was randomized, and past identity expression was always assessed third so that participants’ responses regarding past expression behavior would not influence their responses regarding their preferences for or comfort with expression.

Next, using a 1 to 7 Likert-scale (strongly disagree – strongly agree), participants indicated how they expected expression of each of the three identities (cultural, personal, work) to influence their coworkers’ inclusive behaviors. These questions were grouped by identity (cultural, personal, work), and the order in which the identities were presented was randomized. When focused on cultural identity, participants were asked how they expected cultural-identity expression to influence professionally inclusive behaviors (4 items: e.g., “If I talked to my White topics.” These instructions were intended to signal that the questions were about the participant’s ideal levels of expression, rather than actual expression behavior.
coworkers about something related to my racial/ethnic background in the next few days then, afterwards, they would be likely to actively seek my input on work-related projects,” $\alpha \geq .91$, for each identity), socially inclusive behaviors (4 items: e.g., “If I talked to my White coworkers about something related to my racial/ethnic background in the next few days then, afterwards, they would be likely to make an effort to spend time with me socially,” $\alpha \geq .85$ for each identity), multicultural appreciation behaviors (2 items: e.g., “If I talked to my White coworkers about something related to my racial/ethnic background in the next few days then, afterwards, they would be likely to show interest in things that I share that might highlight my race or ethnicity,” $\alpha \geq .86$ for each identity), and personal appreciation behaviors (2 items: e.g., “If I talked to my White coworkers about something related to my racial/ethnic background in the next few days then, afterwards, they would be likely to show interest in things that I share that might highlight my personal life,” $\alpha \geq .79$ for each identity). When focused on personal identity or work identity, participants answered the same questions but the beginning of each question changed to say “If I talked to my White coworkers about something related to my personal life” or “If I talked to my White coworkers about something related to my work,” respectively. Participants concluded the study by completing exploratory measures (see Supplemental Materials).

**Analysis**

Analyses were conducted using a repeated-measures ANOVA. For each dependent variable (e.g., comfort with identity expression), the repeated measures assessed the dependent variable across each of the three types of identities (cultural, personal, work). Because the predicted mediators in this study involve inclusive behaviors – a source of significant theoretical interest in the present paper – I begin by reporting the results of repeated-measures ANOVAs
involving expected inclusive behaviors as dependent variables, and then move on to analyzing the primary dependent variables (comfort with identity expression, past identity expression).

In instances where Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated (this was the case for all dependent variables except personal appreciation behavior and preference of identity expression), degrees of freedom were corrected using the conservative Greenhouse–Geisser estimate of sphericity. However, in no case did violations to sphericity result in notable differences in significance levels.

Strong effect sizes produced in the repeated-measures ANOVA analyses allowed me to not only compare conditions using planned contrasts (i.e., comparing both cultural- and personal-identity expression to a baseline of discussing work) but to utilize pairwise comparisons to compare all conditions to one another. Thus, all reported comparisons are pairwise comparisons, utilizing a Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons and correct for violations to sphericity.

Mediation analyses were conducted using MEMORE, an SPSS macro designed for mediation analyses involving within-subjects designs (Montoya & Hayes, 2017). These mediation analyses employed a bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. For consistency, all mediation analyses included four expected inclusive behaviors (expected professionally inclusive behavior, expected socially inclusive behavior, expected multicultural appreciation behavior, expected personal appreciation behavior). For simplicity, all mediation analyses were conducted by comparing either cultural- or personal-identity expression to the control condition of discussing work.

Results
**Expected professionally inclusive behavior.** Expected professionally inclusive behavior differed significantly by identity, $F(1.85,170.05) = 40.07, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .30$ (see Figure 7). Participants expected work-identity expression ($M = 5.23, SD = 1.20$) to lead to more professionally inclusive behavior than personal-identity expression ($M = 4.73, SD = 1.16$), $p < .001$, and expected both work- and personal-identity expression to lead to more professionally inclusive behavior than cultural-identity expression ($M = 4.37, SD = 1.34$), $ps < .001$.

![Figure 7](image)

*Figure 7. Mean expected professionally inclusive behavior in Study 1b. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.*

**Expected socially inclusive behavior.** Expected socially inclusive behavior differed significantly by identity, $F(1.75,160.55) = 22.91, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .20$ (see Figure 8). Participants expected personal-identity expression ($M = 4.87, SD = 1.10$) to lead to more socially inclusive behavior than work-identity expression ($M = 4.59, SD = 1.16$), $p = .001$, and expected both personal- and work-identity expression to lead to more socially inclusive behavior than cultural-identity expression ($M = 4.26, SD = 1.32$), $ps < .01$. 49
**Expected multicultural appreciation behavior.** Expected multicultural appreciation behavior differed significantly by identity, $F(1.81,166.31) = 6.03$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .06$ (see Figure 9). Participants expected cultural-identity expression ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 1.40$) and personal-identity expression ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.18$) to result in similar levels of multicultural appreciation behavior, $p = 1.00$. However, participants expected both cultural- and personal-identity expression to result in *greater* levels of multicultural appreciation behavior compared to work-identity expression ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 1.29$), $p = .02$ and $p = .01$, respectively.
Figure 9. Mean expected multicultural appreciation behavior in Study 1b. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.

**Expected personal appreciation behavior.** Expected personal appreciation behavior differed significantly by identity, $F(2,184) = 16.46, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .15$. Participants expected personal-identity expression ($M = 5.08, SD = 1.08$) to result in greater personal appreciation behavior compared to both cultural-identity expression ($M = 4.51, SD = 1.34$), $p < .001$, and work-identity expression ($M = 4.56, SD = 1.19$), $p < .001$. However, cultural-identity expression and work-identity expression did not result in different levels of expected personal appreciation behavior, $p = 1.00$.

**Willingness to express identity.** Willingness to express differed significantly by identity, $F(1.75,161.38) = 147.63, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .62$ (see Figure 10). Participants were more willing to express a work identity ($M = 3.80, SD = 0.94$) compared to a personal identity ($M = 2.53, SD = 0.99$), $p < .001$, and were more willing to express both a work identity and a personal identity compared to a cultural identity ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.92$), $ps < .001$. 

Figure 10. Mean expected willingness to express in Study 1b. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.

A mediation analysis revealed that cultural-identity expression (relative to a work-identity expression) had a significant direct effect on comfort with identity expression, $b = -1.46$, 95% CI [-1.75, -1.17], a significant indirect effect via expected professionally inclusive behavior, $b = -0.26$, 95% CI [-0.51, -0.04], and non-significant indirect effects via other expected inclusive behaviors (social, multicultural appreciation, personal appreciation). A separate mediation analysis revealed that personal-identity expression (relative to a work-identity expression) had a significant direct effect on comfort with identity expression, $b = -1.25$, 95% CI [-1.55, -0.96], a significant indirect effect via expected professionally inclusive behavior, $b = -0.16$, 95% CI [-0.32, -0.02], and non-significant indirect effects via other expected inclusive behaviors (social, multicultural appreciation, personal appreciation).

Preference for identity expression. Preference for identity expression differed significantly by identity, $F(2,184) = 75.22, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .45$. Participants had a greater preference for engaging in work-identity expression ($M = 3.91, SD = 0.99$) compared to
personal-identity expression \((M = 2.79, SD = 1.12), p < .001\), and a greater preference to engage in both work- and personal-identity expression compared to cultural-identity expression \((M = 2.47, SD = 1.23), ps < .001\).

Although significant differences were not expected on this measure, I conducted mediation analyses to assess whether concerns with inclusive behaviors may be underlying minorities’ preferences against expressing cultural identities. This analysis revealed that cultural-identity expression (relative to a work-identity expression) had a significant direct effect on preference for identity expression, \(b = -1.10, 95\% \text{ CI} [-1.44, -0.77]\), a significant indirect effect via expected professionally inclusive behavior, \(b = -0.29, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.56, -0.05]\), and no significant indirect effects via other expected inclusive behaviors (social, multicultural appreciation, personal appreciation). A separate mediation analysis for personal-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression) revealed no significant indirect effects via expected inclusive behaviors.

**Discussion**

Study 1b provides evidence that when minorities abstractly consider identity expression among majority-group coworkers, a fear of potential professional costs makes them unwilling to express their cultural identities. Specifically, minorities were less willing to engage in cultural-identity expression compared to both work-identity expression and personal-identity expression. Thus, minorities have concerns with cultural-identity expression above and beyond other forms of personal expression. While both cultural- and personal-identity expression prompt concerns with being professionally included, cultural-identity expression triggers these concerns to a larger extent and thus results in lower willingness to express.

Minorities also perceived that cultural-identity expression threatened social inclusion. Specifically, compared to discussing work, minorities expected cultural-identity expression to
trigger less socially inclusive behavior from majority-group coworkers, but – interestingly – expected personal-identity expression to result in more socially inclusive behavior. Thus, while minorities expect opening up about their personal lives to facilitate social bonds, they do not expect these benefits to generalize to opening up about their cultural backgrounds.

Contrary to predictions, minorities did not believe that cultural-identity expression posed a risk to multicultural appreciation behavior. Rather, minorities expected both cultural-identity expression and personal-identity expression to increase majority-group coworkers’ interest in their cultural backgrounds. One possible reason for this effect is that, given the infrequency of learning about minority cultures, minorities expect their initial cultural-identity expressions to, on average, be met with intrigue and curiosity. Future research can examine whether there are moderators to such effects. For example, it may be that after a few initial cultural-identity expressions, minorities feel as though they have satiated their colleagues’ curiosity and will subsequently expect to encounter disinterest from their colleagues when they engage in cultural-identity expression. Alternatively, minorities may feel as though certain ways of expressing their cultural identities will be met with curiosity, and others – such as those expressing culturally-based frustrations – will be met with disinterest and disdain.

Also contrary to predictions, minorities did not prefer expressing their cultural identities to the same extent as their work and personal identities. Instead, concerns with professional ramifications drove a relatively low preference for cultural-identity expression. In some ways, this finding is not surprising. Minorities’ preferences are aligned with the perceived realities of the workplace: if minorities feel uncomfortable with cultural-identity expression due to its potential professional costs, they are unlikely to desire engaging in this behavior. Future studies can further disentangle minorities’ preferences from minorities’ concerns about the workplace.
Taken together, Studies 1a and 1b provide evidence that minorities’ instinctive reaction to cultural-identity expression is to expect negative repercussions in terms of inclusion; however, concretely considering a specific instances of cultural-identity expression alleviates these fears and, in some cases, leads minorities to actually expect positive responses from their majority-group colleagues. Studies 2-5 will examine which of these two intuitions are correct - minorities’ abstract concern that cultural-identity expression will jeopardize inclusion or minorities’ concrete assessment that cultural-identity expression can elicit greater inclusion from their colleagues.

**Study 2**

**Cultural-Identity Expression with Current Coworkers**

Study 2 tested how majority-group members reacted to cultural-identity expressions by their current minority-group colleagues. This study followed a 4-condition between-subjects design. I assessed whether and how majority-group employees’ inclusive behaviors (professional, social, and multicultural appreciation) toward a minority coworker were influenced after recalling a time when the minority coworker engaged in one of the following: 1) rich cultural-identity expression, 2) less-rich cultural-identity expression, 3) emotion expression, or 4) a work discussion (control). Emotion expression was included as a form of rich personal expression that is non-cultural in nature.

**Method**

**Participants.** Four hundred and fifty-two White adult residents of the United States were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. In order to qualify for participation, individuals were required to meet the following eligibility criteria: pass an initial attention check, identify racially
as White, and indicate that they have been working in a white-collar job for at least three months. Of the participants who passed this initial criteria, 5 were excluded because they could not think of an example of the situation that they were asked to describe for the experimental manipulation, 5 were excluded because they indicated that they did not answer all of the questions with the same coworker in mind throughout the study, and 2 were excluded because they specifically stated that their coworker did not differ from them culturally. This left 440 participants (46% Women; 100% White) for data analysis.

Procedure. After completing an attention check and demographic questionnaire (age, gender, nationality, race, occupation, and length of current employment), participants who met our eligibility criteria were asked to write down the initials of a coworker who is culturally dissimilar from himself/herself. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four recall prime conditions in which they were asked to describe a time when they were interacting with their selected coworker and he/she did the following: “said something that helped you to better understand his/her cultural background” (rich cultural-identity expression condition), “said something that made you aware of his/her cultural background” (less-rich cultural-identity expression condition), “said something that helped you to better understand his/her emotions and feelings” (emotion expression condition), or “talked to you about a work-related project” (work discussion / control condition). See Supplemental Materials for complete descriptions.

After the recall prime, participants then completed mediation measures (status perceptions, closeness, anxiety) and dependent measures (professionally inclusive behaviors, socially inclusive behaviors, and multicultural appreciation behaviors). Finally, participants

---

5 White-collar workers were those who self-identified as belonging to the following US Census categories of occupation: executive, administrative, or managerial; professional specialty; technicians or related support; sales; administrative support or clerical.
completed demographic questions about their coworker (e.g., gender, age, race, nationality, and a free response box to indicate any other relevant cultural differences) and confirmed whether they answered all questions with the same coworker in mind.6

Measures

Mediation measures. Participants completed the following mediation items: status perceptions (participants were told to imagine that a 10-rung ladder represents the level of respect given to employees in their company, and then indicated which of the 10 rungs best represents the level of respect that their coworker has in relation to the rest of the company), closeness (4 subjective closeness items, e.g., “how close do you feel to [coworker initials],” combined with 3 items assessing their willingness to share intimate information with their coworker,7 e.g., “to what extent do you feel comfortable with opening up to [coworker initials] about your emotions and feelings,” $\alpha = .89$), anxiety (2 items: e.g., “I felt anxious,” $\alpha = .73$). All mediation measures were converted to the same standardized scale.

Professionally inclusive behaviors. Professionally inclusive behavior was measured using two items on a 1 to 5 (not at all - extremely so) scale (e.g., “To what extent do you value [coworker initials]’s work-related contributions”) and four items on a 1 to 7 (extremely unlikely – extremely likely) scale (e.g., “If you had to assemble a team to work on an important new project, how likely would you be to ask [coworker initials] to join your team”). Because items were

---

6 Participants also completed manipulation check questions and exploratory measures (see Supplemental Materials).

7 These latter two items were included based on past work in the relationships literature that states that “the amount of personal information that one person is willing to disclose to another appears to be an index of the ‘closeness’ of the relationship, and of the affection, love, or trust that prevails between the two people” (Jourard, 1959: 428).
measured using different scales (some using a 1 to 5 scale, others using a 1 to 7 scale), all six items were standardized before being averaged to form a composite measure of professionally inclusive behaviors ($\alpha = .94$). See Supplemental Materials for the full set of items.

**Socially inclusive behaviors.** Socially inclusive behavior was measured using five items on a 1 to 7 (extremely unlikely – extremely likely) scale (e.g., “if you were about to eat lunch with another coworker and saw [coworker initials] eating alone, how likely would you be to invite [coworker initials] to join,” $\alpha = .92$). See Supplemental Materials for the full set of items.

**Multicultural appreciation.** Participants completed two measures of multicultural appreciation. See Supplemental Materials for the full set of items.

*Multicultural appreciation behavior toward minority coworker.* Participants answered two items on a 1 to 5 (not at all - extremely so) scale (e.g., “to what extent are you interested in learning more about [coworker initials]'s cultural background,” $\alpha = .73$).

*Multicultural appreciation within organization: Endorsement of multicultural ideology.* On a scale of 1 to 7 (strongly disagree – strongly agree) scale, participants indicated their agreement with five statements adapted from previous research (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Plaut et al., 2009; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006). For example: “Employees should recognize and celebrate cultural and racial differences” ($\alpha = .80$).

**Manipulation checks.** The stories written by participants during the recall task were coded by two research assistants (who were blind to condition) for whether the minority coworker in the story mentioned a cultural identity. Stories that mentioned a cultural identity
were coded again by the same research assistants for the level of richness of cultural-identity expression using a 1 to 7 (low richness - high richness) scale (intrarater reliability: ICC$^2 = .92$).\footnote{In addition, participants completed manipulation check items, but these items did not yield significant results. See Supplemental Materials for more details.}

**Analysis**

With the exception of the manipulation check, all analyses were conducted by submitting the four experimental conditions to a univariate ANOVA and then utilizing planned comparisons. When applicable, mediation analyses were conducted using Hayes bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Hayes, 2013a). For any independent variable (e.g., cultural-identity expression compared to work discussion) exhibiting a significant total effect on a dependent variable, I report mediation results including the direct effect of the independent variable (i.e., the amount of the independent variable’s total effect that cannot be attributed to any mediating variables), as well as the indirect effects of the independent variable via each of the three predicted mediators (i.e., the amount of the independent variable’s total effect that can be attributed to each mediating variable).

**Results**

**Manipulation check.** A series of logistic regressions revealed that, relative to the work discussion condition (in which culture was mentioned in 8% of responses), culture was mentioned significantly more in the experimental conditions (in 45% of the emotion expression responses, and in 93% and 92% of the less-rich and rich cultural-identity expression responses), $ps < .001$. Thus, cultural identity was more salient in these latter three conditions.

A univariate ANOVA revealed that richness of cultural-identity expression differed significantly by condition, $F(2,436) = 107.50, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .43$. Planned comparisons further
demonstrated that, compared to when the coworker engaged in rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.68$), cultural richness was significantly lower when the coworker engaged in less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.45$), $p = .004$, emotion expression ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 2.34$), $p < .001$, or work discussions ($M = 0.20$, $SD = 0.83$), $p < .001$.

**Professionally inclusive behavior.** Professionally inclusive behavior differed significantly across conditions, $F(3,436) = 2.63$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2_p = .02$ (see Figure 11). Relative to when a minority coworker discussed work ($M = -0.14$, $SD = 1.00$), participants’ professionally inclusive behavior was greater when the coworker engaged in rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 0.11$, $SD = 0.80$), $p = .04$, or emotion expression ($M = 0.14$, $SD = 0.79$), $p = .02$, but not less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = -0.07$, $SD = 0.88$), $p = .51$.

![Figure 11. Mean professionally inclusive behavior in Study 2. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.](image)

Dependent measure is standardized due to items being asked on different scales.

A mediation analysis revealed that rich cultural-identity expression (relative to a work discussion) had a non-significant direct effect on professionally inclusive behavior, $b = 0.05$,
95% CI [-0.13, 0.22], a non-significant indirect effect via status perceptions, \( b = 0.01 \), 95% CI [-0.03, 0.06], a significant indirect effect via closeness, \( b = 0.16 \), 95% CI [0.02, 0.31], and a significant indirect effect via anxiety, \( b = 0.04 \), 95% CI [0.001, 0.10]. A similar mediation analysis was conducted for emotion expression (relative to a work discussion), but found no evidence for the predicted mediation pathways. However, an unpredicted indirect effect of \textit{increased} anxiety was found to underlie emotion expression, \( b = -0.03 \), 95% CI [-0.08, -0.001].

**Socially inclusive behavior.** Socially inclusive behavior differed significantly across conditions, \( F(3,436) = 3.00, p = .03 \) \( \eta_p^2 = .02 \) (see Figure 12). Relative to when a minority coworker discussed work (\( M = 4.89, SD = 1.69 \)), participants’ socially inclusive behavior was significantly greater when their coworker engaged in rich cultural-identity expression (\( M = 5.46, SD = 1.13 \)), \( p < .01 \), and marginally greater when the coworker engaged in either less-rich cultural-identity expression (\( M = 5.22, SD = 1.33 \)), \( p = .08 \), or emotion expression (\( M = 5.24, SD = 1.46 \)), \( p = .08 \).

![Figure 12. Mean socially inclusive behavior in Study 2. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.](image-url)
A mediation analysis revealed that rich cultural-identity expression (relative to work discussion) had a non-significant direct effect on socially inclusive behavior, \( b = 0.23, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.04, 0.51] \), a non-significant indirect effect via status perceptions, \( b = 0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.01, 0.06] \), a significant indirect effect via closeness, \( b = 0.28, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.04, 0.55] \), and a significant indirect effect via anxiety, \( b = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.00, 0.15] \). A second and third mediation analysis compared less-rich cultural-identity expression and emotion expression, respectively, to work discussions, but found no evidence of indirect effects via increased status perceptions, increased closeness, or decreased anxiety. However, an unpredicted indirect effect of increased anxiety was found to underlie emotion expression, \( b = -0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.16, -0.003] \).

**Multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker.** Multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker differed significantly across conditions, \( F(3,436) = 5.79, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .04 \) (see Figure 13). Relative to when the minority coworker discussed work \( (M = 4.36, SD = 1.17) \), participants’ multicultural appreciation behavior was significantly greater when the coworker engaged in rich cultural-identity expression \( (M = 4.93, SD = 0.88), p < .001 \), less-rich cultural-identity expression \( (M = 4.66, SD = 1.02), p = .03 \), and emotion expression \( (M = 4.75, SD = 1.03), p < .01 \).
A mediation analysis revealed that rich cultural-identity expression (relative to work discussion) had a significant direct effect on multicultural appreciation behavior toward their coworker, $b = 0.39$, 95% CI [0.15, 0.63], a non-significant indirect effect via status perceptions, $b = 0.004$, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.05], a significant indirect effect via closeness, $b = 0.13$, 95% CI [0.02, 0.27], and a significant indirect effect via anxiety, $b = 0.04$, 95% CI [0.0001, 0.13]. A second and third mediation analysis compared less-rich cultural-identity expression and emotion expression, respectively, to work discussions, but found no evidence of indirect effects.

**Multicultural appreciation within organization: Endorsement of multicultural ideology.** Endorsement of multicultural ideology differed significantly across conditions, $F(3,436) = 2.86, p = .04$, $\eta^2_p = .02$ (see Figure 14). Relative to when a minority coworker discussed work ($M = 5.07$, $SD = 1.11$), participants’ endorsement of multicultural ideology was marginally higher when the coworker engaged in rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 5.40$, $SD$...
but did not significantly differ when a coworker enacted either less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 5.26, SD = 1.12$), $p = .28$, or emotion expression ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.09$), $p = .42$.

![Figure 14. Mean multicultural appreciation behavior in terms of endorsement of multicultural ideology within organization in Study 2. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.](image)

A mediation analysis revealed that rich cultural-identity expression (relative to work discussion) had a non-significant direct effect on endorsement of multiculturalism, $b = 0.24$, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.61], a non-significant indirect effect via status perceptions, $b = 0.01$, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.07], a non-significant indirect effect via closeness, $b = 0.02$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.11], but a significant indirect effect via anxiety, $b = 0.06$, 95% CI [0.003, 0.17].

**Discussion**

Study 2 provided support for the primary predictions that, relative to a minority engaging in work discussions, a minority engaging in rich cultural-identity expression increased
majorities’ engagement in professionally inclusive behavior, socially inclusive behavior, multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker who expressed his/her identity, and endorsement of multicultural ideology on the organization level. Both increased closeness and decreased anxiety mediated these effects, with the exception of endorsement of multicultural ideology, which was only mediated by decreased anxiety. There was no evidence of status perceptions as a mechanism underlying these effects, perhaps due to operationalizing status perceptions in terms of the minority coworker’s level of “respect in the company” rather than the participants’ personal level of respect for the minority coworker.

As expected, less-rich cultural identity did not influence professionally inclusive behavior nor endorsement of multicultural ideology but, contrary to predictions, such expression marginally increased socially inclusive behavior and significantly increased multicultural appreciation behavior toward the specific minority coworker who expressed his/her identity. There a few potential explanations for these findings. One possibility is that “less-rich” cultural-identity expression was less-rich in a relative sense (compared to “rich” cultural-identity expression) but not still not very low in richness in an absolute sense. The qualitative coding of cultural richness supports this notion – both rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression fell on average within the same 3-4 range on a richness scale ($M_{\text{rich}} = 3.90$ and $M_{\text{less-rich}} = 3.27$, respectively). Moreover, pairwise comparisons demonstrated that less-rich cultural-identity expression, in addition to rich cultural-identity expression, was significantly higher in cultural richness compared to the emotion expression condition ($M_{\text{emotion}} = 1.91$), $p < .001$. Given that less-rich cultural-identity expressions were, on average, still moderately rich in an absolute sense, these expressions may have gleaned some of the benefits of richer cultural-identity
expressions, leading to somewhat greater socially inclusive behavior and multicultural appreciation behavior.

As expected, emotion expression increased socially inclusive behavior (although only to a marginal extent) and failed to influence endorsement of multicultural ideology. However, contrary to predictions, emotion expression significantly increased professionally inclusive behavior and multicultural appreciation behavior toward participants’ specific minority coworker. One potential reason for the unexpected positive effect on multicultural appreciation behavior is that 45% of emotion expression responses included a mention of culture. The coupling cultural topics with the general richness associated with emotion expression may have led to a greater interest in minorities’ cultural backgrounds.

**Study 3**

**Attempted Replication of Study 2**

Study 3 recruited participants from the ClearVoice Panel in order to replicate the effects of Study 2 using an alternative sample. Similar to Study 2, Study 3 followed a 4-condition (rich cultural-identity expression, less-rich cultural-identity expression, emotion expression, work discussion / control) between-subjects design

**Method**

**Participants.** Participants were recruited online through a panel of adults managed by ClearVoice. In order to qualify for participation, individuals were required to meet the following eligibility criteria: pass an initial attention check, identify racially as White, and indicate that they work in a white-collar job. Of the 484 participants who completed the study, 8 were

---

9 White-collar workers were those who indicated that their work can be best described as “white collar (professional work, often in an office setting),” as opposed to blue collar “(manual work,
excluded because they were unable to identify a coworker who differed from them culturally, 19 were excluded for not providing a real answer in response to the experimental manipulation, 58 were excluded because they stated that they could not think of an example of the situation that they were asked to describe for the experimental manipulation, and 15 were excluded because they indicated that they did not answer all of the questions with the same coworker in mind throughout the study. This left 384 participants (65% Women; 100% White) for data analysis.

**Procedure.** Participants who met our eligibility criteria were asked to write down the initials of a coworker who is culturally dissimilar from himself/herself. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four recall prime conditions, which differed slightly from Study 2. Specifically, participants were asked to describe a time when they were interacting with their selected coworker and he/she did the following: “said something that made you aware of how his/her thoughts, feelings, or less-known experiences relate to his/her cultural background” (rich cultural-identity expression condition), “said something that made you aware of his/her cultural background” (less-rich cultural-identity expression condition), “said something that made you aware of his/her emotions and feelings” (emotion expression condition), or “made you aware of a work-related project that he/she was working on” (work discussion / control condition).

After the recall prime, participants completed similar mediation measures to the ones completed in Study 2 (status perceptions, closeness, anxiety), with one notable difference being the measure for status perceptions. The present study measured status perceptions using 2 items on a scale of 1 to 7 (*strongly disagree* – *strongly agree*; “I respect him/her,” “I admire him/her,” $\alpha = .84$). Participants then completed measures of inclusive behavior (professionally inclusive

---

often in a field or factory setting),” or “customer service (non-white-collar service work, often in a retail or restaurant setting).”
behaviors, socially inclusive behaviors, multicultural appreciation behavior toward their minority coworker, endorsement of multicultural ideology) using the same items used in Study 2.

Next, participants completed a set of manipulation check items, which differed from those used in Study 2. Specifically, on a 1 to 5 scale (not at all - very much so) participants completed items measuring the salience of their coworker’s cultural background (2 items, e.g., “During the interaction you described with [coworker initials], to what extent did he/she make you aware of his/her racial background,” α = .92), richness of cultural-identity expression (3 items, e.g., “During the interaction you described with [coworker initials], to what extent did he/she provide you with insight into personal thoughts and perspectives that are shaped by his/her racial background,” α = .94), and richness of personal expression (3 items, e.g., “During the interaction you described with [coworker initials], to what extent did he/she provide you with insight into his/her personal thoughts and perspectives,” α = .88). See Supplemental Materials for complete descriptions of these manipulations. Finally, participants confirmed whether they answered all questions with the same coworker in mind throughout the study. 11

Analysis

All analyses were conducted by submitting the four experimental conditions to a univariate ANOVA.

Results

10 As in Study 2, two items measured multicultural appreciation behavior toward the participant’s minority coworker. However, these items exhibited low reliability (α = .49), and thus only one item was used in Study 3: “To what extent are you interested in learning more about [coworker initials]'s racial/ethnic background?”

11 Participants also completed additional exploratory measures, see Supplemental Materials.
Manipulation check: Salience of coworker identity. Salience of the coworker’s cultural identity differed significantly by condition, $F(3,379) = 39.94, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .24$. Compared to participants in the control condition ($M = 1.67, SD = 1.13$), participants perceived their coworker’s cultural identity as significantly more salient in the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.15, p < .001$, the rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.14, p < .001$, and in the emotion expression condition (to a marginal extent; $M = 1.97, SD = 1.22, p = .08$).

Manipulation check: Richness of cultural-identity expression. Perceived richness of cultural-identity expression differed significantly by condition, $F(3,379) = 12.89, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .09$. Compared to participants in the rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 2.64, SD = 1.20$), participants perceived significantly less richness of cultural-identity expression in the control condition, ($M = 1.75, SD = 1.13, p < .001$, and in the emotion expression condition ($M = 2.02, SD = 1.14, p < .001$, but – unexpectedly – not in the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 2.60, SD = 1.26, p = .81$).

Manipulation check: Richness of personal expression. Perceived richness of personal expression differed significantly by condition, $F(3,380) = 4.40, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .03$. Compared to participants in the rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 3.04, SD = 1.16$), participants perceived significantly less richness of personal expression in the control condition ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.21, p = .02$, but not in the emotion expression condition ($M = 3.18, SD = 0.96, p = .37$, nor the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 2.83, SD = 1.24, p = .21$).

---

12 Qualitative coding by external raters confirmed that richness of cultural-identity expression did not differ between the rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression conditions.
**Inclusive behavior.** Experimental condition did not significantly influence participants’ professionally inclusive behaviors, $F(3, 380) = 0.24, p = .87, \eta^2_p = .002$, socially inclusive behaviors, $F(3, 380) = 0.54, p = .65, \eta^2_p = .004$, nor endorsement of multicultural ideology, $F(3,380) = 1.40, p = .24, \eta^2_p = .01$. Experimental condition marginally influenced multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker, $F(3,380) = 2.10, p = .10, \eta^2_p = .02$. Planned contrasts revealed that, relative to when a minority coworker discussed work ($M = 3.07, SD = 1.15$), participants’ multicultural appreciation was somewhat lower when the minority engaged in emotion expression ($M = 2.82, SD = 1.19$), $p = .15$, but did not differ when the minority engaged in either rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.21$), $p = .64$, nor less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 3.22, SD = 1.26$), $p = .64$.

Because rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression did not differ in richness, additional analyses were conducted with these two conditions collapsed together. The only meaningful change observed was in the significance of the F-statistic for multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker, which changed from marginally significant ($p = .10$) to significant ($p = .05$).

**Exploratory analyses.** A closer assessment of the data provides some insight into why the results from Study 2 did not replicate in Study 3. To provide context, additional analyses were first conducted using data from Study 2. In the rich cultural condition on Study 2, at least 50% of the descriptions that participants wrote were examples of rich cultural-identity expression that met three criteria that are likely important for the manipulation to be effective: they were rich (meaning they described a minority colleague’s thoughts and feelings related to his/her cultural background, as was the intended effect of the manipulation), the participant described what the minority said in vivid detail (making it likely that the recall task would have an effect.
on the participant’s thoughts and feelings toward the minority coworker during the study), and what the minority said was non-threatening (e.g., did not highlight broader intergroup tensions related to the U.S. presidential election or the Black Lives Matter movement in the U.S.).

In contrast, in Study 3, only 10% of responses in the rich cultural-identity expression condition met this criteria: while similar in richness level, participants’ descriptions were much less detailed (on average they were half the length in Study 3, compared to Study 2, and often only mentioned the topic that the minority discussed rather than providing details about what the minority actually said), and were more likely to cover threatening topics (e.g., the U.S. election or the Black Lives Matter movement, in part due to this study being run closer to the election and soon after a highly publicized police shooting).

To explore this latter possibility regarding threat in greater detail, a research assistant who was blind to condition rated identity expression descriptions for the level of potential threat (i.e., the extent to which a minority sharing the experience with a majority-group coworker had the potential to create a sense of threat in the majority-group coworker, coded on a scale of 1 to 3 – not at all to very much so). An ANOVA analysis revealed that the identity expression conditions differed significantly in levels of potential threat, $F(3,330) = 22.67, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .17$. Compared to discussing work ($M = 1.02, SD = 0.22$), both rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 1.68, SD = 0.82$) and less-rich cultural-identity expression ($M = 1.49, SD = 0.70$) resulted in higher levels of threat, $ps < .001$, whereas emotion expression did not ($M = 1.13, SD = 0.45$), $p = .24$.

**Discussion**

Study 3 failed to replicate most of the results from Study 2. The likely reason for this null effect is simply that the manipulation in Study 3, which differed somewhat from the
manipulation in Study 2 (see Supplemental materials), did not sufficiently induce an in-depth recollection of a previous interaction with a minority coworker. Consequently, the experimental manipulation was not strong enough to significantly influence participants’ thoughts and behaviors. This methodological issue can be resolved in future studies by pre-testing experimental manipulations to ensure they elicit in-depth responses. Not only will this improvement result in more effective experimental manipulations across conditions, it should also help to distinguish the less-rich and rich cultural-identity expression conditions (which did not differ in richness levels in the present study) by drawing out particularly rich responses in the latter condition.

Another possible reason for the null findings in this study theoretical. The results of Study 3 suggest a potential boundary condition of rich cultural-identity expression, such that discussing one’s thoughts and feelings concerning broad, current intergroup conflicts may be ineffective at eliciting inclusive behavior from one’s coworkers due to increased levels of threat. Additional studies are needed to examine this possibility.

**Study 4**

**Cultural-Identity Expression in a Controlled Experiment**

Study 4 examined the effects of cultural-identity expression using a controlled experimental approach, enabling me to assess the effects of cultural-identity expression absent of any potential moderating factors associated with a particular work context. Participants were introduced to a novel work setting and exposed to pre-determined examples of cultural-identity expression using a 3 (identity expression: cultural, personal, and work) by 2 (richness: rich, less-rich) between-subjects design. Personal-identity expression served as a non-cultural form of self-sharing, and work-identity expression served as a control condition.
Method

Participants. Adults residing in the USA were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Seven hundred twenty-two White participants (49% women) completed the study after meeting two eligibility criteria: passing an initial attention check and identifying as White.

Procedure. Participants completed an initial attention check, followed by a questionnaire including age, gender, race, and education. Those who met the eligibility criteria continued and read that this was a study conducted on behalf of a consulting company, named TCX Consulting, which was interested in developing a work environment that enables employees to work together virtually while interacting in ways that resemble an office environment. Participants created a username and selected an avatar that resembled them physically, choosing from among a pre-determined set of avatars that varied in racial group membership. The survey led participants to believe that they were paired with an African-American female coworker whose name was TurkEnthusiast and whose avatar was a black female. In reality, this coworker was pre-programmed by the research team.

Participants were then told that they and their coworker would individually complete a work task in which they each provided answers to five “consulting questions” facing TCX Consulting’s clients. For example: “A growing gasoline company hopes to expand its presence in the U.S. market. To do so, they want to gather information on how many miles an average American travels from home to work on a daily basis (roundtrip). Please provide your estimate.” Each consulting question could be answered by providing a numeric estimate on a 0-100 scale, and was pre-tested to ensure that participants’ answers would typically fall within this range.

The survey then prompted participants to take a “coffee break” in which they would get to know their coworker by taking turns sharing answers to personal questions. The second question in the coffee break was “Describe something new or interesting that you did in the past
month.” The experimental manipulations of identity expression (cultural vs. personal vs. work) and richness level (rich vs. less-rich) were embedded in the coworker’s response to this question. For consistency, the minority coworker’s responses all involved a change to her appearance, either focusing on the decision to wear her hair in more Afro-centric styles (cultural-identity expression), wear less conventional glasses (personal-identity expression), or wear different – but equally appropriate – clothes to work (work-identity expression). The coworker either discussed the personal significance of changing her appearance (rich) or how she looks different due to changing her appearance (less-rich). Regardless of condition, the coworker’s response was similar in length. See Supplemental Materials for full experimental manipulations. After being exposed to the experimental manipulation, participants responded to a set of mediation questions measuring status perceptions, closeness, and anxiety.

Participants were then informed that they would continue with the coffee break, but that (unbeknownst to their coworker) they would have a choice about what questions they and their coworker would answer next, and that they and their coworker need not answer the same questions during this portion of the coffee break. For consistency, participants viewed the same potential questions for themselves and their coworker and, for each question, rated their interest in personally answering the question and their interest in their coworker answering the question. Some of these items were incorporated into a measure of closeness and other items were incorporated into a measure of multicultural appreciation behavior toward their coworker. Participants were then informed that, due to time constraints, they and their coworker would not answer the last coffee break question, but would instead continue to the next part of the study. Participants then completed measures of professionally inclusive behaviors, socially inclusive
behaviors, and multicultural appreciation behaviors. Finally, participants completed manipulation checks and read a debrief form.  

**Measures**

**Mediators.** Participants completed the following mediation items using a Likert scale: status perceptions (2 items: e.g., “I respect her,” \( \alpha = .80 \)), closeness (5 subjective closeness questions, e.g., “how close do you feel to TurkEnthusiast,” combined with 2 questions assessing their willingness to share intimate information with TurkEnthusiast, e.g., “What is your happiest early childhood memory,” \( \alpha = .83 \)), and anxiety (2 items: e.g., “I felt anxious,” \( \alpha = .72 \)). All mediation measures were converted to the same standardized scale.

**Professionally inclusive behaviors.** Three behavioral measures of professionally inclusive behavior were assessed: (1) *incorporation of coworker’s professional input* was measured by giving participants a second opportunity to supply estimates to the five consulting questions and measuring the extent to which participants adjusted their original answers to take their minority coworker’s estimates into account; (2) *strength of numeric promotion recommendation* was measured by enabling participants to recommend their minority coworker for two promotions at TCX Consulting\(^{14}\) on a 1 to 5 (*do not recommend - recommend strongly*) scale (\( \alpha = .78 \)); (3) *strength of written promotion recommendation* was assessed by allowing participants to write a free-response promotion recommendation for their coworker and assessing the strength of the recommendation by having two coders (blind to experimental condition) indicate on a 1 to 9 (*extremely unlikely - extremely likely*) scale how likely they would be to

---

\(^{13}\) Participants also completed exploratory measures, described in Supplemental Materials.

\(^{14}\) Participants were told that these promotions would take place after the study was complete. For example “TCX Consulting is also looking for Workers to operate as Senior Editors for future TCX Consulting tasks.”
promote the minority coworker based on each participant’s written recommendation (interrater reliability: ICC$_2$ = .95). See Supplemental Materials for a more complete description of these measures.

**Socially inclusiveness behaviors.** Two behavioral measures of socially inclusive behavior were assessed: (1) *inclusion in a future social activity* was measured by giving participants an opportunity to rank the minority coworker in terms of their willingness to include her in a fun virtual game and a fun online social activity ($\alpha = .70$); *inclusiveness during a social interaction* was assessed by giving participants an opportunity to complete a free-response “Nice to Meet You” message for their minority coworker and having two Black American coders (blind to experimental condition) code these messages on a 1 to 9 (*extremely unlikely* - *extremely likely*) scale with the following question in mind: “how likely is this person to want to socially interact with you if you cross paths again?” (interrater reliability: ICC$_2$ = .93). See Supplemental Materials for a more complete description of these measures.

**Multicultural appreciation.** Two measures of multicultural appreciation were assessed: (1) *multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker* was assessed by giving participants an opportunity to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 (*not at all* - *very much*) their interest in the minority coworker answering two culturally-based questions during the coffee chat (e.g., “Describe an important component of your heritage or cultural background,” $\alpha = .84$); (2) *endorsement of multicultural ideology* was measured using participants’ responses to four items on a 1 to 7 (*strongly disagree* - *strongly agree*) scale (e.g., “Recognizing cultural and racial diversity should be a fundamental characteristic of TCX Consulting, $\alpha = .82$). See Supplemental Materials for a more complete description of these measures.
Manipulation checks. Using a 1 to 5 (not at all - very much so) scale, participants completed two items assessing the salience of the coworker’s cultural identity (e.g., “To what extent did TurkEnthusiast make you aware of his/her racial background,” $\alpha = .95$), three items assessing richness of cultural-identity expression (e.g., “To what extent did TurkEnthusiast provide you with insight into personal thoughts and perspectives that are shaped by his/her racial background,” $\alpha = .95$) and three items assessing richness of personal expression (e.g., “To what extent did TurkEnthusiast share intimate feelings and emotions,” $\alpha = .84$).

Analysis

Unless otherwise specified, primary analyses were conducted using a 3 (identity expression: cultural, personal, work) x 2 (richness: rich, less-rich) factorial ANOVA and mediation analyses were conducted using Hayes bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Hayes, 2013a).

Results

Manipulation check: Salience of coworker identity. As expected, salience of the minority coworker’s cultural identity was significantly influenced by the identity expression manipulation, $F(2,690) = 658.91, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .66$. As expected, compared to participants in the work-identity expression condition ($M = 1.43, SD = 1.46$), participants perceived their coworker’s cultural identity as significantly more salient in the cultural-identity expression condition ($M = 3.92, SD = 0.97$), $p < .001$, but not in the personal-identity expression condition ($M = 1.41, SD = 0.78$), $p = .78$. There was no significant main effect for richness, nor was there a significant interaction between identity expressed and richness, $ps > .25$.

Manipulation check: Richness of cultural-identity expression. Richness of cultural-identity expression was significantly influenced by the richness manipulation, $F(1,690) = 6.83, p$
< .01, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, and the identity expression manipulation, $F(2,690) = 436.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .56$. However, as expected, these main effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(2,690) = 12.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Simple effects demonstrated that perceived cultural richness was higher when richness was high, compared to low, in the cultural-identity expression condition, $b = 0.57$, $p < .001$, but perceived richness of cultural-identity expression did not differ in the personal- or work-identity expression conditions ($ps > .25$).

**Manipulation check: Richness of personal expression.** As expected, richness of personal expression was significantly influenced by the richness manipulation, $F(1,690) = 9.83$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, such that participants perceived personal richness to be higher in the rich condition ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.93$) compared to the less-rich condition ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.85$), $p < .002$. Results also revealed an unexpected main effect for identity expression, $F(2,690) = 8.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, such that compared to when the coworker engaged in cultural-identity expression ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.90$), participants perceived personal richness to be significantly lower when coworkers engaged in either personal-identity expression ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.86$), $p < .01$, or work-identity expression ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 0.90$), $p < .001$.

**Professionally inclusive behavior: Incorporation of coworkers’ professional input.**

The data for incorporation of the minority coworker’s professional input were normally distributed except for a spike in responses at the zero-level due to some participants never adjusting their answers to include their coworker’s responses. Given this semi-continuous distribution, a two-part analysis (Manning et al., 1981) was appropriate in order to simultaneously 1) conduct a logistic regression to examine the effect of the experimental conditions on participants’ (dichotomous) decision to either keep all answers the same or adjust at least one answer, and 2) conduct a linear regression to examine the effect of the experimental
conditions on the degree to which participants adjusted their answers to incorporate their coworker’s responses (continuous outcome, excluding people who did not adjust their responses at all). I conducted this two-part analysis using conventional path modeling in Mplus. Identity expression and richness were coded using weighted effect coding, with work-identity expression and low richness as the reference groups. Interaction terms were also included in the model. Results revealed only a marginally-significant positive main effect of cultural-identity expression on participants’ (continuous) degree of answer adjustment, $b = .03$, $p = .08$. All other main effects, as well as interactions terms, were non-significant ($ps > .50$).

**Professionally inclusive behavior: Strength of numeric promotion recommendation.**

Strength of numeric promotion recommendations did not differ significantly across conditions ($ps > .25$).

**Professionally inclusive behavior: Strength of written promotion recommendation.**

Strength of written promotion recommendations differed significantly across identity expression conditions, $F(2,681) = 3.73$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2_p = .01$ (see Figure 15). Planned contrasts demonstrated that, relative to when a minority coworker expressed a work identity ($M = 6.47$, $SD = 1.70$), participants wrote significantly stronger recommendations when the minority coworker expressed a cultural identity ($M = 6.83$, $SD = 1.54$), $p = .01$, or a personal identity ($M = 6.79$, $SD = 1.44$), $p = .03$. No other significant effects were found.
A mediation analysis revealed that cultural-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression) had a significant direct effect on the strength of the recommendation, $b = 0.29$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.57], a significant indirect effect via status perceptions, $b = 0.07$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.18], a non-significant indirect effect via closeness, $b = 0.004$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.06], and a non-significant indirect effect via anxiety, $b = -0.002$, 95% CI [-0.04, 0.03]. A similar analysis using personal-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression) found no evidence for indirect effects. In fact, regressing status perceptions on personal-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression) revealed no significant main effect, $b = 0.001$, $p = .99$.

**Socially inclusive behavior: Inclusiveness during a social interaction.** As shown in Figure 16, inclusiveness during a social interaction was significantly influenced by identity expression, $F(2,684) = 3.24, p = .04$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, with planned contrasts revealing a significant positive effect of cultural-identity expression ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 1.03$), $p = .01$, and a non-
significant effect of personal-identity expression \( (M = 5.96, SD = 0.90), p = .24 \), relative to work-identity expression \( (M = 5.84, SD = 0.80) \). There was also a near significant effect of richness, with planned contrasts revealing a positive effect of high richness \( (M = 6.02, SD = 0.96) \) relative to low richness \( (M = 5.89, SD = 0.86) \), \( F(1, 684) = 3.63, p = .057, \eta^2_p = .01 \).

The overall interaction term only trended toward conventional levels of significance, \( F(2, 684) = 2.07, p = .13, \eta^2_p = .01 \), indicating that the effect of richness did not differ significantly across all three forms of identity expression. However, the hypotheses of the study concerned particular pairwise comparisons, rather than the overall trend (which would naturally be diluted by any non-significant contrasts). As such, I also tested specific interactions of theoretical interest, while using Bonferroni corrections as a stringent control for false positives.

A comparison between cultural-identity expression and work-identity expression revealed that cultural-identity expression led to greater socially inclusive behavior when richness was high (cultural: \( M = 6.22, SD = 1.08 \); work: \( M = 5.87, SD = 0.85 \), \( p = .01 \), but not when richness was low (cultural: \( M = 5.89, SD = 0.94 \); work: \( M = 5.82, SD = 0.75 \), \( p = 1.00 \)).

A comparison between personal-identity expression and work-identity expression revealed that socially inclusive behavior did not differ between these conditions when richness was high (personal: \( M = 5.97, SD = 0.92 \); work: \( M = 5.87, SD = 0.85 \), \( p = 1.00 \), nor when richness was low (personal: \( M = 5.95, SD = 0.89 \); work: \( M = 5.82, SD = 0.75 \), \( p = .80 \)).

Parameter estimates provide further evidence in support of this interaction by revealing a marginal interaction between richness and cultural-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression), \( b = 0.28, p = .10 \).
A mediation analysis examined mechanisms underlying the main effect of cultural-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression), revealing a significant direct effect on socially inclusive behavior, \( b = 0.16, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.002, 0.32] \), a significant indirect effect via status perceptions, \( b = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.01, 0.11] \), a non-significant indirect effect via closeness, \( b = 0.003, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.01, 0.03] \), and a non-significant indirect effect via anxiety, \( b = 0.001, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.01, 0.02] \). A moderated mediation analysis found no evidence that the indirect effects were moderated by richness.

**Socially inclusive behavior: Inclusion in a future social activity.** Participants’ willingness to include their minority coworker in a future social activity did not differ by experimental condition (\( ps > .25 \)).

**Multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker.** Participants’ multicultural appreciation behavior toward their coworker differed significantly across identity expression conditions, \( F(2,696) = 6.51, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .02 \) (see Figure 17). Planned contrasts
demonstrated that, relative to when a minority coworker expressed a work identity ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.15$), participants showed greater appreciation for the minority coworker’s cultural identity after she expressed a cultural identity ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.27$), $p = .03$, but not after she expressed a personal identity ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.11$), $p = .15$. No other significant effects were found.

![Figure 17. Mean multicultural appreciation behavior toward minority coworker in Study 4. Error bars represent ±1 SEM.](image)

A mediation analysis examined mechanisms underlying the main effect of cultural-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression), revealing a non-significant direct effect on multicultural appreciation behavior, $b = 0.16$, 95% CI [-0.04, 0.36], a significant indirect effect via status perceptions, $b = 0.06$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.12], a non-significant indirect effect via closeness, $b = 0.02$, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.09], and a non-significant indirect effect via anxiety, $b = -0.002$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.01].
Multicultural appreciation: Endorsement of multicultural ideology. Results of a factorial ANOVA using the dependent measure of endorsement of multiculturalism yielded no significant effects for identity expression \( (p = .78) \), richness \( (p = .15) \), or the interaction \( (p = .87) \).

Discussion

Study 4 provided evidence that, compared to simply focusing on work, engaging in cultural-identity expression is an effective means through which minorities can elicit inclusive behaviors from majorities. Both rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression caused majorities to perceive minorities as higher status, which in turn led majorities to be more professionally inclusive, socially inclusive, and open to learning about a minority coworker’s multicultural background. Rich cultural-identity expression was particularly effective at increasing socially inclusive behaviors. One reason that rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression were similarly effective at increasing other types of inclusive behaviors may be because the “less-rich” condition is more accurately described as “moderately rich,” providing a fair amount of insight into the minority coworkers’ culturally-based thoughts despite being less rich than the “rich cultural-identity expression” condition. Thus, Study 4 provides promising evidence that cultural-identity expression is particularly effective when high in richness, but can still be very beneficial when richness is only moderate.

Personal-identity expression was similarly effective to cultural-identity expression at increasing the strength of majorities’ recommendation letters for a minority coworker, but was otherwise ineffective at increasing inclusive behaviors. Specifically, unlike cultural-identity expression, personal-identity expression (relative to work-identity expression) did not significantly affect majorities’ willingness to incorporate their minority coworkers’ professional input, multicultural appreciation behavior toward the minority coworker who expressed her cultural background, nor inclusive behavior during a social interaction.
It is surprising that personal-identity expression did not have effects similar to cultural-identity expression in terms of increasing closeness and socially inclusive behavior. Past work suggests that opening up about rich non-cultural personal topic is beneficial for intergroup interactions. However, this past work focused on sharing highly intimate personal information (e.g., sharing embarrassing moments or personal problems; Ensari & Miller, 2002; Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007). While rich expression includes sharing intimate information (e.g., sharing feelings), the rich expressions in the present study were relatively modest in intimacy compared to past work, instead reflecting moderate levels of intimacy that are more common in the workplace. At these moderate levels of intimacy, rich personal expression may not be as effective as rich cultural expression. A minority sharing inner thoughts about an appearance-related personal identity, such as liking a certain style of glasses, may not seem sufficiently intimate to create a sense of closeness. In contrast, a minority sharing inner thoughts about her appearance related to a culturally-relevant feature like hair may seem more intimate because majority-group coworkers have less exposure to this type information. Supporting this notion, cultural-identity expression was significantly higher than personal-identity expression on the manipulation check measure of richness of personal expression, a component of which assesses the intimacy of information shared.

Rich cultural-identity expression did not influence endorsement of multicultural ideology. This null finding may be due to participants’ exposure to the overarching organization being limited to the duration of the study, making it difficult to answer questions about what the organization at large should or should not do to support multiculturalism more broadly.

Neither closeness nor anxiety significantly mediated the effects of cultural-identity expression. One possible explanation for these null effects is that the virtual nature of the
interaction in Study 4 lacked nonverbal behavior and other cues that are typically required to influence coworker’s emotions and feelings (Barsade, 2002). Thus, compared to the in-person interactions that participants recalled in Study 2, the virtual interactions in Study 4 limited the extent that participants could feel close to or anxious around the coworker.

**Study 5**

**Cultural-Identity Expression in In-Person Interactions**

Study 5 attempted to replicate the findings from Studies 2-4 regarding rich and less-rich cultural-identity expression, but used in-person (rather than recalled or virtual) interactions to gain greater ecological validity compared to Study 4. This study also builds on the previous studies by investigating a potential boundary condition regarding the valence of rich cultural-identity expression. Rich expression involves sharing one’s thoughts and feelings and, for members of a minority group, such thoughts and feelings may involve negatively-valenced information such as culturally-based frustrations stemming from their membership in a historically less advantaged group. Given this possibility, Study 5 tests whether rich cultural-identity expression can be effective if it involves voicing frustrations relating to belonging to a minority cultural group.

The in-person interactions in this study present a unique opportunity to examine the fine-tuned differences between personal- and cultural-identity expression. Thus, in Study 5, less-rich personal-identity expression – often considered “small talk” in work contexts – was used as a control condition. Compared to the previous control conditions involving work discussion, personal-identity expression is likely to be considered more similar in content to cultural-identity expression. Thus, Study 5 involves a more conservative test of the effects of cultural-identity expression. Overall, Study 5 followed a 4-condition (rich cultural-identity expression, rich +
frustrated cultural-identity expression, less-rich cultural-identity expression, small talk / control condition), between-subjects design. In this study, identity was expressed by a confederate who acted as a naïve participant while interacting with majority-group members.

Method

Participants and design. White students and community members were recruited to participate in a psychology study at an east coast university. All recruited participants indicated on a pre-screening questionnaire (administered by either the psychology study pool or by members of the research team) that they identify as White. Two hundred eight-seven participants were entered into the study. Of these participants, 5 were excluded because they did not identify as White, 2 were excluded because of a technical error that made it unclear what experimental condition they were exposed to, 1 was excluded for not providing real responses (i.e., providing the same answer for every question), and 2 were excluded because they were unable to complete the study. This left 277 participants (58% women; 100% White, 0.4% Hispanic/Latino, 0.7% Native American, 0% Black, 0% Asian).

Procedure. Each session of the study included a group of 2-3 participants, as well as one confederate who was trained to behave like a naïve participant. The confederate was always a Black male or female (played by one of six Research Assistants). The confederate was named either Keisha (female), Latoya (female), or Lamar (male), as previous research demonstrated that 100% of participants in their studies identified these names as referring to people who are racially Black (Milkman, Akinola, & Chugh, 2015). A White experimenter instructed participants to write their first name on a name tag and wear it for the duration of the study. Participants then individually began the study in Qualtrics, completing demographic questions (name, age, gender, race, country of birth, and education level).
Similar to Study 4, participants were informed that this is a study on how people alternate between work tasks and work breaks, and how this alternation ultimately influences performance on work tasks. Further, the experimenter informed participants that they should think of themselves as Consultants for a company called TCX Consulting, that they should think of the experimenter as their Consulting Supervisor, and that they and their coworkers would have opportunities to work together and take breaks together throughout the study. No information suggested that the study was about cultural differences.

Similar to Study 4, participants individually completed a work task in which they each provided answers to twelve consulting questions facing TCX Consulting’s clients. For example: “An advertising agency aims to incorporate various social media platforms to their new ad campaign. To do so, they want to gather information on how many times an average American goes on a social media webpage (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.) in a week. Please provide your estimate.”

Participants then relocated as a group to a break room, where they took turns answering a series of “getting to know you” questions. Participants were provided with packets containing pre-determined questions, which they were told to answer in a pre-determined order. The order enabled the “getting to know you” session to always end with the confederate providing an answer that included the manipulation of identity expression (increasing the likelihood that participants would remember the confederate’s answer due to recency effects). Specifically, the

---

16 To further facilitate the discussion, each member of the group was given at least one specific role: reader (the person who reads each question aloud), caller (the person who calls on each person when it is their turn to answer the question), timer (the person who makes sure that each person stays within an allotted timeframe for their answer to each question), and experimenter liaison (person who finds the experimenter if there are any issues). The confederate was always assigned to the role of experimenter liaison.
final question asked participants to describe one thing that they enjoyed doing recently and the confederate responded differently depending on a randomly assigned experimental condition: less-rich personal-identity expression / control (confederate discussed a music festival she attended, focusing on surface-level details such as bands playing music), less-rich cultural-identity expression (confederate discussed a Caribbean festival she attended, focusing on surface-level details such as groups playing reggae music), rich cultural-identity expression (confederate discussed a Caribbean festival she attended, focusing on meaningful details such as how going to the festival is a way of staying connected to her heritage), or rich + frustrated cultural-identity expression (confederate discussed a Caribbean festival she attended, focusing on meaningful details and frustrations, such as feeling connected to people who understand, rather than stereotype, her). Other than these key differences, as many details as possible were kept constant across conditions (see Supplemental Materials).

Participants then returned to their computers and individually completed tasks and questions that related to each of their coworkers, who were identified by name (participants’ names were emphasized to one another by using name tags, having participants say their names aloud during the “getting to know you” session, and using a racially prototypical name for the confederate). Specifically, participants completed mediation questions (measuring status perceptions, closeness, anxiety), measures of inclusive behavior (professional, social, multicultural appreciation), and manipulation check items.\(^\text{17}\) To ensure that participants were not aware that the study was focused on their responses to the confederate, participants completed

\(^{17}\) Participants also completed exploratory measures, described in Supplemental Materials.
the same questions about each coworker in most cases, however the measures reported below are focused on the questions regarding the confederate.

**Measures**

**Mediators.** Using similar methods to Study 4, participants completed the following mediation items: status perceptions (2 items: e.g., “I respect Keisha/Latoya/Lamar,” $\alpha = .66$), closeness (3 subjective closeness items, e.g., “During our interaction, I felt like I became closer to Keisha/Latoya/Lamar,” combined with a question\(^1\) assessing their willingness to share intimate information with the confederate during an anticipated one-on-one interaction that they thought would take place later in the study, e.g., “What is one emotional experience you've had with a close friend?,” $\alpha = .67$), anxiety (2 items: e.g., “I felt anxious when interacting with Keisha/Latoya/Lamar,” $\alpha = .77$). Closeness items were standardized due to differences in scales.

**Professionally inclusive behaviors.** Using similar methods to Study 4, three behavioral measures of professionally inclusive behavior were assessed:

(1) *Incorporation of coworker’s professional input* was measured by giving participants a second opportunity to supply estimates to the consulting questions, ostensibly providing them with one other coworker’s answer for each question (the confederate’s answer was ostensibly provided for three questions, although in reality the confederates answers – as well as other coworkers’ answers – were pre-determined), and measuring the extent to which participants adjusted their original answers when provided with answers from the confederate. To motivate participants to make accurate estimates, participants were told

---

\(^1\) Participants completed two questions assessing willingness to engage in intimate self-disclosure, but factor analyses indicated that the closeness factor was more cohesive when one of the questions regarding intimate self-disclosure was dropped.
that they had been entered to win a raffle and would have a higher chance of winning if they provided accurate responses

(2) *Strength of numeric promotion recommendation* was measured by enabling participants to recommend each coworker (on a 1 to 5, *do not recommend - recommend strongly*) for two promotions ($\alpha = .67$). Compared to Study 4, the stakes of participants’ promotion recommendations were increased in Study 5 by informing participants that promotions decisions would be implemented for the remainder of the study, although in reality no promotions took place.

(3) *Strength of written promotion recommendation* was assessed by enabling participants to write a free-response promotion recommendation for each coworker and assessing the strength of the recommendation for the confederate by having two coders (blind to experimental condition) rate on a scale of 1 to 9 (*extremely unlikely - extremely likely*) how likely they would be to promote the minority coworker based on each participant’s written recommendations (inter-rater reliability: $\text{ICC}_2 = .82$).

**Socially inclusiveness behaviors.** Two behavioral measures of socially inclusive behavior were assessed:

(1) *Inclusion in future social activities* was measured by giving participants an opportunity to indicate their level of interest in interacting with each coworker again during two future occasions, one during the study (rating their interest in having a one-on-one getting to know you session with each coworker) and one after the study (rating their interest in being at a future social event with each coworker). These two items were combined into one measure of inclusion in future activities ($\alpha = .68$)
(2) Similar to Study 4, inclusiveness during a social interaction was assessed by giving participants an opportunity to complete a “Nice to Meet You” card for each coworker, distributing these cards to participants’ coworkers at the end of the study, and having two Black American coders (blind to experimental condition) code messages on a 1 to 9 (extremely unlikely - extremely likely) scale with the following question in mind: “how likely is this person to want to socially interact with you if you cross paths again?” (inter-rater reliability: ICC₂ = .84).

**Multicultural appreciation.** Two measures of multicultural appreciation behavior were assessed:

(1) Multicultural appreciation behavior toward the confederate was assessed by telling participants toward the end of the study that they would conclude the study with a one-on-one “getting to know you” session with the confederate, and then asking them to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 (not at all - very much) their interest in the confederate answering two culturally-based questions during the one-on-one session (e.g., “Describe an important component of your heritage or cultural background,” \( \alpha = .83 \))

(2) Endorsement of multicultural ideology was measured using participants responses to four items on a 1 to 7 (strongly disagree - strongly agree) scale (e.g., “Employees [at TCX Consulting] should recognize and celebrate cultural and racial differences,” \( \alpha = .81 \)).

**Manipulation checks.** Using a 1 to 5 (not at all - very much so) scale, participants completed two items assessing the salience of the confederate’s cultural identity (e.g., “To what extent did Keisha/Latoya/Lamar make you aware of his/her racial background,” \( \alpha = .92 \)), three items assessing the richness of cultural-identity expression by the confederate (e.g., “To what
extent did Keisha/Latoya/Lamar provide you with insight into personal thoughts and perspectives that are shaped by his/her racial background,” $\alpha = .84$), and three items assessing the extent to which the confederate voiced culturally-based frustrations (e.g., “To what extent did Keisha/Latoya/Lamar voice frustrations relating to his/her race,” $\alpha = .87$).

**Analysis**

Because participants were in groups of 3-4 people (including the confederate), there is dependency in the data. Therefore, analyses were conducted using a multilevel model with participants nested within groups (113 groups total), treating experimental condition as a fixed effect and allowing the intercept for the dependent variable to vary by group. For each analysis, I report the fixed effect of each condition (rich, rich + frustrations, less-rich) compared to the control condition of small talk.

For each significant or marginally significant effect, I tested for indirect effects via the predicted mediators of status, closeness, and anxiety. These analyses were conducted using 2-1-1 multilevel mediation models in MPlus (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010), with participants nested within groups. Each analysis included one experimental condition (e.g., rich cultural-identity expression + frustrations) compared to the control condition of small talk, three mediators (status, closeness, and anxiety), and one dependent variable. The 2-1-1 structure of the model indicates that the independent variable (experimental condition) was treated as a level-2 variable (which varied between, not within, groups), and the mediators and dependent variables were treated as level-1 variables (which varied within group). The model included a fixed direct effect of experimental condition on the dependent variable, and indirect effects of the experimental condition on the dependent variable via each mediator. These indirect effects were comprised of a combination of fixed and random effects (including random slopes between the
mediators and dependent variable), following the 2-1-1 multilevel mediation model specifications by Hayes (2013b). Covariance between random intercepts and slopes was left at the default of zero, as allowing these effects to covary did not improve model fit.

**Results**

**Manipulation check: Salience of coworker identity.** Compared to the control condition \((M = 1.13, SD = 0.54)\), participants perceived the confederate’s cultural identity as significantly more salient in each of the cultural-identity expression conditions: rich \((M = 3.24, SD = 1.10)\), \(b = 2.11, p < .001, 95\% CI [1.76, 2.47]\), rich + frustrations \((M = 3.75, SD = 0.99)\), \(b = 2.62, p < .001, 95\% CI [2.27, 2.97]\), and less-rich \((M = 2.95, SD = 1.20)\), \(b = 1.82, p < .001, 95\% CI [1.47, 2.17]\).

**Manipulation check: Richness of cultural-identity expression.** Compared to participants in the rich cultural condition \((M = 2.39, SD = 0.92)\), participants perceived significantly less cultural richness in the less-rich cultural condition \((M = 1.89, SD = 0.74)\), \(b = -0.51, p < .001, 95\% CI [-0.78, -0.23]\), and the control condition \((M = 1.17, SD = 0.45)\), \(b = -1.22, p < .001, 95\% CI [-1.50, -0.94]\), but more cultural richness in the rich + frustrations cultural condition \((M = 3.11, SD = 1.01)\), \(b = 0.71, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.43, 0.99]\).

**Manipulation check: Culturally-based frustrations.** Compared to the rich + frustrations cultural condition \((M = 2.07, SD = 1.06)\), participants perceived significantly less culturally-based frustrations in the control condition \((M = 1.08, SD = 0.42)\), \(b = -0.99, p < .001, 95\% CI [-1.20, -0.77]\), the less-rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 1.15, SD = 0.41)\), \(b = -0.92, p < .001, 95\% CI [-1.14, -0.71]\), and the rich cultural-identity expression condition \((M = 1.18, SD = 0.39)\), \(b = -0.88, p < .001, 95\% CI [-1.10, -0.66]\).

**Professionally inclusive behaviors: Incorporation of coworkers’ professional input.** Compared to the control condition \((M = 0.36, SD = 0.18)\), participants incorporated the
confederate’s input marginally more in the rich + frustrations cultural condition \(M = 0.42, SD = 0.22\), \(b = 0.06, p = .06, 95\% CI [-0.003, 0.12]\), but not in the rich \(M = 0.39, SD = 0.18\) and less-rich \(M = 0.38, SD = 0.17\) cultural conditions, \(ps > .25\).

**Professionally inclusive behaviors: Strength of numeric recommendation.** Compared to the control condition \(M = 3.86, SD = 0.87\), participants provided marginally stronger numeric recommendations for the confederate in the rich cultural condition \(M = 4.13, SD = 0.74\), \(b = 0.27, p = .06, 95\% CI [-0.01, 0.55]\), but not the rich + frustrations \(M = 3.80, SD = 0.77\) and less-rich \(M = 3.90, SD = 0.83\) cultural conditions, \(ps > .25\).

**Professionally inclusive behaviors: Strength of written recommendation.** The experimental conditions did not differ significantly from the control condition, \(ps > .25\).

**Socially inclusive behaviors: Inclusion in future social activities.** Compared to the control condition \(M = 3.40, SD = 1.08\), participants included the confederate in future social activities to a somewhat greater extent in the rich + frustrations condition \(M = 3.73, SD = 1.01\), \(b = 0.33, p = .06, 95\% CI [-0.01, 0.67]\), but not the rich \(M = 3.65, SD = 1.02\) and less-rich \(M = 3.58, SD = 1.02\) cultural conditions, \(ps > .15\).

**Socially inclusive behaviors: Inclusion during a social interaction.** The experimental conditions did not differ significantly from the control condition, \(ps > .25\).

**Multicultural appreciation behavior toward confederate.** Compared to the control condition \(M = 3.06, SD = 1.10\), participants showed significantly greater interest in learning about the confederate’s cultural background in the rich + frustrations cultural condition \(M = 3.74, SD = 1.14\), \(b = 0.67, p = .001, 95\% CI [0.29, 1.05]\), but not the rich \(M = 3.27, SD = 1.29\) and less-rich \(M = 3.24, SD = 1.12\) cultural conditions, \(ps > .25\).
**Endorsement of multicultural ideology.** The experimental conditions did not differ significantly from the control condition, \( ps > .10 \).

**Mediation analyses.** For every significant or marginally significant effect reported above, there was no evidence of an indirect effect via status perceptions, closeness, or anxiety. However, to provide more insight into how each of the experimental conditions influenced the mediation variables, I report the results of three separate multilevel analyses (using the same analytical approach as I used for the main dependent variables) using each mediating variable as an outcome variable.

**Status perceptions.** Compared to the control condition \((M = 6.54, SD = 0.98)\), participants perceived the confederate as significantly higher status in the rich cultural condition \((M = 6.99, SD = 1.08)\), \( b = 0.45, p = .02, 95\% CI [0.09, 0.81] \), and the rich + frustrations cultural condition \((M = 6.92, SD = 1.14)\), \( b = 0.38, p = .04, 95\% CI [0.03, 0.73] \), but not in the less-rich cultural condition \((M = 6.80, SD = 1.04)\), \( b = 0.26, p = .15, 95\% CI [-0.09, 0.61] \).

**Closeness.** Compared to the control condition \((M = -0.13, SD = 0.74)\), participants sense of closeness to the confederate was marginally higher in the rich + frustrations cultural condition \((M = 0.10, SD = 0.74)\), \( b = 0.23, p = .08, 95\% CI [-0.03, 0.48] \), but not in the rich \((M = 0.04, SD = 0.79)\) and less-rich \((M = -0.05, SD = 0.55)\) cultural conditions, \( ps > .20 \).

**Anxiety.** The experimental conditions did not differ significantly from the control condition, \( ps > .15 \).

**Discussion**

Similar to Study 4, rich cultural-identity expression caused majorities to view minorities as higher status and also led majorities to provide strong numeric promotion recommendations for their minority colleagues. Interestingly, this latter effect only occurred when rich expression was positively-valenced and did not involve voicing cultural frustrations. Thus, majority-group
members are more likely to support the professional advancement of a minority coworker when they feel that they can understand the minority’s unique background. However, if majorities are aware that a minority coworker has culturally-based frustrations, they may be less willing to take action that will give the minority greater power within the organization.

Other findings regarding positively-valenced rich cultural-identity expression did not replicate in Study 5. These null findings are likely due to two methodological limitations of the present study. One limitation is that the control condition, which involved discussing personal life, was fairly similar to the cultural identity conditions, thus providing too conservative of a test of the effects of rich cultural-identity expression. Indeed, in all conditions the confederate discussed attending a music festival, and the rich cultural condition simply specified the cultural nature of the festival and some of the unique cultural meaning associated with attending the festival (see Supplemental Materials for full experimental manipulations). In addition, prior to the experimental manipulation, the confederate answered two other “nice to meet you” questions in an identical manner across all conditions. Future studies may need to provide greater distinctions between the control and comparison conditions (similar to Studies 2 and 4 in the present work) in order to detect the benefits of rich cultural-identity expression.

Another limitation of the present study was that the participants interacted in groups rather than as dyads. This group interaction may dilute the experimental effects for a couple of reasons. First, it decreases the likelihood that participants are attending to what any specific person said and can remember the details of what the confederate said during the experimental manipulation. Second, it makes what the confederate shared seem less tailored to each individual participant. One of the benefits of meaningful self-disclosure is that it signals to the recipient of the information that she is trusted by the discloser (Miller, 2002). This signaling likely plays an
important role in helping the recipient feel closer to and less anxious around the discloser. However, in a group setting, recipients may assume that a discloser is simply sharing information because he is outgoing or because he feels close to other members of the group, and thus may not conclude that the information shared is an indicator of trust and closeness directed toward them personally. Thus, perhaps unsurprisingly, participants in the present study did not feel closer to or less anxious around the minority confederate in the rich cultural-identity expression condition that was positively valenced and, consequently, did not behave more inclusively toward the confederate in many of the ways found in previous studies.

Interestingly, in some cases, the rich + frustrations cultural-identity expression condition was uniquely successful at causing participants to behave more inclusively toward the minority confederate. This may seem surprising because the negatively-valenced nature of the information shared could have potentially made participants feel anxious and therefore caused them to behave less inclusively. Indeed, a manipulation check confirmed that participants perceived the confederate as voicing substantially more culturally-based frustrations in this condition. However, another manipulation check also demonstrated that the rich + frustrations condition was significantly richer in content compared to all other conditions. This particularly elevated level of richness may be needed to break through the noise of group interactions and allow others in the group to feel as though they have been confided in by the confederate even though the information was not necessarily directed toward them individually. There may have even been an added benefit of focusing on frustrations in a group context, as this context may reduce the burden of needing to personally respond to this sensitive information in an effective manner. Future studies can further examine the potential power of different forms of rich cultural-identity
expression, and whether these different forms of expression are more or less effective depending on the context in which they are shared.

**General Discussion**

The present research provides promising evidence that cultural-identity expression by a minority-group employee can encourage inclusive behaviors by majority-group colleagues in diverse work contexts. I distinguish between two forms of cultural expression: rich cultural-identity expression – which provides greater insight into a minority coworker’s culturally-based thoughts and feelings – and less-rich cultural-identity expression – which focuses on surface-level details related to a minority’s culture. Studies 1a and 1b reveals that minorities fear cultural-identity expression in the abstract, but, after concretely considering how cultural-identity expression may unfold with a specific majority-group colleague, have an intuition that cultural-identity expression can elicit inclusive responses from their colleague. However, minorities for the most part do not differentiate between different forms of cultural-identity expression (rich versus less-rich) when anticipating the potential benefits of such expression.

The results of the remaining studies (summarized in Table 1) demonstrate that *rich* cultural-identity expression was most effective at increasing majority-group coworkers’ inclusive behaviors. Relative to control conditions, rich cultural-identity expression by a minority employee led majority-group coworkers to provide stronger professional recommendations for the minority colleague (Studies 4 and 5), incorporate the minority colleague’s professional input to a greater extent (Studies 2 and 4), show greater social engagement with the minority colleague (Studies 2 and 4), show greater interest in learning about the minority coworker’s cultural background (Studies 2 and 4), and indicate somewhat greater endorsement of a multicultural ideology that would benefit minority coworkers in general by encouraging employees to
celebrate – rather than suppress – their differences (Study 2). Study 5 provided evidence that some of these benefits can be achieved even when rich cultural-identity expression involves voicing culturally-based frustrations. The power of rich cultural-identity expression is its ability to increase majorities’ status perceptions of a minority colleague and enable majorities to feel closer to and less anxious around a minority colleague.

Although less-rich cultural-identity expression often did not influence inclusive behavior, it still prove beneficial on occasion. For example, in some situations, sharing surface-level information about a minority cultural identity (e.g., the differences in one’s appearance as a result of wearing Afro-centric hairstyles) increased majority-group coworkers’ interest in the minority’s background (Studies 2 and 4) and willingness to write stronger recommendations for the minority (Study 4). Thus, encouragingly, cultural-identity expression can at times be effective even at somewhat lower levels of richness.

Rich non-cultural personal expression was at times effective at increasing majorities’ inclusive behaviors but, in other cases, failed to elicit the same levels of inclusion that rich cultural-identity expression achieved. Specifically, compared to rich cultural-identity expression, rich personal expression (in Studies 2 and 4) was less consistently able to make majority-group employees incorporate their minority coworker’s professional input (doing so in Study 2, but not Study 4), feel closer to and socially include their minority coworker (doing so marginally at best; Study 2), and appreciate the cultural background of their minority coworker (doing so in Study 2, but not Study 4). Rich personal expression was also unable to influence majorities’ endorsement of multicultural ideology within their organization. Thus, counterintuitively, rich expression was most effectively when highlighting a cultural difference rather than focusing on other personal information.
The present studies also suggest some potential boundary conditions associated with rich cultural-identity expression. In particular, rich cultural-identity expression was not effective in Study 3, perhaps due to an elevated focus on broad intergroup tensions (such as the Black Lives Matters movement and the 2016 presidential election). Coupled with the findings in Study 5 that showed that rich cultural-identity expression is beneficial when voicing more personalized cultural frustrations, the present studies suggest that rich cultural-identity expression may be an effective outlet when focusing on personal difficulties that do not implicate majority group members, but may be less effective when highlighting broad societal issues that are potentially relevant to the majority-group member. Study 5 also suggests that it is important to consider the context in which cultural-identity expression occurs, with group interactions perhaps being less conducive to making connections through expressing cultural differences. Importantly, however, across all studies, no form of cultural-identity expression (regardless of valence or level of richness) decreased majorities’ inclusive behaviors relative to simply discussing work or engaging in small talk. These findings provide reassurance that, even if cultural-identity expression does not increase inclusive behavior in every situation, at very least it does not jeopardize inclusion as minorities fear when considering cultural-identity expression in the abstract. Overall, the present studies provide promising evidence that cultural-identity expression – particularly when high in richness – is effective under certain conditions, and suggest fruitful future directions for examining the nuances that can enable such expression to be most powerful.
Table 1. Summary of key findings across studies regarding the effects of different forms of expression on different types of inclusive behaviors. In the left column are the study numbers, followed by each form of expression of interest (with the exception of emotion expression, all forms of expression are identity expression), and the control condition indicated in parentheses. In the headers are the dependent variables for each study: “professional” indicates professionally inclusive behaviors, “social” indicates socially inclusive behaviors, “multicultural app. to coworker” indicates multicultural appreciation toward a specific minority coworker, “multicultural ideology” indicates endorsement of multicultural ideology on the organizational level, and specific sub-types of dependent variable are indicated after a colon (e.g., in Study 5, the results shown for professionally inclusive behavior are specifically for the strength of numeric recommendations written on behalf of the confederate on the left, and level of incorporation of confederate’s professional input on the right). In the body of the table, “significant” indicates a significant increase relative to the control condition ($p < .05$), “(M)” indicates a marginally significant increase relative to the control condition ($p < .10$), and “n.s.” indicate a non-significant effect ($p > .10$). The asterisk (*) represents moderation by richness, such that an effect is particularly strong when high in richness. Any variables not shown has non-significant effects across all experimental conditions. More in-depth results for each study are provided in table format in the Appendix.
Table 1 (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and Experimental Manipulation</th>
<th>Results for Inclusive Behaviors in Each Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural (Work)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural (Work)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion (Work)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural (Work)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural (Work)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion (Work)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional: Written Rec. / Incorporate Input</td>
<td>Social: During Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Work)</td>
<td>Significant / (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Work)</td>
<td>Significant / n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional: Numeric Rec. / Incorporate Input</td>
<td>Social: Future Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural (Small talk)</td>
<td>(M) / n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural + Frustrations (Small talk)</td>
<td>n.s. / (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural (Small talk)</td>
<td>n.s. / n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103
**Theoretical Contributions**

The present work illuminates the critical role of employees’ everyday interpersonal behaviors in making diversity successful through cultivating inclusion from the bottom up in organizations. Scholars have substantiated the power of climates and cultures of inclusion to enhance employees’ psychological outcomes, group functioning, and employee retention (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hewlin, 2009; Nishii, 2013; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Ramarajan et al., 2008). This past work typically takes stock of the level of inclusion within an organizations as a starting point for understanding downstream consequences. The present paper makes an important contribution to this literature by examining how a climate of inclusion is cultivated in the first place. The findings of this research provide evidence that minority employees’ behaviors, in the form of cultural-identity expression, can effectively elicit majority-group coworkers’ inclusive behaviors, which are foundational components of an inclusive climate. I thus extend the research on climate of inclusion by shedding light on the interpersonal behaviors that contribute to such climates, and in doing so, empower employees to harness – rather than suppress – their differences. More broadly, this work extends research on diversity by demonstrating how diversity is helped or hindered not only by whether and to what extent differences are present (Blau, 1977; Teachman, 1980; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998), but also whether and in what ways those differences are made salient through behaviors such as cultural-identity expression. Such research on identity expression and salience is an important step toward disentangling past findings in diversity research and identifying the conditions under which diversity is beneficial or detrimental in organizations (van Knippenberg et al., 2004).

The theoretical development and conceptual articulation of inclusive behaviors is another contribution of the present research. While the inclusion literature has tended to focus on constructs relating to people’s experiences and perceptions of inclusion (Nishii, 2013; Pelled et
al., 1999; Roberson, 2006; Shore et al., 2011), the present work is the first to synthesize common themes from past work in order to explicitly propose a unifying framework of inclusive behaviors. The proposed three-pronged conceptualization of inclusive behaviors (professional, social, and multicultural appreciation) presents a well-rounded picture of the distinct ways in which employees’ everyday actions and decisions can foster, or detract from, a sense of inclusion in organizations. Moreover, the present findings provide initial support for the importance of capturing all three types of inclusive behavior. For example, minorities who engaged in less-rich cultural-identity expression elicited inclusive behaviors on one or two dimensions, but never on all three. The three types of inclusive behavior thus provide a fuller picture of the inclusion-related tradeoffs that employees make when interacting at work.

The present work also highlights the potential to conceptualize – and achieve – a more collectively beneficial climate of inclusion, in the sense that such climates are beneficial for both minority and majority groups. The irony of inclusion is that the conditions that foster inclusion for one group often detract from a sense of inclusion for other groups. Whereas minorities fare better in contexts that recognize and value cultural differences, majorities feel most comfortable in a colorblind atmosphere in which cultural differences are suppressed (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Plaut et al., 2011; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2007). In light of these divergent perspectives, researchers are increasingly interested in establishing inclusive conditions that are welcoming for both minority and majority groups (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Plaut et al., 2011). The present work proposes that rich cultural-identity expression is a powerful tool for fostering collectively beneficial “win-wins,” empowering minorities to express their true selves (a necessary component of multiculturalism) while eliciting more inclusive behaviors from their colleagues, enabling majorities to feel closer to and less anxious around their minority colleagues.
(addressing their concerns with exclusion in multicultural environments), and encouraging
majorities to endorse a multicultural ideology that celebrates differences within their
organization.

Rich cultural-identity expression also has the potential to counteract culturally-based
stereotypes and biases in the workplace. For example, past research suggests that employees
have a bias against Afrocentric hairstyles, compared to Eurocentric styles, and consider
employees with Afro-centric hairstyles to have lower chances of professional success (Opie &
Phillips, 2015). Yet, in the present work, rich cultural-identity expression in which a minority
employee discussed her decision to wear her hair in Afrocentric styles, rather than Eurocentric
styles, led majorities to view the minority as higher status, write her a stronger professional
recommendation, incorporate her professional input to a greater degree, write her more socially
inclusive messages, and express greater interest in learning about her background. The present
work also found that minorities can counteract biases more explicitly through rich cultural-
identity expression that highlights frustrations with being stereotyped. This finding is especially
encouraging in light of an alternative possibility – that it may behoove minorities to keep such
concerns to themselves lest they stir the pot and exacerbate their circumstances.

By clarifying the benefits of sharing cultural versus non-cultural personal information
about the self, the present work makes an important contribution to research on self-expression
in intergroup relations. While intimate personal sharing has been proven effective in intergroup
interactions, the evidence for such effects focuses either on intimate expression in a very broad
sense (without differentiating between cultural and non-cultural expression; Harrison et al.,
1998; Shelton et al., 2010; Turner & Feddes, 2011), or on expression of emotions and other
aspects of the self that are not specific to one’s culture (Ensari & Miller, 2002; Turner et al.,
2007). While this past research has highlighted the advantages of sharing deeper non-cultural information that has the potential to highlight *similarities* (Harrison et al., 1998), the present work is the first to demonstrate that employees may benefit at least as much from expressing meaningful aspects of one’s *differences*.

The benefits of expressing cultural identity differences have important implications for research on identity management. Employees are constantly assessing how to best manage their social identities at work (Roberts, 2005), including whether and how to express their identities to coworkers who differ from themselves (Phillips et al., 2009). These considerations are particularly salient for employees from traditionally underrepresented or marginalized social identity groups (Clair et al., 2005; Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Hewlett et al., 2005; Ragins, 2008; Yoshino, 2006). Past work on identity management has been primarily theoretical, highlighting how members of marginalized groups – including cultural and racial minority groups – often anticipate negative consequences from expressing their identities to culturally dissimilar colleagues (Clair et al., 2005; Dumas et al., 2008; Phillips et al., 2009; Ragins, 2008; Yoshino, 2006). However, empirically testing these assumptions is critical, as the present research demonstrates that while minorities do indeed fear cultural-identity expression in the abstract, they actually expect their majority-group colleagues to behave *more* – rather than *less* – inclusively when considering concrete instances of cultural-identity expression. These findings provide a more nuanced account of individuals’ thought processes and decisions regarding identity expression.

The present work also builds on and extends identity management theorizing about the potential of identity management for “differentiating” (Clair et al., 2005) and “restoring positive distinctiveness” to (Roberts, 2005) a minority identity. The construct of richness is introduced to
this literature as a way of organizing identity management strategies that have been grouped together in previous work (Clair et al., 2005; Roberts, 2005), but range substantially in richness – from subtly claiming an identity through displaying identity markers on one’s clothes (low in richness, Bell & Nkomo, 2001) to boldly challenging cultural assumptions held by the majority-group (potentially high in richness, Creed & Scully, 2000). These actions may be highly successful in achieving certain goals, such as achieving authenticity or changing others’ perceptions and beliefs. However, the goal of promoting inclusive behavior is unique from these other goals, as it requires a behavioral change on the part of others. The present research suggests that when it comes to encouraging more inclusive behavior from others, it may be worthwhile to distinguish the strategies which are high in richness. Expressions that are high in richness not only inform others of one’s authentic self and change other’s perceptions – they also foster closeness and mitigate anxiety, resulting in a net increase in inclusive behavior. The present work thus expands upon prior research by proposing a new dimension that can be used to identify strategies that are uniquely suited for achieving a commonly-held goal of inclusion.

**Conclusion**

The success of diversity hinges upon creating a sense of inclusion among people who differ on critical dimensions like culture. The present research demonstrates the power of minority cultural-identity expression – particularly when high in richness – to encourage inclusive behavior in majority-group members, in part because such expression increases majorities’ comfort with their minority-group colleagues. The present findings provide promising evidence that encouraging employees to express their true selves may be the key to cultivating a collectively beneficial sense of inclusion and ultimately harnessing diversity.
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CHAPTER 2.

Sacrificing Status for Social Harmony:
Concealing Relatively High Status Identities from One’s Peers

Rachel D. Arnett
Jim Sidanius

Abstract
Given strong human desires to be respected and understood, we demonstrate a surprising
tendency: individuals consistently conceal high status identities (sacrificing status and
authenticity) to preserve social harmony. We experimentally demonstrate that, contrary to third-
party observers’ expectations (Study 1), individuals were more likely to conceal relatively high
status identities, compared to similar status identities, from their peers (Studies 2-6), and even
expected to conceal in professional contexts (Study 4). Concealment was an effort to mitigate
interpersonal threats (to the self, others, and belonging; Study 5), and occurred even when
individuals could not be blamed for disclosure (Study 6). Thus, individuals have a persistent
discomfort with elevating their status above their peers. We conclude by considering the
promising implications of identifying conditions that encourage high status individuals to
prioritize shared goals of social harmony, as well as caveats regarding how prioritizing
interpersonal motives (i.e., through identity concealment) may inadvertently reinforce inequality.
Introduction

When an individual belongs to a relatively prestigious group, is he likely to make this identity known or keep it to himself? Scholarly work delineating the human desire to be known and understood suggests the former, stating “If people are to succeed in laying claim to a particular identity, it is critical that they look the part. By ... acquiring a grandiose title, or accumulating a curriculum vitae that is too fat to fit into a normal-sized briefcase, people may leave their interaction partners few doubts concerning who they are and how they expect to be treated” (Swann, 1983: 37). This quote represents a common intuition: people readily disclose identities that have the potential to elevate their status above others. This assumption is rooted in the notion that greater status affords greater opportunities (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), making high status identity disclosure appealing and perhaps even prudent.

While high status identity disclosure may have enticing benefits associated with authenticity and status, such disclosure may also have negative interpersonal ramifications. Revealing relatively high status identities highlights differences in where people stand in a broader societal hierarchy, and thus has the potential to trigger concerns with a host of negative social processes, including discrimination, conflict, and homophily (Allport, 1954; M. McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Because these harmful dynamics disadvantage those lower in the social hierarchy, scholars have focused almost exclusively on how concerns with these interpersonal processes lead individuals to conceal relatively low status identities from their peers (Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005; Dumas, Rothbard, & Phillips, 2008; Goffman, 1963; Hewlett, Luce, & West, 2005; Yoshino, 2006). Yet, given that high status individuals also experience interpersonal concerns in cross-status interactions (Blascovich, Mendes, Hunter, Lickel, & Kowai-Bell, 2001; Vorauer, Hunter, Main,
& Roy, 2000), surprisingly little is known about whether individuals manage these concerns by concealing relatively high status identities. This lacunae in our knowledge has resulted in many open questions. Does the burden of easing cross-status interactions fall squarely on the shoulders of people lower in the social hierarchy, with them concealing status-related differences while their more advantaged counterparts proudly trumpet their true selves and reap the benefits? Or, are high status individuals also motivated to conceal status-related identities, sacrificing personal benefits in order to facilitate social harmony with their peers?

The present paper delves into this understudied realm of high status identity concealment, examining whether individuals intentionally conceal relatively high status identities, more so than relatively similar status identities, when interacting with peers. A professor may decide to tell a fellow parent that he is a teacher, or a student from a prestigious school may withhold his affiliation when meeting a new acquaintance. Past theoretical work has considered the possibility that high status identity concealment takes place (Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009). An open question still remains regarding the frequency of such behavior given the potential for status-related incentives to outweigh interpersonal concerns, leading to disclosure. Further investigation into high status identity concealments’ psychological underpinnings and boundary conditions can provide valuable insight into when and why such concealment occurs, illuminating whether this behavior is rare or whether this behavior is in fact quite common.

We propose that high status identity concealment is a prevalent, deeply-ingrained behavior that transpires in many contexts. The foundation of this prediction is that a multitude of factors, several of which have been absent from previous theorizing, are likely to work together to encourage concealment. An individual may conceal a relatively high status identity in order to shield oneself from interpersonal threats that are unique to people in high status positions (threats
to the self, e.g., concerns with being envied and eliciting hostility), protect peers from the very same threats that have been shown to prompt low status identity concealment (threats to others, e.g., concerns that the lower status peer will feel stigmatized; Goffman, 1963), and mitigate concerns that are common to both parties (threats to belonging, e.g., concerns that the two individuals will seem too different to get along). Thus, we expect individuals to perceive high status identity concealment as a means of avoiding not only self-relevant threats, but also threats that are relevant to their peers, suggesting that the appeal of concealment is the ability to promote a mutual feeling of social harmony in which both parties feel at ease in the interaction. These benefits of fostering harmony are expected to outweigh concerns with downplaying status and forgoing authenticity, resulting in concealment. The present paper examines these predictions regarding high status identity concealment and its mechanisms, as well as potential moderators of concealment pertaining to context (i.e., social versus professional settings) and perceptions of intentionality (i.e., whether disclosure is perceived as an intentional act by the high status individual). Figure 18 provides a summary of key processes that we investigate.

Understanding the nature and scope of high status identity concealment speaks volumes to how people prioritize basic human motives: the desire for status (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015) and authenticity (Swann, 1983) on the one hand, and social harmony on the other (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). To the extent that individuals sacrifice status and authenticity in order to promote social harmony, the present paper makes important advances in understanding how members of high status groups – whose interests are often depicted as conflicting with members of lower status groups (Dahling, Wiley, Fishman, & Loihle, 2016; Hideg & Ferris, 2014; Shteynberg, Leslie, Knight, & Mayer, 2011) – can be motivated to advance a common goal of social harmony with their cross-status peers. To determine whether
this may be the case, we consider in greater detail the personal costs of concealment that may make such behavior seem unlikely at first glance, followed by the manifold interpersonal benefits that may ultimately make concealment the preferred behavioral choice.

Figure 18. Process of high status identity concealment, and potential moderators.

High Status Identity Concealment: Costs for the Self

Previous research suggests that high status identity concealment may be unlikely due to several potential benefits to disclosure and corresponding costs of concealment. The status of an individual’s identities has implications for his or her status as an individual (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972), meaning his or her ability to achieve a fundamental human desire for respect and prestige in the eyes of others (Anderson et al., 2015). If a man at a conference shares that he is a pharmaceutical technician and asks a surgeon about her profession, she may feel most comfortable replying, “I work at a hospital.” But if she is mistaken for a nurse’s aide, she will be
viewed as lower status and, consequently, less competent (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002); her opinion will be discounted (Berger et al., 1972); and she will receive less help from others (Van Der Vegt, Bunderson, & Oosterhof, 2006). Recognition that one has concealed an identity or allowed the identity to be combined with a larger group (e.g., hospital employees) may call into question the identity’s value and distinctiveness, diminishing a positive source of pride and self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Hiding a part of oneself is likely to feel inauthentic and dirty (Gino, Kouchaki, & Galinsky, 2015), undermining a desire to be known and understood by others (Swann, 1983). Thus, high status identity concealment can be costly in terms of sacrificing status (Do others value me?) and authenticity (Do others see me for who I truly am?).

High status identity concealment may seem particularly unlikely due to a tendency for people who occupy high status positions to prioritize self-serving goals and behaviors over more interpersonally-oriented goals and behaviors. People with higher status and greater access to power are more accustomed to standing out and expressing their authentic selves, and thus concealment is likely to seem unnatural to them (Kifer, Heller, Perunovic, & Galinsky, 2013; Kraus, Piff, Mendoza-Denton, Rheinschmidt, & Keltner, 2012; Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007). Being viewed as lower status due to concealment may be experienced as a form of status loss, triggering particularly adverse reactions among people who are accustomed to being highly regarded by others (Blader & Chen, 2011; Marr & Thau, 2014). Moreover, while highlighting status differences may have negative ramifications for the lower status counterpart, such other-related concerns may be unnoticed or ignored by high status individuals due to their tendency to be less socially engaged and communally-oriented than lower status peers (Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus et al., 2012).
This initial evidence suggests that high status identity disclosure is likely to be deemed unproblematic, whereas high status identity concealment is likely to be experienced as unfamiliar and perhaps even aversive. Yet, to gain a more complete understanding of concealment decisions, one must not only consider these personal factors but also several interpersonal concerns.

**High Status Identity Concealment: Benefits for Social Harmony**

Despite the advantages of disclosure and related costs associated with concealment, we consider whether individuals are inclined to conceal a relatively high status identity due to the potential for the identity to activate interpersonal threats, which we consider to be negative thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that undermine social harmony. Humans are fundamentally social beings who thrive when they are in harmony with others, and struggle cognitively and emotionally when social support is diminished or threatened (Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005; Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). One potential threat to social relations stems from the presence of status differences, which can suggest that one individual in an interaction is higher in the social hierarchy and thus more deserving of privileges and opportunities compared to the other (Blascovich et al., 2001; Fiske et al., 2002; Leary, Jongman-Sereno, & Diebels, 2014; Phillips et al., 2009; Shelton & Richeson, 2005). For decades, scholars have considered how status differences activate threats in lower status individuals in terms of how they will be viewed and treated by others (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Goffman, 1963; Major & O’Brien, 2005). Since knowledge of status differences is a prerequisite for these threats to occur, there is also a long-standing tradition of understanding how individuals attempt to minimize interpersonal threats through concealing their lower status identities (Clair et al., 2005; Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Hewlett et al., 2005; Yoshino,
Yet, despite the fact that high status individuals also experience threat in cross-status interactions (Blascovich et al., 2001; Vorauer et al., 2000), and are capable of understanding others’ concerns in these interactions (Todd & Galinsky, 2014), surprisingly little scholarly inquiry has examined whether interpersonal threat concerns are sufficiently worrisome to prompt high status identity concealment. One exception is Phillips and colleagues (2009), whose theoretical work proposed that individuals may be motivated to conceal high status identities and touched upon threat-related drivers. Building on this work by further examining threat-based mechanisms has the potential to provide valuable insight into the frequency of concealment behavior.

We provide a framework of motives driving high status identity concealment, focusing on three types of interpersonal threats that are expected to work in tandem: threats to the self, others, and belonging. Because these interpersonal threats are not only relevant to the focal high status individual, but also the individual’s peer, they collectively pose a threat to social harmony. We propose that these interpersonal threats are extensive enough to make high status identity concealment a highly pervasive behavior. Given the centrality of these interpersonal threats to our theorizing, we elaborate upon each threat – threat to the self, threat to others, and threat to belonging – below.

Interpersonal threats to the self refer to potential disruptions to social harmony that stem from negative thoughts, emotions, or behaviors directed from another person toward the self. Consistent with previous research, we expect concerns with encountering envy to be one potential self-relevant threat prompting concealment (Phillips et al., 2009), and relate this to a broader constellation of threats to the self. Revealing a relatively high status identity highlights a group membership that, in society, is associated with greater status, competence, and privileges
(Fiske et al., 2002). For the relatively lower status peer, this disparity has the potential to trigger envy, defined as discontent stemming from the recognition that another person has superior qualities or achievements in a self-relevant domain (Feather & Sherman, 2002; Parrott & Smith, 1993). In addition to envy, concerns with stereotypes may play a role in concealment. Similar to low status group members’ concerns with being negatively stereotyped (Goffman, 1963; Phillips et al., 2009; Steele & Aronson, 1995), high status individuals may be concerned with negative stereotypes such as being presumed cold or snobby (Fiske et al., 2002; Vorauer, Main, & O’Connell, 1998). Combined together, concerns with envy and negative stereotype can trigger fears of hostile envy (also referred to as resentment) which derive from a sense of injustice – either objective or subjective – stemming from the perception that another person is unfairly advanced or that the self is unfairly disadvantaged (Feather & Sherman, 2002; Neeley, 2013; Smith & Kim, 2007). Hostile envy is likely to occur when a high status individual is perceived as cold and unfriendly (Fiske et al., 2002), and can make one feel justified in engaging in hostile behaviors toward the high status person or desiring to see that person fail (Cikara & Fiske, 2012; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007; Feather, 2008; Feather & Sherman, 2002; Smith, Parrott, Ozer, & Moniz, 1994). For an individual deciding whether to reveal a high status identity, it may be difficult to predict whether disclosure will elicit these threatening reactions – perhaps because she is unsure whether she will come across as sufficiently warm or whether the person will feel as though he has been unfairly disadvantaged in a particular domain – leading to the conclusion that concealment is the safest choice. Thus, a doctor who is interacting with a person with a less prestigious title and educational background may think: *If I conceal that I am a doctor, I won’t have to worry about them resenting me or hoping to see me fail.*
Threats to others stem from stigmatization – devaluing another due to his or her identity – and concerns with activating negative psychological experiences in relatively lower status peers (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Goffman, 1963; Major & O’Brien, 2005; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Disclosing a high status identity can highlight a peer’s relative low status, raising alarms that he or she is likely to be negatively stereotyped, looked down upon, discriminated against, or excluded (Cuddy et al., 2007; Festinger, 1954; Greenberg, Ashton-James, & Ashkanasy, 2007; Lewis & Sherman, 2003; Link & Phelan, 2001; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Even if the peer is not worried about treatment by the discloser, being in a relatively lower status position may trigger negative feelings of self-doubt (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Smith et al., 1994), which can be detrimental to cognitive functioning and performance (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Thus, concealing may be an attempt to protect others from harmful questions about their self-worth. If I conceal that I am a doctor, I won’t make others feel down on themselves or uncomfortable.

Threat to belonging is a third mechanism concerning whether there is sufficient overlap in the individuals’ identities and lives to form a solid foundation for interaction. Highlighting a relatively high status identity compared to a peer may trigger questions about whether the two parties have sufficient common knowledge or interests to relate to one another and develop a close-knit relationship (Blau, 1977; J. M. McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; M. McPherson et al., 2001). Concealing may be a means of quelling such threats to belonging. If I conceal that I am a doctor, they won’t assume that I have no interest in watching sports or getting to know them.

In sum, while there are costs associated with concealing relatively high status identities – both in terms sacrificing status and authenticity – there are also benefits in terms of mitigating an
array of interpersonal threats (relating to the self, others, and belonging). We expect the benefits of concealing relatively high status identities to overshadow the costs, making concealment a likely behavior (see Figure 18). To the extent that high status individuals conceal not only for their own sake, but also for the sake of others, we consider this behavior to be an effort to protect a collective feeling of social harmony. In line with the notion that concealment is driven by a desire to preserve social harmony for the self and others, it is worth examining whether this behavior is particularly likely for individuals who have a strong desire for belonging and are especially attuned to social cues (Pickett, Gardner, & Knowles, 2004). In addition to this individual difference, two other factors that may influence concealment are outlined below.

Potential Moderators of Concealment Decisions

Given that concealment decisions are a matter of weighing the relative costs (i.e., status and authenticity) versus benefits (i.e., social harmony) of concealment, it is worth examining how concealment decisions may change depending on factors that shift this relative cost/benefit assessment. We consider how the costs and benefits associated with concealment may differ depending on 1) whether one is in a social or professional setting and 2) whether the disclosure is perceived as an intentional act by the high status individual. Figure 18 summarizes how these factors may influence concealment. By examining each of these potential moderators, we not only provide insight into when high status identity concealment occurs, but also why.

Influence of Context: Social versus Professional

Whether an individual is in a social or professional context may play a role in determining concealment decisions due to shifts in the perceived costs of concealment, particularly relating to sacrificing status. Status has many benefits that are unique to professional settings, such as higher compensation, better performance evaluations, and greater access to
professional opportunities and resources (Belliveau, O’Reilly, & Wade, 1996; Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992; Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). In social settings (e.g., lunch with friends) and even mundane professional situations (e.g., casual interactions with coworkers), the potential for status to enable a person to achieve these goals is likely to be low or moderate, making the costs of concealment minimal. However, in a highly competitive professional context, the costs of concealing status are dramatically higher, potentially costing oneself a desired promotion or raise.

As a result of these differences in concealment costs, we expect to find that the relative status of one’s peers influences high status identity concealment in everyday social and professional settings, but not highly competitive professional contexts. If this hypothesis is supported, it suggests that individuals carefully weigh the costs of concealment against the benefits, straying away from concealment when it is too costly in terms of status loss. If this hypothesis is not supported, it suggests that high status identity concealment is a robust effect driven by a fundamental discomfort with disrupting social harmony through status differences, regardless of the personal costs of status loss.

Influence of Perceived Intentionality

Another factor that may influence concealment decisions is whether disclosure is likely to be perceived as an intentional act by the focal high status individual. Disclosure may seem highly intentional when an individual verbally reveals his identity, but unintentional when announced by another person (e.g., a lawyer’s friend could inform others that she is a defense attorney), exposed by an inanimate information source (e.g., a slide show at an orientation session may include background information on all new employees), or inadvertently revealed by the self (e.g., an individual drops a folder that reveals his affiliation with a prestigious university).
Whether the disclosure is perceived as intentional or unintentional has implications for whether identity concealment will be seen as beneficial. This is because high status individuals’ intentions are often monitored closely, with negative intentions often serving as justification for blame. Indeed, members of high status groups are often readily blamed for a host of social issues (e.g., the recent financial crisis) due to the perception that they are capable of exerting harm (competent) and willing to do so (cold; Cuddy et al., 2007; Glick, 2005). Similarly, if a focal individual discloses a high status identity, the content of the identity casts him as a capable person (competent), but perceptions of intentional disclosure may be interpreted as a willingness to violate social norms of equality (cold; Fiske et al., 2002; Haslam & Fiske, 1999; Richard H Smith & Kim, 2007). Being perceived as competent and cold within the interaction is likely to result in others blaming the high status individual for any discomfort that they experience as a result of the disclosure. Further, these key ingredients of perceived competence, coldness, and culpability often provide the necessary fuel needed to evoke resentment and provoke hostility (Cuddy et al., 2007). Sensing this possibility, an individual may view concealment as particularly attractive when their disclosure will be perceived as intentional. In contrast, concealment may be deemed unnecessary when disclosure is likely to be perceived as unintentional; in this case, the high status individual is unlikely to be blamed for the identity coming to the fore, potentially achieving an image of being highly competent without seeming cold or eliciting hostility. Supporting this notion, having a third party disclose favorable information on one’s behalf (thus decreasing intentionality) has been characterized as a “superior strategy” for being seen as competent while circumventing backlash from others (Jones & Pittman, 1982: 245).

Whether perceived intentionality influences an individual’s concealment of relatively high status identities sheds light upon the mechanisms underlying this decision process. When
perceived intentionality is low (e.g., when disclosure can be attributed to an external source) and the high status individual is less likely to be blamed for disclosure, it is possible that his perceived threats to self will be reduced (i.e., threats regarding eliciting hostility), thereby decreasing high status identity concealment. This finding would suggest that high status identity concealment decisions are driven less by threats regarding one’s elevated status being known per se (and the manifold interpersonal implications stemming from these differences being known, including threats to others and belonging), but are primarily driven by concerns with being blamed for intentionally elevating one’s status through the act of disclosure (and the downstream threats that are specific to the self).

While the above behavioral pattern is plausible, we predicted the opposite: individuals will view concealment of a relatively high status identity as beneficial and preferable even when disclosure is likely to be perceived as unintentional. There are two potential reasons why perceived unintentionality may have no impact on concealment preferences. The first possibility is that perceived unintentionality will decrease concerns with blame for disclosure, which in turn decreases perceived threats to self (i.e., threats regarding eliciting hostility); however, nonetheless, the persistence of other threats (i.e., threats to other and belonging) will be sufficiently strong to maintain a high level of concealment even when threats to the self are minimized. A second possibility is that perceived unintentionality will decrease concerns with blame for disclosure, but these decreased concerns with blame will not decrease perceived threats to self; this outcome would suggest that even when there is an objectively lower possibility of self-directed threats, the subjective fear of threats to self may be just as strong, leading to persistent concealment.
In sum, investigating the influence of intentionality, as well as the context in which disclosure takes place (social versus professional), provides valuable insight into when high status identity concealment occurs as well as the psychological mechanisms dictating concealment behavior.

**Overview of Studies**

In our first of six studies, we test a fundamental assumption of this paper: that third party observers generally expect individuals to disclose, rather than conceal, relatively high status identities. In the remaining five experiments, we test our main hypothesis that individuals are more likely to conceal an identity that conveys relatively high status, as opposed to relatively similar status, compared to a peer. We first test this hypothesis in a field setting where participant status varied naturally (Study 2), followed by a lab setting using participants with a common high status identity (Study 3). Study 4 tested the hypothesis that relative status will influence high status identity concealment in everyday social and professional contexts, but not highly competitive professional contexts. Study 5 examined whether our predicted mechanisms regarding interpersonal threat (to the self, others, and belonging) underlie high status identity concealment, and whether concealment is more common among people who are particularly concerned with belonging. Finally, Study 6 investigated whether individuals continue to conceal relatively high status when disclosure is perceived as unintentional, potentially lowering threats to self and thus the likelihood of concealment.

Throughout these studies, we focused on identities related to education because of their uniqueness as important, status-relevant aspects of the self-concept that can be easily concealed. Education is among a small subset of social identities (i.e., race, gender) that form the basis of status differentiation among individuals (Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980). However,
compared to other social identities such as race, status differences in terms of education are generally very explicit – as evidenced by public ranking systems (e.g., U.S. News and World Report) – making individuals acutely aware of the status implications of disclosing an educational identity. Education is also suitable for the present research because it is easily concealed: it is not a permanent part of one’s appearance and, after graduation, there is likely no instance in which a person will be required to reveal his education through aspects of his appearance. At the same time, there are many instance in which a person may wish to make his or her education known. Educational affiliations can be a strong source of identity and pride that manifests themselves through impassioned sports competitions, prominently displayed diplomas, and proudly-worn paraphernalia. In professional contexts, educational identities are a common source of interpersonal differentiation that can influence an individual’s perceived qualifications and access to professional networks (J. M. McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; Rivera, 2011). Thus, although education may not be as chronically salient as other social identities, individuals are likely to find themselves in many situations in which they would like to make this (often hidden) part of their self-concept known and must decide whether to disclose or conceal.

In addition to testing our hypotheses regarding concealment of status-relevant identities relating to education, we also examine concealment of other personal information, such as one’s hometown and hobbies. Because the relative status of this other information did not differ systematically across experimental conditions, participants’ decisions to conceal this information about themselves allowed us to unpack whether participants were simply less willing to share any information about themselves with relatively lower status peers or, as we expected, whether participants’ concealment behaviors were specific to identities conveying status.
Study 1
Third Party Expectations of High Status Identity Concealment

Study 1 tested an underlying assumption of the present paper: that people do not expect individuals to conceal relatively high status identities from their peers. We also assessed whether participants expected individuals to experience interpersonal threat when making these decisions.

Method

Participants and design. This study followed a 2 condition design, such that a focal individual’s status was manipulated to be either relatively high or relatively similar compared to an interaction partner. Although subsequent studies in this paper (which were conducted prior to this initial study) suggest that it would be sufficient to power our study to find a difference of 30% (i.e., expected concealment decisions differing by 30% across conditions), the present study used a more conservative criteria of 20% in order to ensure that we could detect any potential difference across conditions. We required a sample of 180 participants to meet this criteria.

We recruited participants from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, a reliable platform for the recruitment of participant samples for research purposes (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Data were collected in batches (e.g., posting 50 slots at a time on the MTurk website) until we reached a sample size exceeding 180 participants. Two hundred and three participants (41% women; $M_{age} = 35$; 78% White/Caucasian; 7% Asian; 6% Black/African-American; 10% Latino/Hispanic; 1% Pacific Islander; 2% Other Race) completed the study.

Procedure. Participants were told to imagine the following scenario. They were sitting on a plane, in the window seat, when they happened to notice that the person sitting next to them
(in the middle seat) had IDs in their\textsuperscript{19} wallet indicating that they are from California originally but currently attend an Ivy League university in an eastern state (the actual university and state were told to participants). After the middle passenger put their wallet away, the aisle passenger arrived and started a conversation with the middle passenger. The middle passenger’s relative status was manipulated by changing the information shared by the aisle passenger, such that the middle passenger was either relatively similar status (each individual attended a different Ivy League university) or relatively high status (the middle passenger attended an Ivy League university but the aisle passenger did not). Specifically, the participant read:

The passenger in the aisle seat introduces themselves first and one of the things you overhear the aisle passenger say (to the middle passenger) is "I'm from Maryland originally, but I'm currently living in [current state]. I'm a sophomore at [Ivy League university, non-Ivy League university], studying political science. What about you?"

Participants then indicated their identity concealment expectations by completing a free response question in which they wrote what they thought the middle passenger would say in response to the aisle passenger. Next, participants completed several Likert-scale items assessing the perceived likelihood of the middle passenger sharing different types of information in their response (including their identity, enabling us to measure identity concealment likelihood\textsuperscript{20}) and expected interpersonal threat concerns (pertaining to the middle passenger). Final questions included attention checks confirming that the participant knew the university attended by both the middle passenger and aisle passenger, a manipulation check, a question assessing the gender

\textsuperscript{19} Gender-neutral pronouns like “they” and “their” were used throughout the study

\textsuperscript{20} Compared to analyses using expected concealment decisions, analyses using identity concealment likelihood yielded similar results and are included in the Supplemental Materials.
they imagined for the other passengers, and demographic information (gender, race, age, education background, citizenship, and country of birth).

**Expected identity concealment decision.** Expected identity concealment decisions were assessed by using a computer program to detect whether participants included (disclosure, coded as zero) or excluded (concealment, coded as zero) the name of the middle passenger’s university when writing the response they expected the middle passenger to say to the aisle passenger. The first author verified that mentions of the university were indeed instances of disclosure and that omissions of the name of the university were indeed instances of concealment.

**Expected interpersonal threat.** Using a scale of 1 to 7 (strongly disagree – strongly agree), participants indicated the extent to which they expected the middle passenger to experience the following threats when considering whether or not to share their Ivy League affiliation with the aisle passenger: threats to the self (e.g., concern that sharing an Ivy League affiliation might “cause the aisle passenger to resent them,” $\alpha = .95$), threats to the other (e.g., concern that sharing their Ivy League affiliation might “make the aisle passenger feel judged,” $\alpha = .93$), or threats to belonging (e.g., concern that sharing their Ivy League affiliation might “make it seem like they and the aisle passenger can’t relate to one another,” $\alpha = .93$).

**Manipulation check.** Participants all rated the status of several universities, including the two used in the manipulation of relative status, on a scale of 1 to 10 using a subjective social status ladder (adapted from Goodman et al., 2001).

**Attention check.** Participants responded to a multiple-choice question asking what university the middle passenger and the aisle passenger each attended. Based on an a priori decision, participants (n = 25) who did not select the correct university for at least one passenger
were excluded, and analyses were conducted with the remaining participants (n = 178). Including all participants in the analyses did not alter the significance of the results, with one minor exception that is noted in a footnote in the results.

Results

Manipulation check. A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed an expected main effect, $F(1, 177) = 861.24, \eta^2_p = .83, p < .001$. Status ratings of the aisle passenger’s university were significantly higher for the university conveying relatively similar status ($M = 9.42, SD = 0.89$) compared to the university conveying relatively lower status ($M = 4.71, SD = 1.98$).

Expected identity concealment decisions. A logistic regression revealed a non-significant effect of relative status on expected concealment decisions, $b = 0.03, p = .96, 95\% CI [0.39, 2.72], OR = 1.03$. Participants expected the middle passenger to conceal their identity to the same degree regardless of whether the identity conveyed relatively high status or relatively similar status compared to the aisle passenger (participants expected that only 10% of middle passengers would conceal in either condition).

Expected interpersonal threat. We conducted a Maximum Likelihood factor analysis of the interpersonal threat items, using with a varimax rotation and Kaiser criteria of eigenvalues greater than 1. Factor scores were derived from SPSS using the regression method. This analysis revealed that all interpersonal threat items loaded onto one factor ($\alpha = .97$); thus, participants expected the middle passenger to experience a general sense of threat.

A least-squares regression revealed that participants expected the middle passenger to experience higher levels of threat when their identity conveyed relatively high status ($M = 0.18$, 95\% CI [0.09, 0.27], $\beta = 0.18, p < .001$).
compared to when their identity conveyed relatively similar status ($M = -0.18, SD = 0.88), b = 0.36, p = .01, 95\% CI [0.07, 0.65], \beta = .18$.\textsuperscript{21}

**Discussion**

Third-party observers expected individuals to conceal an identity to the same extent (only 10\% of the time), regardless of whether the identity had the potential to convey relatively high status, as opposed to similar status, compared to a peer. Although third-parties expected relatively high status individuals to be more aware of the potential for interpersonal threats, they did not expect these individuals to act upon threat-related concerns by increasing concealment. Our remaining studies explore whether these third-party expectations are correct or false.

**Study 2**

**Concealment in a Field Setting**

Study 2 tested our main hypothesis that relative status affects identity concealment, using a field setting in order to enhance ecological validity. We allowed participant status to vary naturally and tested for an interaction between participant status and peer status, examining whether participants with higher status would be more likely to conceal a status-related identity from a low status peer, compared to a high status peer. Specifically, we examined whether graduate students would be more likely to conceal their undergraduate alma mater when the alma mater was relatively high status, as opposed to relatively similar status, compared to a peer.

\textsuperscript{21} When including participants who failed attention checks, two separate threat factors emerged and participants expected that relative high status, compared to relatively similar status, would cause the middle passenger to experience significantly more concern with threats to others and belonging, $p = .01$, but not with threats to the self, $p = .33$. While it is possible that participants genuinely did not expect relatively high status to trigger threats to the self, this null finding may simply be due to including participants who were not aware of the passengers’ relative status (as evidenced by failing the attention check). At very least, these results suggest that third parties expect high relative status to elicit greater concerns with threats to others and belonging.
Method

Participants and design. We recruited graduate students at a top-tier American university. The top-tier nature of the university allowed for a conservative examination of our hypotheses. In this setting, one may expect that a common high status graduate school identity would make participants less likely to conceal a relatively high status undergraduate alma mater because they expect the peer to be less threatened given that they now attend the same high status school. To the extent that we find support for our hypotheses in this setting, it suggests that even when an individual is aware that a peer has a high status identity in one domain (graduate school), they still experience concerns about elevating their status above the peer in another domain (undergraduate alma mater).

We were permitted to collect data at two large campus events (Open House Day and Class Registration Day) but no additional events. Because of this restriction, we set our target sample to be as many participants as we could recruit during these events.

This study was a 2 (peer status: low, high) condition between-subjects design, with a continuous independent variable of participant status (based on the level of status of their undergraduate alma mater identity). Our primary question was whether graduate student participants would conceal their undergraduate alma mater identity when introducing themselves to a peer. Thus, while all interested students were allowed to participate, we limited our inclusion criteria for data analysis to participants who were in their first year of graduate school (for whom undergraduate alma mater would be most relevant when introducing themselves) and attended college at a nationally ranked university or liberal arts college according to U.S. News & World Report (allowing us to use a single ranking system to determine participant identity status). One hundred twenty-nine participants (46% women; $M_{age} = 25$; 64% White; 26% Asian; 7%
Hispanic; 3% Black or African-American; 1% Native American; 2% Other Race) met our inclusion criteria, and completed all critical measures for our analyses (both indicating their school and completing the dependent variable, described below).

**Procedure.** Graduate students at two major campus events were approached and asked to enter a study on “interpersonal relationships.” Participants were informed that, as part of the study, they would be entered into a raffle for a free dinner with other graduate students at their school. The dinner attendees would include other raffle winners, as well as a pre-selected student who would be assisting with organization and logistics. They were also told that one way to help potential attendees get to know one another is to have them provide introductions in advance, which would be shared with other dinner attendees (including the pre-selected student) if the participant won the raffle. Participants read an introduction from the pre-selected student, which included our experimental manipulation of peer status. Participants then handwrote their own introductions, allowing us to collect our dependent variable of identity concealment decisions, as well as concealment of information unrelated to their educational identity (e.g., hometown). Finally, participants completed a demographic questionnaire (gender, age, hometown, and educational background) and an attention check (verifying that participants knew what university the pre-selected student attended), and submitted a raffle ticket.

**Participant status.** Participant status was a continuous variable based on the status of each participant’s undergraduate alma mater according to U.S. News and World Report college rankings. For example, if a participant attended the number one university (Princeton) or liberal arts college (Williams) according to U.S. News & World Report, her status equaled 1 in our

---

22 We attempted to recruit additional participants online but this sample (n = 39) was not sufficiently large to assess differences between sampling methods and was thus excluded.
dataset. If a participant attended the number fourteen university (Washington University in St. Louis) or liberal arts college (Washington and Lee University), his status equaled 14. These numbers were then multiplied by negative one so that higher numbers indicated higher status.

**Peer status.** We randomly assigned participants to read information about one of two pre-selected students. The same information was provided for each pre-selected student, with the exception of the stated undergraduate alma mater: either a top 5 university on U.S. News and World Report or a school that was not in the top 5. Specifically, participants read:

Hi! I am a graduate student in the Public Health department at [American University], with an interest in infectious disease. I attended [low status alma mater, high status alma mater] for undergrad, and am now enjoying life in [current city]. For fun, I like spending time with family and friends, traveling, doing yoga, and watching shows on Netflix. Best of luck in the raffle, and I look forward to meeting you if you win!

**Identity concealment decisions.** A coder, who was blind to condition, coded participants’ written introductions for whether they included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1) their undergraduate alma mater identity.

**Concealment decisions regarding other information.** A coder, who was blind to condition, coded participants’ written introductions for whether they included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1) other unique information that was disclosed by the pre-selected student, including: hobbies and area of study.

**Attention check.** This study was conducted during high traffic campus events where students are not accustomed to participating in studies. Therefore, many students completed only the necessary information to enter the raffle (which was their incentive for participating) and gave only a cursory glance at the study materials. We made an a priori decision to exclude participants (n = 36) who did not pass an attention check regarding the pre-selected student’s
undergraduate alma mater, as this served as an indicator that they may not have read the study materials (including the experimental manipulation). Results with less stringent exclusion criterion trended in the same direction, and are reported in the Supplemental Materials.

**Results**

**Identity concealment decisions.** We conducted a multiple logistic regression, centering both independent variables (using weighted effect codes for peer status to allow us to assess main effects). As seen in Table 2, this analysis revealed only the predicted significant interaction, $b = 0.03$, $p = .04$, 95% CI [0.00, 0.06], $OR = 1.03$. Simple slopes analysis demonstrated that participants whose own undergraduate identity was high status (in the upper 10% in U.S. News & World Report ranking within our sample) were more likely to conceal their undergraduate identity from a low status peer compared to a high status peer, $b = 1.29$, $p = .02$, 95% CI [0.17, 2.41], $OR = 3.63$. However, participants whose undergraduate identity was low status (in the lower 10% in U.S. News & World Report ranking within our sample) did not conceal differently to low and high status peers, $b = -0.86$, $p > .25$, 95% CI [-2.46, 0.74], $OR = 0.42$. Because our sample skewed towards high status individuals (skewness = -2.14), these results better speak to the concealment tendencies of high (rather than low) status individuals.
Table 2. Regressing concealment of identity and other information (e.g., hobbies) on key variables in Study 2. The table reports unstandardized coefficients for logistic regressions.

\[ + p < .10 \quad * p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Hobby Concealment</th>
<th>Area of Study Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Status (0 = Similar Status, 1 = Lower Status)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Status (Continuous)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Status X Participant Status</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.63***</td>
<td>-3.25***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concealment decisions regarding other information.** Two separate multiple logistic regression analyses found no evidence that our experimental conditions influenced concealment of hobbies or area of study, \( ps > .25 \). See Table 2 for regression results.

**Discussion**

Using a field setting, Study 2 demonstrates that high status identity concealment is a naturally occurring phenomenon enacted by people from a breadth of backgrounds (in terms of undergraduate alma mater). Given that participants and their peers all shared a common high status identity – graduate students at a top-tier university – individuals appear to avoid elevating their status above a peer even when the peer has clearly achieved high status in a separate – albeit related – domain. Concealment was specific to status-relevant identities; participants did not conceal other unique personal information (e.g., hobbies) in a systematic way.

**Study 3**

**Concealment in a Lab Context**
Whereas Study 2 provided an ecologically valid experimental context, Study 3 investigated concealment using a more controlled experimental setting and a larger sample size to improve statistical power. We utilized a sample of individuals with a common high status identity and tested our prediction that these individuals would be more likely to conceal the identity when it conveyed relatively high status, as opposed to similar status, compared to a peer.

Method

Participants and design. Although at the time of data collection there was no clear benchmark for the level of high status identity concealment to expect, we decided that 20% would represent a meaningful difference in concealment across experimental conditions. Detecting this difference required a sample size of 138 participants to achieve 80% power for $\alpha = .05$. To allow for the possibility of exclusions, we recruited 151 undergraduates at a high status American university (58% women; $M_{age} = 20$; 50% White; 28% Asian; 15% African-American; 14% Hispanic; 1% Native American; 1% Other Race). Participants either completed the study for class credit through a psychology student subject pool or for pay through an experimental research lab. We limited the participants to American citizens or permanent residents because we anticipated that international students might differ in their view of American schools and their status. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (relative status: similar, high) in a between-subjects design.

Procedure. Participants completed eligibility questions assessing university affiliation and citizenship, followed by a demographic questionnaire including gender, race, and age. Participants were then randomly assigned to read one of two imaginary scenarios in which they interacted with a peer. Participants’ relative status was manipulated by changing the peer’s
university to be similar status to the participant (the relatively similar status condition) or lower status than the participant (the relatively high status condition). Specifically, participants read:

Imagine that you are sitting on a plane going across the country. You are not particularly busy and you end up talking to the person next to you. When introducing themselves, they say: *I'm from Maryland originally, but I'm currently living in New Jersey. I'm a sophomore at [similar status school; lower status school], studying political science. What about you?* What is your response? Please write what you would say.

In response to the above prompt, participants supplied a free response introduction about themselves, which allowed us to assess our dependent variable of identity concealment decisions, as well as concealment of other information (e.g., hometown). Participants then completed 2 items measuring identity concealment intentions, an attention check, and a manipulation check. Participants also completed exploratory measures at different points during the study (see Supplementary Materials available online).

**Identity concealment decisions.** Two coders, both of whom were blind to condition, coded participants’ introductions for whether their high status school identity was included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1); Cohen’s $\kappa = 1.00, p < .001$.

**Concealment decisions regarding other information.** A coder, who was blind to condition, created four separate variables corresponding to whether participants’ introductions

---

23 Compared to analyses using concealment decisions, analyses using concealment intentions yielded similar results and are thus included in the Supplemental Materials available online.

24 Given the perfect reliability for coding concealment decisions regarding university identity, we utilized only one coder for the purposes of coding of other information.
included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1) their hometown, current town, college major, or year in college (all of which were mentioned by the peer).

**Manipulation check.** Subjective social status was measured the same as in Study 1.

**Attention check.** Participants responded to a question asking what school the peer attended. Several schools were listed, including the two schools in each experimental condition. Based on an a priori decision, participants (n = 15) who did not select the correct school were excluded, and analyses were conducted with the remaining participants (n = 136). Including all participants in the analyses did not alter the significance of the results.

**Results**

**Manipulation check.** A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed an expected main effect, $F(1, 134) = 987.30$, $\eta_p^2 = .88$, $p < .001$. Status ratings of the peer’s university were significantly higher for the university conveying relatively similar status ($M = 9.66$, $SD = 0.72$) compared to the university conveying relatively lower status ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 2.05$).

**Identity concealment.** A logistic regression revealed the predicted significant effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions, $b = 1.24$, $p = .001$, 95% CI [0.49, 1.99], $OR = 3.45$. Participants concealed their identity significantly more when they were relatively high status, as opposed to relatively similar status, compared to a peer. See Figure 19 for concealment percentages across experimental conditions.
Concealment of other information. Four separate logistic regression analyses found no evidence that relative status influenced concealment of hometown, current town, college major, or year in college, $ps \geq .25$.

Discussion

Using a controlled experimental design, Study 3 provides additional evidence that individuals conceal relatively high status identities, more so than relatively similar status identities, from their peers. As expected, relative status did not influence concealment of information in domains unrelated to the status difference, such as their hometown.

Study 4

Concealing in Professional Contexts
Whereas the previous studies focused exclusively on social contexts, Study 4 investigated whether the effect of relative status on identity concealment differed between social and professional settings. These different settings represented differences in concealment costs. We tested our hypothesis that relative status would influence concealment when participants were in an everyday social context (low concealment cost) or an everyday professional context (moderate concealment cost), but not when they were in a highly competitive professional context (high concealment cost).

Method

Participants and design. This study was a 2 (relative status: similar, high) by 3 (concealment cost: low, moderate, high) between-subjects design. Because concealment decisions differed by nearly 30% in Study 3, we powered Study 4 to detect concealment decisions differing by 30% across relative status conditions in the low concealment costs condition (i.e., if 50% of participants concealed when relatively high status, and 20% of participants concealed when relatively similar status), 15% across relative status conditions in the moderate concealment cost condition,\(^{25}\) and 0% across relative conditions in the high concealment cost condition. This analysis required a target sample size of 522 participants to achieve 80% power for \(\alpha = .05\).

Recruited participants were undergraduate students at an American university who either completed the study for class credit through a psychology student subject pool or for pay through an experimental research lab. We collected data in batches (e.g., posting 50 slots at a time) until

\(^{25}\) Powering the study to detect our predicted effect of 30% (as opposed to 15%) differences across relative status conditions in the moderate condition required a smaller target sample of 390 participants. However, we chose a more conservative power analysis approach using 15% differences so that we could detect more subtle differences between conditions if they existed.
we reached a sample size exceeding 522 participants. This yielded a sample size of 541 participants. Four participants were excluded for failing to provide a sufficient response when the dependent variable was collected (e.g., not responding to the prompt). This left 537 participants (56% women; \( M_{age} = 20 \); 60% White; 26% Asian; 11% Black or African-American; 10% Hispanic; 1% Native American; 0.4% Pacific Islander; 3% Other Race) for data analysis.\(^{26}\)

**Procedure.** Participants completed eligibility questions assessing university affiliation, followed by a questionnaire assessing demographic information including gender, race, and age. Participants were then randomly assigned to imagine one of 6 hypothetical scenarios that involved attending a meet-and-greet event as part of a program for which they were selected. Concealment cost was manipulated by altering the type of program that the meet-and-greet event was for - either a study abroad program (low concealment cost); an internship abroad program (moderate concealment cost); or an internship abroad program with a highly competitive and desirable full-time job available to a few interns at the end of the internship (high concealment cost). The moderate and high concealment cost scenarios were the same in all respects, except that participants in the latter condition were told:

Program Coordinators have informed you that they will pick a handful of interns to return for a prestigious advanced leadership training program upon graduation. If chosen for this

\(^{26}\) Unlike in Study 3, in Study 4 we made an a priori choice not to limit our participants to American citizens and permanent residents in order to ensure that our findings would not be limited to people accustomed to the cultural norms of the United States. Nonetheless, as a robustness check, we reanalyzed the data in Study 4 excluding non-Americans (\( n=56 \)) and found no notable changes to the significance of the core findings of this study. These results can be found in the Supplemental Materials available online.
program, leadership trainees will have the opportunity to work directly with leaders in the organization and will be on the fast-track to a leadership position themselves.

In all conditions, participants imagined approaching two people at the meet and greet, one of whom was a student and one of whom was a Program Coordinator. As they approached, participants imagined overhearing the student mentioning several things to the Program Coordinator, including what university they attend (either relatively similar status compared to the participant, or relatively low status compared to the participant), which served as our manipulation of relative status. Specifically, they read the following:

As you join them, the student [or “intern” in the moderate and high concealment cost conditions] is saying “Exactly. Before I came to [similar status university; lower status university], I lived in Maryland; but this will be my first time living abroad, so I’m really excited about it.” They then turn to you and, after they both say hello, the Program Coordinator says: “So, what about you? Where are you coming from and what got you interested in the program?”

In response to the Program Coordinator’s question, participants were prompted to write an introduction in a free response text box, which we used to assess the dependent variable of identity concealment decisions, as well as concealment decisions regarding their hometown (the one other specific piece of personal background shared by the other student). Participants then completed 3 items assessing identity concealment intentions, a manipulation check of concealment costs, and an attention check verifying that they knew what university the other student attended. Participants also completed exploratory measures at different points during the study (see Supplementary Materials available online).

---

27 Compared to analyses using concealment decisions, analyses using concealment intentions yielded similar results and are thus included in the Supplemental Materials available online.
**Identity concealment decisions.** Two coders, both whom were blind to condition, coded the introductions for whether each participant’s high status university identity was included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1); Cohen’s $\kappa = .99$, $p < .001$.

**Hometown concealment decisions.** One coder, who was blind to condition, coded the introductions for whether each participant included (disclosure, coded as 0) or excluded (concealment, coded as 1) their hometown or any other location in which they have lived.

**Manipulation check: relative status.** The manipulation check for relative status was conducted using participant responses from Study 3, in which participants evaluated the status of the two universities in each experimental condition on a scale of 1 to 10 using a subjective social status ladder (adapted from Goodman, et al., 2001).

**Manipulation check: concealment cost.** As a manipulation check, participants answered seven questions relating to the costs of concealment. Using a 7-point scale, participants rated how important seven considerations were to them in the scenario, e.g., “being respected” or “seizing an opportunity” ($\alpha = .90$).

**Attention check.** Participants completed three attention check questions, confirming that they knew their peer’s school, whether the scenario was in an internship or study abroad setting, and whether the scenario included an opportunity to be chosen for an advanced training program or not. Based on an a priori decision, participants ($n = 82$) who did not pass the attention checks were excluded, and analyses were conducted with the remaining participants ($n = 459$). Including all participants in the analyses yielded similar results (see Supplemental Materials).

**Results**
**Manipulation check: relative status.** A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed an expected main effect, $F(1, 134) = 835.11$, $\eta^2 = .86$, $p < .001$. Status ratings of the peer’s university were significantly higher for the university conveying relatively similar status ($M = 9.57$, $SD = 1.04$) compared to the one conveying relatively lower status ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 2.07$).

**Manipulation check: concealment cost.** A univariate ANOVA revealed significant differences in concealment costs, $F(2, 456) = 24.85$, $\eta^2 = .10$, $p < .001$. Planned comparisons indicated that, compared to the moderate concealment cost condition ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.17$), concealment costs were perceived as significantly greater in the high concealment cost condition, ($M = 5.34$, $SD = 1.00$), $b = 0.44$, $\eta^2 = .02$, $p = .001$, and significantly lower in the low concealment cost condition ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.13$), $b = -0.46$, $\eta^2 = .03$, $p < .001$.

**Identity concealment.** We conducted a multiple logistic regression. Both independent variables, as well as their interaction, were entered into the analysis, with relatively similar status and high concealment cost conditions serving as reference groups. We centered these variables using weighted effect codes to allow us to assess main effects. As seen in Table 3, compared to the high concealment cost condition, identity concealment did not differ in the low concealment cost condition, $b = 0.30$, $p = .20$, 95% CI [-0.16, 0.76], $OR = 1.35$, but was marginally higher in the moderate concealment cost condition, $b = 0.41$, $p = .08$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.88], $OR = 1.51$. We observed a significant main effect of relative status, $b = 0.61$, $p = .001$, 95% CI [0.24, 0.99], $OR = 1.84$, such that participants concealed more when they were relatively high status, as opposed to relatively similar status, compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, no significant interactions were found, $ps > .25$. Figure 20 provides concealment percentages across condition.
Figure 20.

Percentage of participants who concealed their high status identity as a function of relative status and concealment costs (Study 4).

Table 3. Regressing identity concealment and hometown concealment on key variables in Study 4. The table reports unstandardized coefficients for logistic regressions.

+ $p < .10$   * $p < .05$   ** $p < .01$   *** $p < .001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Hometown Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Relative Status (0 = Similar, 1 = High)</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>-0.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Concealment Cost (Dummy Code)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Concealment Cost (Dummy Code)</td>
<td>0.41+</td>
<td>-0.69+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Status X Low Concealment Cost</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-1.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Status X Moderate Concealment Cost</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-2.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-1.77***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hometown concealment.** We conducted the same multiple logistic regression analysis for hometown concealment decisions as we did for identity concealment decisions. As seen in Table 3, this analysis revealed two significant interactions, $ps < .01$. Further examination (using three separate logistic regression analyses) revealed that, in contrast to the high concealment cost condition in which the effect of relative status was non-significant, $p = .17$, the effect of relative status was significant in both the moderate, $p = .01$, and low, $p = .02$, concealment cost conditions; these latter two effects were due to participants concealing less when they were relatively high status, as opposed to when they were relatively similar status, compared to a peer.

**Discussion**

In Study 4, participants expected to conceal relatively high status identities, more so than similar status identities, even in highly competitive contexts where important professional opportunities were at stake. Although the hypothetical nature of this study does not allow us to definitively conclude that individuals will conceal their high status identities when faced with the actual competitive pressures of a professional setting, the present study suggests that at very least individuals are mindful of the interpersonal challenges associated with elevating their status in professional settings and strongly consider prioritizing social harmony (as opposed to professional gain) through concealment.

Study 4 also found that to the extent that relative status influenced concealment of other information, it had the opposite effect compared to identity concealment: being higher status made participants less inclined to concealing their hometown. Thus, the decision to conceal from lower status peers is not unilateral and, if anything, individuals may make themselves more comfortable with concealing high status identities by disclosing other information instead.
Study 5

Interpersonal Threats as Mechanisms Underlying Concealment

Having established that individuals conceal relatively high status identities across a variety of contexts, Study 5 examined whether concealment could be explained by concerns with interpersonal threats (to the self, others, and belonging) and moderated by a desire for belonging (leading to greater concealment). Additionally, while previous studies focused on concealment of identities that are particularly high status on an absolute level (i.e., concealment of identities associated with top-tier universities), Study 5 assessed whether concealment generalized to an identity (being a college graduate) that is more moderate in absolute status and more common in society. Finally, Study 5 used a more diverse participant pool compared to Studies 2-4.

Method

Participants and design. This study was a 2 condition (relative status: similar, high) between-subjects design. We also included a continuous moderator variables (desire for belonging). Our power analysis was based on our finding in Study 3 that concealment decisions differed by nearly 30% across relative status conditions. Although the moderator variable in our analyses was continuous, we conducted a more conservative power analysis based upon a 2 by 2 design for 2 dichotomous independent variables. We thus powered our study to detect concealment differing by 30% across relative status conditions at one level of the moderator, and by 0% across relative status conditions at the other level of the moderator. Based on this analysis, we targeted a sample size of 284 participants to achieve 80% power for $\alpha = .05$.

We recruited adults residing in the USA from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. This participant pool enabled us to examine the generalizability of our results by utilizing a more diverse sample (compared to both university participant pools and standard online samples)
while still yielding results that are at least as reliable (Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011; Buhrmester et al., 2011; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). In addition, online platforms have been shown to have a “disinhibition effect” such that “people say and do things in cyberspace that they wouldn’t ordinarily say and do in the face-to-face world” (Suler, 2004: 321), are more likely to engage in self-disclosure (Joinson, 2001), and are more willing to engage in behavior that violates social norms and damages social relationships (Lowry, Zhang, Wang, & Siponen, 2016). Thus, in short-term virtual interactions on MTurk, participants may feel particularly empowered to engage in high status identity disclosure, and less concerned with the social consequences of doing so, allowing for a conservative test of our hypotheses.

We collected data in batches (e.g., posting 50 slots at a time) until we reached a sample size of approximately 284 college-educated adults. This process yielded a sample size of 275 participants, of whom 267 completed all key variables (40% women; $M_{age} = 31$; 75% White; 16% Asian; 7% Black/African-American; 5% Hispanic; 1% Native American; 0.4% Other Race).

**Procedure.** Participants were directed to an online study in which they completed a demographic questionnaire asking age, gender, race, marital status, highest level of education, learner type (two options: whether they are an audio or visual learner), seasonal preference (two options: whether they are a summer or winter person), and country region (four options: Midwest, Northeast, South, West). Participants only continued to the remainder of the study if they completed a college degree or higher, as this was our high status identity of interest.

---

28 As discussed below, we matched the partner’s seasonal preference and country region to be the same as each participant’s answers. Creating broad categories (two categories of seasonal preferences and four categories of country regions) was intended to (1) make it seem more
After the demographics section, the study proceeded as follows. Participants were informed that they would be playing a picture perception game with a partner\textsuperscript{29} from Mechanical Turk (in reality, they were the only participant). Participants were told that they would have a few seconds to look at a picture and subsequently answer a question about it. As long as one partner answered a question correctly, both partners would receive points, which would then be converted to a bonus (maximum of 15 cents) at the end of the game.

Before the game, participants completed a “getting to know you” session, in which partners could exchange information about themselves. Participants were told that they would receive information about their partner first and, while ostensibly waiting to receive this information, they completed a series of multiple-choice questions assessing desire for belonging.\textsuperscript{30} They then began the “getting to know you” session. Participants were sequentially shown their partner’s responses to five questions in the following order: region of country, relationship status, education level, learner type, and seasonal preference. For relationship status, participants were informed that “your partner did not share a response or was not asked this question.” This was done to avoid establishing a norm that all responses must be shared.\textsuperscript{31} The probable and realistic that their partner would have selected the same responses as them for both questions and (2) minimize the chances that participants would interpret having the same responses as their partner as a sign that they are extremely similar to their partner.

\textsuperscript{29} Participants first learned that the study involved a partner when reading in the consent form that they would “play [a game] with another Turker. Before playing the game, you and the other Turker will have the opportunity to exchange information about yourselves.”

\textsuperscript{30} Participants also completed a measure of desire for authenticity, which had no effects on concealment decisions (ps > .25).

\textsuperscript{31} Participants were previously told that the system would “give options regarding what to share based on your responses at the beginning of this study. Some of the information that you are allowed to share will be the same as your partner, but some will be different.” These instructions were provided to make it seem plausible that their partner may not have been given the option to
partner’s education level served as our manipulation of relative status and was randomly assigned to either be either a “4-year college degree or higher” or “Some high school.” Learner type (audio vs. visual learner) was set to always be different from the participant, allowing us to assess participants’ concealment behavior regarding status-neutral differences. For region of country and seasonal preference, partner information was matched to be the same as the participant. After viewing their partner’s response to each question, participants indicated their decision to disclose or conceal their own response before proceeding to the next question.

Following the “getting to know you” session, participants completed a questionnaire measuring their comfort with sharing information for each question in the “getting to know you” task (including a two-item measure of identity concealment intentions), mediation items assessing interpersonal threat (as well as respect for their partner, see Supplementary Material available online), a manipulation check of relative status, and an attention check verifying that participants knew their partner’s level of education. Participants then played the picture perception game, and afterwards indicated any suspicion about having a real partner in the study. Additional questions were asked for exploratory purposes only (see Supplementary Material).

---

share a response to certain questions, thus reducing the chances that their partner would be perceived as purposely concealing information regarding their relationship status.

32 In a pre-test on MTurk, audio and visual learners were judged to be the same in status in a paired sample t-test, $t(28) = -0.52, p = .61$.

33 Compared to analyses using concealment decisions, analyses using concealment intentions yielded mostly similar results and are thus included in the Supplemental Materials available online. One exception is included in a footnote in the Results section below.
**Identity concealment decisions.** After viewing their partner’s education level, participants indicated whether they would like to share their education level with their partner, responding either yes (disclosure, coded as 0) or no (concealment, coded as 1).

**Concealment of learner type.** After viewing their partner’s learner type (which always differed from their own), participants were asked whether they would like to share their learner type with their partner, responding yes (disclosure, coded as 0) or no (concealment, coded as 1).

**Interpersonal threat.** Using a scale of 1 to 7 (strongly disagree – strongly agree), nine items assessed threat to self (e.g., “I worried that sharing my educational background might cause my partner to assume things about me,” $\alpha = .97$), five items assessed threat to others (e.g., “I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner feel judged,” $\alpha = .96$), and four items assessed threat to belonging (e.g., “I worried that sharing my educational background might make it difficult to have a good relationship with my partner,” $\alpha = .94$). See Supplemental Materials for full list of interpersonal threat items.

**Desire for belonging.** Using a scale of 1 to 7 (strongly disagree – strongly agree), four items assessed desire for belonging (e.g., “I really want to get along well with my partner,” “I really want to develop a good relationship with my partner,” $\alpha = .85$). These items were customized to assess desire for belonging within the context of the present study.

**Manipulation check.** As a manipulation check, participants rated their partner’s subjective social status on a scale of 1 to 10 using a subjective social status ladder (adapted from Goodman et al., 2001).

**Attention and suspicion checks.** Participants completed an attention check question asking whether their partner’s education level was a 4-year college degree or higher, a 2-year
college degree, some college, high school degree / GED, or some high school. Participants answers were considered correct if they selected “4-year college degree or higher” in the relatively similar status condition, or if they selected “some high school” in the relatively high status condition. Participants were also allowed to pass the attention check if they selected “high school degree / GED or higher” in the relatively high status condition because we determined a priori that this reflected an accurate encoding of their status being higher than their partner’s. Participant also completed a suspicion check in which they indicated whether they believed their partner was real. Based on an a priori decision, participants failed the suspicion check only if they indicated that they believed that their partner was fake and also treated the partner as though he or she was fake. Participants (n = 23) who failed the attention or suspicion check were excluded, resulting 244 participants being included in our analyses. Including all participants in the analyses did not alter the significance of the results.

Results

Manipulation check. Our manipulation of relative status was successful, $b = -1.78, p < .001, 95\% CI [-2.14, -1.41], \beta = -.52$. Compared to participants in the similar status condition ($M = 6.30, SD = 1.19$), participants in the relatively high status condition rated their partner as significantly lower in status ($M = 4.53, SD = 1.67$).

Identity concealment. A logistic regression revealed the expected main effect for relative status on identity concealment decisions, $b = 3.06, p < .001, 95\% CI [1.86, 4.27], OR = 21.33$. Participants were more likely to conceal their identity when they were relatively high status (34% concealed), as opposed to similar status (2% concealed), compared to a peer.
**Interpersonal threat mediation.** Using the same factor analysis approach as Study 1, we found that all three forms of interpersonal threat (to self, other, and belonging) loaded on one factor (item loadings ranged from .73 to .94) with high reliability ($\alpha = .98$), suggesting that participants experienced a general sense of threat rather than three distinct types of threats. A mediation analysis employing Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure (utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals) revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, $b = 1.71$, 95% CI [0.39, 3.02], $OR = 5.53$, and a significant indirect effect via interpersonal threat, $b = 1.70$, 95% CI [1.09, 2.56], $OR = 5.47$.

**Desire for belonging.** A multiple logistic regression analysis revealed that individual differences in desire for belonging did not moderate the effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions, $b = .05$, $p > .25$, 95% CI [-1.14, 1.23], $OR = 1.05$.\(^{34}\)

**Concealment of learner type.** A logistic regression revealed a non-significant effect of relative status on learner type concealment, $b = -0.29$, $p = .49$, 95% CI [-1.11, 0.53], $OR = 0.75$.

**Discussion**

Consistent with our predictions, Study 5 found that the tendency to conceal relatively high status identities is driven by a desire to mitigate interpersonal threats (to the self, others, and belonging) that would otherwise undermine social harmony. Participants experienced these threats as a general sense of interpersonal threat, rather than three specific types of threat. A higher individual difference in the desire for belonging did not change concealment behavior; rather, all participants – both those high and low in desire for belonging alike – opted to conceal.

\(^{34}\) Moderation results using concealment intentions as the dependent variable differed somewhat, revealing a marginally significant interaction, $p = .09$, such that individuals with a greater desire for belonging had stronger intentions to conceal. See Supplemental Materials.
relatively high status identities due to a common understanding that interpersonal relationships were at stake. Taken together, these findings suggest that identity concealment may be determined less by individuals’ desire to actively cultivate social harmony, and more so by a common human desire to protect against detriments to social harmony.

In addition to illuminating mechanisms, Study 5 demonstrated the generalizability of high status identity concealment. Whereas previous studies focused on concealment of identities associated with top-tier universities, Study 5 provides evidence of concealment among individuals with more moderately high status identities (regarding being college graduates) in society. Thus, concealment of relatively high status identities is not a behavior restricted to a small group of elites, but, rather, appears to extend to anyone who is put in a position of relatively high status. Furthermore, with this broader set of participants, we once again found that concealment from lower status peers occurred specifically with status-relevant information (i.e., education identity) and did not apply to other information (i.e., learning style).

Study 6

Concealing When Perceived Intentionality is Low

Study 6 builds on Study 5 by providing additional insight into the mechanisms underlying concealment decisions in terms of threats to the self. Specifically, Study 6 investigated whether concealment of relatively high status identities persisted even when disclosure was not framed as an attentional act by the high status individual and could instead be attributed to a computer system. If so, this suggests that decreased perceptions of intentionality reduce threats to the self, and that threats to the self are a primary determinant of concealment decisions that, when reduced, changes concealment decisions. However, we predicted the opposite: that individuals would conceal to the same extent, regardless of whether or not
disclosure was perceived as intentional. This result could occur for one of two reasons, which we tease apart. One possibility is that decreasing perceived intentionality decreases threats to the self, but other threats – such as threats to others and belonging – are sufficient to prompt high status identity concealment even when threats to the self are reduced. A second possibility is that decreasing perceived intentionality will have no influence on threats to the self (and thus no influence on concealment), suggesting that subjective threats to the self are difficult to attenuate even in situations where a person is objectively less likely to encounter such threats.

Study 6 also addressed a limitation of Study 5. Study 5 presented questions measuring desire for belonging immediately prior to the manipulation, potentially priming participants to consider the social ramifications of disclosure more strongly than they would do naturally. Study 6 addressed this limitation by eliminating desire for belonging from the study design.35

Method

Participants and design. This study was a 2 (relative status: similar, high) by 2 (perceived intentionality: low, high) between-subjects design. Based on our finding in Study 5 that concealment decisions differed by 32%, we powered Study 6 to detect concealment decisions differing by 30% across relative status conditions when perceived intentionality was high, and by 0% across relative status conditions when perceived intentionality was low. This analysis required a target sample size of 284 participants to achieve 80% power for \( \alpha = .05 \). We recruited adults residing in the USA on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Similar to our reasoning for Study 5, we expected this online platform to provide a conservative test of our hypotheses. Basic demographics were collected for all participants, but only college-educated participants were

35 Study 5 also included a measure of desire for authenticity, which was not included in Study 6.
permitted to complete the full study. We collected data in batches (e.g., posting 100 slots at a time) until we reached a sample size exceeding 284 college-educated adults. This process yielded a sample size of 315 participants (51% women; $M_{age} = 34$; 80% White; 10% Black or African-American; 7% Asian; 5% Hispanic; 2% Native American; 0.6% Other Race).

**Procedure.** Participants followed a similar procedure to Study 5, with the following exceptions.

During the “getting to know you” session, participants in the high perceived intentionality condition were under the impression that they were sending information about themselves to their peer, and that their peer would be aware that they chose what information to send. Specifically, they were told that during the “getting to know you” session their partner would “know that you were given the option to share a subset of items (some of which may be different from the items shared about them) and that you chose what to share from among that subset.” Thus, for participants in this condition, there was potential to be blamed if they were perceived as disrupting the interpersonal interaction by introducing a status difference. In the low perceived intentionality condition, participants were told that their partner would be “under the impression that all information that they receive about you was sent by an automated system, so your partner will have no idea that you had a choice regarding what information is or is not shared. In other words, they will assume that the automated system is responsible for the information that is shared or not shared about you.” Thus, for participants in this condition, there was little, if any, possibility that they would be blamed for any discomfort generated by the disclosure of their high status identity.
Study 6 used the same interpersonal threat items as Study 5, but added four new, reverse-coded items. Participants also completed a manipulation check measuring perceived intentionality (e.g., “My partner will hold me accountable for any information that was or was not shared about me,” “If any information about me bothered my partner or made them uncomfortable, they would blame me for sharing it,” $\alpha = 0.86$).

After the manipulation checks, participants completed attention checks regarding relative status (the same as in Study 5) and perceived intentionality. For this latter attention check, participants read the critical instructions from the manipulation (in both conditions) and selected which instructions were displayed during the study. Participants passed this attention check if they selected the instructions pertaining to their experimental condition. Participants also completed the same suspicion check that was used in Study 5. Sixty participants failed the attention checks, 4 failed the suspicion check, and 1 failed both, resulting in 65 exclusions. Thus, 250 participants were included in our data analyses. Including all participants in the analyses did not alter the significance of the results.

Results

**Manipulation check: relative status.** The relative status manipulation was successful, $b = -1.79, p < .001$, 95% CI [-2.15, -1.43], $\beta = -.53$. Compared to participants in the relatively similar status condition ($M = 6.40, SD = 1.25$), participants in the relatively high status condition rated their partner as significantly lower status ($M = 4.60, SD = 1.65$).

**Manipulation check: perceived intentionality.** As predicted, participants expected perceived intentionality to be greater in the high perceived intentionality condition ($M = 3.54, SD = 1.18$) compared to the low perceived intentionality condition ($M = 2.40, SD = 1.31$), $b = 1.14, p$
< .001, 95% CI [0.83, 1.45], β = .42. To examine whether perceived intentionality included perceptions of being blameworthy, we conducted the same analysis using just the one item focusing on blame (“If any information about me bothered my partner or made them uncomfortable, they would blame me for sharing it”), and once again found significant results, \( b = 0.83, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.42, 1.23], \beta = .25 \).

**Identity concealment.** We conducted a multiple logistic regression, and centered both independent variables using weighted effect codes to allow us to assess main effects. As seen in Table 4, there was a significant main effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions, \( b = 2.81, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [1.98, 3.64], \text{OR} = 16.61 \). Participants were more likely to conceal their identity when they were relatively high status, as opposed to relatively similar status, compared to a peer (see Figure 21 for concealment percentages in each condition.). Perceived intentionality had no significant main effect, \( b = .17, p > .25, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.69, 1.03], \text{OR} = 1.19 \), nor moderating effect, \( b = -1.22, p = .15, 95\% \text{ CI} [-2.87, 0.43], \text{OR} = .30 \), on identity concealment.
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Figure 21. Percentage of participants who concealed their high status identity as a function of relative status and perceived intentionality (Study 6).
Table 4. Regressing identity concealment and learner type concealment on key variables in Study 6. The table reports unstandardized coefficients for logistic regressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Learner Type Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Relative Status</td>
<td>2.81***</td>
<td>-1.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 = Similar, 1 = High)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Intentionality</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 = Low, 1 = High)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Status x Perceived</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal threat mediation.** Using the same factor analysis approach as Study 5, we found that all three forms of interpersonal threat (to self, other, and belonging) loaded on one factor ($\alpha = .90$). However, because we are particularly interested in the influence of perceived intentionality on threat to the self, we present results using the mechanism of threat to self ($\alpha = .97$) below and results using the overall composite of interpersonal threat in the Supplemental Materials. The significance of results did not differ between these two analyses.

We conducted a mediation analysis employing Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. This analysis estimated the effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions directly, and indirectly via threat to self. The results revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, $b = 1.88$, $95\% CI [0.93, 2.83]$, $OR = 6.55$, and a significant indirect effect via threat to self, $b =
1.82, 95% CI [1.20, 2.64], OR = 6.17. A follow-up moderated mediation analysis using the same Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure estimated the effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions both directly and indirectly through threat to self, with both direct and indirect effects moderated by perceived intentionality. The index of moderated mediation was non-significant, as the 95% confidence interval included zero (-1.12, 0.77), indicating that threat to self was similarly influential in determining concealment decisions regardless of the perceived intentionality of disclosure.

**Concealment of learner type.** Similar to Study 5, we examined the influence of our experimental conditions on participants’ concealment of status-neutral information regarding learner type. A multiple logistic regression analysis revealed a significant main effect of relative status, $b = -1.05, p = .05$, 95% CI [-2.11, 0.02], OR = 0.35, but no significant effects for perceived intentionality, nor the interaction between the two variables, $ps > .25$. As seen in Table 4, higher relative status led to less concealment of learner type.

**Discussion**

In Study 6, concealment of relatively high status identities was just as likely when the disclosure was perceived as unintentional, compared to when disclosure was perceived as an intentional act by the participant. Although minimizing perceived intentionality meant reducing expectations of being blamed for disclosure (as seen in our manipulation check), this shift in blame did not mitigate participants’ perceived threats to the self. It may be that a focal high status individual expects that elevating one’s status is a strong enough violation of social norms that others will still respond to perceived unintentional disclosure by inferring that the focal individual has negative character attributes or was otherwise negligent when it came to protecting social harmony during their interaction. For example, he may fear coming across as
the type of person who likes his high status to be known and thus failed to take proper steps to actively stop disclosure from occurring (and thus is still somewhat to blame for the disclosure, even if not fully). Ultimately, the findings of the present study demonstrate that threats to the self are not easily overcome: even in a situation when one might reasonably expect threat to the self to be lower due to minimal perceptions of intentionality, individuals were still heavily concerned with and influenced by threats to the self, prompting concealment.

Similar to Study 4, Study 6 found that to the extent that relative status influences concealment of status-neutral information, it is in the opposite direction of its influence on identity concealment. Specifically, participants were less likely to conceal status-neutral information when they were relatively high status, compared to when they were relatively similar status, to a peer.

General Discussion

The present paper reveals a surprisingly widespread tendency: individuals consistently conceal relatively high status identities from their peers in an effort to preserve social harmony. In an initial study, we found that third-party observers expected individuals to conceal an identity to the same extent (only 10% of the time) regardless of whether the identity conveyed relatively high status or relatively similar status compared to a peer. However, in five subsequent studies, we found consistent evidence that this third-party expectation is false. Individuals consistently avoided elevating their status above peers through concealing relatively high status identities, more so than relatively similar status identities. Individuals even expected to conceal high status identities in competitive professional contexts, where concealment can cost an individual valuable promotions and advantages associated with high status. High status identity concealment could not be attributed to a general reticence to share information with relatively
lower status peers; if anything, individuals shared status-neutral information to a greater extent with lower status peers, perhaps as a way of offsetting high status identity concealment. The mechanisms underlying high status identity concealment were heightened concerns with threats to the self, others, and belonging, which operated together as a general sense of interpersonal threat. Even when disclosure would be perceived as unintentional (minimizing the chance of being blamed for highlighting status differences), participants were equally concerned with activating interpersonal threats (including threats to the self) associated with a status difference being known and thus concealed their high status identity. These results suggest that individuals have a persistent internal discomfort with disclosing high relative status and view concealment as a desirable alternative for protecting social harmony.

**Theoretical Contributions**

The present paper provides insight into the understudied phenomenon of high status identity management. Although ample research has examined how individuals manage low status identities (Clair et al., 2005; Goffman, 1963; Phillips et al., 2009; Roberts, 2005), scholars have only recently begun to scratch the surface of how individuals manage high status identities. Phillips and colleagues’ (2009) influential work was the first to propose that individuals may conceal relatively high status identities. Building on this work, and recognizing that high status identities are unique from low status identities in that status motives potentially provide a strong incentive to disclose (Anderson et al., 2015), our research addresses open questions regarding when, why, and to what extent high status identity concealment occurs.

We introduce a comprehensive framework demonstrating that high status identity concealment is driven by several interpersonal threat mechanisms working in tandem across a variety of circumstances, leading to our conclusion that high status identity concealment is a
more pervasive behavior than previous theory would suggest. First, we provide a more nuanced account of when and why interpersonal threats to the self (i.e., envy) may lead to concealment. Second, we argue that high status identity concealment is not only due to concerns with self-relevant threats, but also concerns extending beyond the self that focus on interpersonal threats to others (in terms of the potential for stigma) and belonging (in terms of feeling like there is enough commonality to form a relationship). Third, we tested multiple situations that had the potential to override or attenuate this attention to interpersonal threats – including highly competitive situations and situations that minimize blame for disclosure – but in all cases we found consistent evidence that the desire to minimize interpersonal threats took precedence over individual gain. In sum, while previous scholars laid the foundation of proposing that high status identity concealment is possible (Phillips et al., 2009), the present research provides the first empirical insight into mechanisms and boundary conditions and, in doing so, establishes the ubiquity of high status identity concealment.

Our findings also provide insight into the social-cognitive processes and behaviors of high status individuals. Past research in this domain emphasizes the tendency of high status individuals to be more self-interested and socially disconnected than their lower status counterparts (Kraus et al., 2012). For example, research on social cognition highlights that, compared to their lower status counterparts, high status individuals have a propensity to stand out and are lacking in empathy, interpersonal engagement, and attention to threats (Kraus, Côté, & Keltner, 2010; Kraus et al., 2012; Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Stephens et al., 2007). We do not attempt to negate these previous conclusions that high status, compared to low status, is associated with stronger individual motives and weaker interpersonal motives. However, we
argue that the focus on comparing high- and low-status individuals may have led to an overly simplistic understanding of high status individuals’ social-cognitive processes.

We depart from this prior work’s focus on high status individuals in relation to their lower status counterparts, and instead demonstrate the value of understanding high status individuals in relation to their own (often conflicting) dual motives regarding self-interest vs. social harmony. We argue that, even if high status individuals are heavily influenced by self-interest motives, these motives (which, in the present study, take the form of status and authenticity motives) are best understood in juxtaposition to competing social harmony motives. Attention to these dual motives can facilitate theory that extends beyond just demonstrating the self-interested cognitive tendencies of high status individuals, instead enabling theory that identifies the conditions under which one set of motives is sufficiently strong to take priority over the other and ultimately dictate behavior. This framework allows for the possibility that, even if high status people are heavily motivated by self-interest motives for status and authenticity (perhaps more so than their lower status counterparts), certain conditions (such as being in a position of high relative status) can nonetheless enable social harmony motives take precedence in guiding behavior.

Understanding high status individuals’ competing motives, and the conditions under which high status individuals prioritize collectively beneficial motives of social harmony, has implications for inclusion processes within organizations. Inclusion involves a sense that one can be unique (including disclosing one’s identities), is respected and afforded opportunities, and is socially accepted among one’s coworkers (Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011). Individuals from relatively lower status groups often experience concerns with inclusion, navigating tough choices related to being unique on the one hand and being respected and accepted on the other hand
Our findings suggest that inclusion is a mutual concern for employees from relatively high status groups, who also grapple with disclosing their true selves while maintaining a sense of belonging and harmony among their peers. This finding has potential as a leveraging point for organizational inclusion efforts, which are sometimes resisted by members of higher status groups (Dahling et al., 2016; Hideg & Ferris, 2014; Shteynberg et al., 2011). For example, individuals from higher status groups often interpret inclusion efforts – which include encouraging employees to bring their full selves to work – as being beneficial to people from lower status groups but a means of exclusion for themselves (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). This perception may occur because members of high status groups fail to see the self-relevance of inclusion efforts. However, by acknowledging that even people from relatively high status groups are likely to struggle with whether and how to be authentic among their peers, organizations can make inclusion efforts relevant to all employees. Moreover, by increasing the personal relevance of inclusion efforts in this way, organizations are likely to increase high status group members’ endorsement of inclusion initiatives (Plaut et al., 2011). Given that high status individuals often hold more power and influence (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), their endorsement – or lack thereof – may make the difference between the success or failure of inclusion efforts in organizational contexts.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

There are limitations to the present work, creating fruitful opportunities for future research. First, more thorough examination is needed regarding high status concealment in professional contexts. We find that individuals expect to conceal relatively high status identities in competitive professional contexts where it is in their interest to disclose. However, the hypothetical nature of this study leaves open the possibility that people will behave differently
when confronted with the actual competitive pressures of real-world professional contexts. Thus, future studies can further examine high status identity concealment in work contexts and whether there is a threshold of competitiveness that does indeed trigger high status identity disclosure regardless of the status of one’s peers.

Second, future work can investigate high status concealment involving other identities beyond education. The present findings were limited to concealment of educational identities because they are strong indicators of status (Berger et al., 1980) yet easily concealed. We expect that the findings in the present research will extend to other concealable identities, such as professional and wealth-related identities. For example, professors, CEOs, and members of affluent families will likely experience similar concerns with interpersonal threat when considering whether to disclose their backgrounds, thus opting to conceal. However, there may be some ways in which concealment decisions differ for these other identities. For example, compared to education, the relative status of identities in other domains may be less transparent. Thus, while a professor may feel compelled to conceal her identity from a taxi driver (perhaps saying she works at a school), she may not have a clear assessment of the status implications of disclosing to a person who states that he works at Cravath, Swaine & Moore (not realizing that he works at a top-tier law firm). Thus, while we expect that the processes underlying high status identity concealment will generalize to other domains, such as profession and wealth, further work is needed to understand how unique properties associated with these domains – such as less explicit or known status rankings – may complicate concealment decisions.

Finally, while the present work has focused on high status individuals’ intentions to minimize interpersonal threat and preserve social harmony, additional research is needed to determine whether individuals are successful in achieving these goals or whether their efforts
potentially backfire in some respects. Indeed, it is possible that the short-term benefits of positive interpersonal interactions are offset by long-term detriments to equality within organizations. High status identity concealment may facilitate inequality in two ways. First, high status identity concealment may create feelings of harmony that discourage efforts to actually change status-related inequalities (Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009). For example, employees from Ivy League schools may hide the fact that they have high status educational identities that are accompanied with access to high status mentors, enabling them to scale the organizational ladder at faster paces than their lower status counterparts realize. Second, concealment may create feelings of inauthenticity that discourage high status individuals from seeking subsequent interactions with lower status peers (Swann, 1983), instead causing them to pursue interactions with similar others at the exclusion of lower status peers (Ibarra, 1992; M. McPherson et al., 2001). Such homophilous behaviors can limit lower status individuals from gaining access to valuable resources, social capital, and mentorship opportunities, thus severely restricting their professional advancement opportunities (Ibarra, 1995). Given the potential pitfalls associated with high status identity concealment, future research may investigate whether individuals can disclose high status identities in a manner that fosters both positive relationships and professionally beneficial connections across status differences.

**Conclusion**

The current research demonstrates that while concealing a relatively high status identity sacrifices both status and authenticity, individuals often deem concealment worthwhile because it minimizes interpersonal threats to the self, others, and belonging. While members of relatively lower status social groups often shoulder the burden of minimizing status differences and striving for social inclusion, the present work illuminates that social harmony is a mutual
concern and that high status individuals, similar to their lower status counterparts, rely on identity concealment as a means of preserving social relationships across status differences.
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CONCLUSION

The overarching goal of this dissertation was to examine how individuals attempt to cultivate inclusion in diverse contexts through expressing and concealing their social identity differences in interpersonal interactions. The first paper reveals that, although expression of minority cultural identities can feel stigmatizing and is avoided in certain circumstances (Dumas, Rothbard, & Phillips, 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006), minorities are surprisingly open to expressing their cultural backgrounds when they concretely think through the implications of doing so, and the consequences of such expression are often a higher degree of inclusion from majority-group coworkers (particularly when expression is rich and meaningful). The second paper reveals that, despite a common intuition that individuals in advantaged positions often prioritize personal gains such as status and authenticity (Blader & Chen, 2011; Kifer, Heller, Perunovic, & Galinsky, 2013; Kraus, Piff, Mendoza-Denton, Rheinschmidt, & Keltner, 2012; Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007), these individuals consistently sacrifice personal gain for social harmony by concealing relatively high status identities. Through these findings, this dissertation advances scholarly knowledge regarding how individuals manage identity-based differences in diverse contexts, the social-cognitive processes that contribute to or result from these identity management decisions, and the consequences for inclusion.

However, the two papers also highlight intriguing tensions and unanswered questions that are fruitful territory for future research. Below, I consider three broad sets of remaining tensions and open questions pertaining to 1) how inclusion efforts are experienced by the recipients of such efforts, 2) who the agents and recipients of inclusion can and should be, and 3) whether and how inclusion can be best achieved through the concealment/suppression or disclosure/expression of identity-based differences.
How Are Inclusion Efforts Experienced by the Recipients of these Efforts?

While both dissertation papers shed light upon the ways that individuals attempt to contribute to inclusion in interpersonal interactions, an open question still remains as to whether inclusions efforts by one party have inclusion-related consequences for the receiving party. For example, both papers highlight a way in which members of historically advantaged groups attempt to include their less advantaged counterparts – either through how they respond to the other person’s cultural-identity expression (through engaging in more inclusive behavior) or through the ways in which they manage their own identities (through concealment). Yet, it remains unclear whether these inclusion efforts translate into feelings and experiences of inclusion by their counterparts.

In the first dissertation paper, it may seem straightforward that if a minority’s rich cultural-identity expression leads majority-group colleagues to behave more inclusively toward the minority, the minority will register and benefit from this increase in inclusion. Yet, this may not necessarily be the case. Minorities may feel particularly vulnerable after highlighting intimate and personal details regarding a potentially stigmatizing source of difference, perhaps making them acutely sensitive to the possibility of culturally-based rejection (Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002). After making themselves vulnerable in this manner, minorities may need particularly strong and clear behavioral indicators of inclusion from majority-group coworkers in order to experience a greater sense of inclusion. While majorities’ increases in inclusive behaviors (in response to rich cultural-identity expression) may be sufficiently high for minorities to detect, it is also possible that these increases may still fall short of the levels needed for a minority seeking reassurance that he is indeed still valued and accepted. Thus, while rich cultural-identity expression may lead to more inclusive behaviors, it
remains unclear whether such rich expression will lead to greater feelings of inclusion by the expresser himself.

The second dissertation paper grapples with its own tensions surrounding efforts to include others and understanding how these efforts are translated into the experiences of others. This paper demonstrates that high status individuals engage in a behavior (identity concealment) that they believe will protect social harmony between themselves and others. Yet, as argued in the general discussion of this paper, there are reasons to believe that high status identity concealment may result in less inclusion of lower status individuals, either because high status individuals subsequently avoid individuals who they feel they cannot be themselves around or because high status individuals are hindering access to valuable resources associated with their high status identity. Moreover, given the possibilities of asymmetric information, lower status individuals may experience exclusion or judgment in the moment if they have prior knowledge of their peer’s high status identity, perhaps making them aware that the other person 1) intentionally concealed the identity and 2) potentially did so because of perceiving a status difference between them. This realization may create an even starker awareness of status differences, and the potential for these differences to jeopardize their personal experience of inclusion. Thus, both during and after the interaction, it remains unclear whether the intentions of high status identity concealment, in terms of protecting social harmony, will translate into greater experiences and feelings of inclusion for the lower status counterpart. Given the gaps highlighted in this paper, as well as the paper on cultural-identity expression, research with real dyads is needed to provide more in-depth insight into whether inclusion-related efforts actually positively influence the intended recipients of these efforts.
Inclusion by and for Whom?

While the previous tension concerned the dynamic between an agent and recipient of inclusion, another tension exists when it comes to determining who the agent and recipient can and should be. In both papers, there is an implied notion that members of advantaged groups are the agents of inclusion, whereas members of disadvantaged groups are the recipients. Yet it is worth considering the alternative. For example, while it is possible to think of minority cultural-identity expression as a tactic for minorities to gain inclusion from majority-group colleagues, minority expression can also be framed as an effort by minorities to create a sense of inclusion for majority-group members by giving them access to their less-known thoughts and experiences. This possibility raises several questions. How does minority cultural-identity expression influence a majority's own sense of inclusion? Is the reason that majorities behave more inclusively in response to cultural-identity expression in part because they themselves feel included by minorities’ cultural expressions? Relatedly, could it be that cultural-identity expression increases the perceived status of a minority expresser because it positions her as the agent or initiator of inclusion? These possibilities merit further exploration in future work.

While the paper on cultural-identity expression raises the possibility that minorities can potentially serve as agents of inclusion, it also raises a question about whether this should be the case. A reader of the paper on cultural-identity expression may conclude that the onus of inclusion ultimately rests on the shoulders of members of disadvantaged groups, perhaps suggesting that these individuals have a responsibility to make high status individuals want to include them. Yet, this conclusion belies the reality of power differentials between groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), the preexisting vulnerability of members of disadvantaged groups to
stereotypes and stigma (Major & O’Brien, 2005), and the challenges associated with adding to this vulnerability through engaging in rich cultural-identity expression (Goffman, 1963).

Given the risks of sharing meaningful details regarding membership in a less advantaged group, members of these groups may only be willing to take the leap of faith to engage in rich cultural-identity expression if their more advantaged counterparts contribute to a safe space for doing so. For example, given the tendency for individuals to engage in reciprocal self-disclosure (Derlega, Harris, & Chaikin, 1973; Jourard, 1959), members of an advantaged group may create a safe context for rich minority cultural-identity expression if they first disclose intimate information about themselves, with the safest form of self-disclosure perhaps being in an area that does not pertain to status-related differences. Thus, if a White employee discusses a difficulty that he experienced at work (e.g., trouble with learning a new skill) or at home (e.g., an illness in his family), he may signal to a Latina colleague that he is a person with whom she can be open in a variety of ways (including regarding her cultural background) and thus initiate a reinforcing cycle of self-disclosure and inclusion.

As the above example suggests, while members of disadvantaged groups can contribute to a cycle of inclusion, it can (and perhaps should) be considered, at the very least, a shared responsibility rather than the responsibility of the member of the disadvantaged group. Herein lies the value of the second paper regarding high status identity concealment, as it reveals that high status individuals can be motivated to contribute to social harmony and can be sensitive to how identity-related differences may undermine this broader interpersonal goal. In the section below, I consider how this goal of social harmony may be most effectively achieved.
To Express or to Conceal? What Approaches to Identity Management Are Best for Inclusion?

The present dissertation papers have the potential to leave the reader with a perplexing question – should individuals in diverse contexts express or conceal their identity-based differences? Does the answer depend on the identity in question, particularly whether the identity reflects membership in a historically lower status, minority group versus membership in a historically higher status, majority group? In the past, these questions seemed straightforward. Put simply, prior work often assumed that bringing attention to lower status or underrepresented identities is problematic (Dumas et al., 2008; Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006). In contrast, bringing attention to high status identities was not considered sufficiently problematic to merit in-depth scientific inquiry. Thus, prior to the present work, a general prescription for employees may have implicitly been: be yourself… unless your self has the potential to be stigmatized due to its lower status. The present dissertation turns this perspective on its head, suggesting that expressing minority cultural identities has the potential to be a positive source of connection and inclusion, whereas high status identity disclosure can be surprisingly problematic. Given these complexities, whether individuals should bring attention to or downplay their identity-based differences remains an open question, and the papers in this dissertation seem to provide contradictory recommendations. While one paper frames expression as positive (in terms of the potential for cultural-identity expression to facilitate inclusion), the other portrays concealment as positive (in terms of the ability for concealment to protect social harmony), making it unclear which approach is ultimately more effective for cultivating inclusion.

Of the two dissertation papers, the one on cultural-identity expression is perhaps the most advanced in its thinking regarding identity management, implicitly changing the conversation
from one about whether to highlight (vs. suppress) differences to one about how to effectively bring attention to differences. This conversation shift is based on the assumption that, ultimately, individuals and social relationships benefit from people expressing their authentic selves (Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator, 1997; Swann, 1983), but that individuals must be attentive to the nuances of identity- and status-based concerns that may stem from such authenticity (Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009). The present work identifies rich cultural-identity expression as a positive way for minorities to bring attention to their authentic selves without jeopardizing relationships and inclusion, contributing to a growing perspective that members of disadvantaged groups may have options for effectively expressing their authentic selves if they so choose (Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005; Roberts, 2005) rather than always resorting to concealment and covering (Goffman, 1963; Yoshino, 2006).

In contrast to low status identity management, scholars are only beginning to scratch the surface of how individuals in higher status, majority groups can and should manage their identities (Phillips et al., 2009). Is concealment the best approach when it comes to high status identities (as suggested by the second paper in this dissertation), or is there room to push the conversation beyond concealment in a similar manner to the first paper regarding minority cultural-identity expression? As discussed previously, while high status identity concealment has its merits in terms of protecting social harmony, it is also has (potentially greater) drawbacks to the extent that it precludes lower status individuals from inclusion in other ways (e.g., limiting access to valued networks and resources). Given this double-edged sword of concealment, there may be benefits to bringing attention to high status identities, but doing so in a way that handles status-related differences delicately. In that sense, the main contribution of the second dissertation paper may not necessarily be in showing that individuals conceal high status
identities per se, but rather in demonstrating that high status individuals are sufficiently motivated by interpersonal goals that they are willing to modify their identity management strategies in a manner that facilitates social harmony.

The next frontier in research on high status identity management may focus on how high status individuals can channel the motive to protect social harmony into disclosure, rather than concealment, focusing on approaches to disclosure that are mutually beneficial rather than approaches that simply enable high status individuals to seize personal gains and opportunities. This leads to yet another question: are the approaches to effectively bringing attention to higher status, majority-group identities the same as the approaches to effectively expressing lower-status, minority-group identities (including rich expression)? The answer may be “not necessarily.” By virtue of being underrepresented, minorities’ experiences and psychological processes are likely to be less known and understood, making rich expression a particularly powerful way for minorities to connect with majorities because it allows minorities to be seen as less enigmatic and more familiar to their majority-group counterparts. In contrast, by virtue of being the determinants of societal norms and culture (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002), majority-group individuals’ thoughts and experiences may be highly familiar to minorities. Rich identity expression by a majority-group member may, at its best, come across as just more of the same information that minorities are always exposed to; however, at its worst, it may come across as an attempt to reinforce majority-group perspectives and norms, implicitly silencing minorities or dissenting views. Thus, it remains unclear whether rich identity expression by majority-group members is beneficial in terms of fostering stronger cross-status relationships and facilitating a collective experience of inclusion.
Although rich expression may be a less promising conduit of inclusion for high status individuals, focusing on the underlying reason that rich cultural-identity expression is beneficial for members of minority groups may help to identify approaches to disclosure and expression that can be beneficial for members of higher status, majority groups as well. Part of the reason that minority cultural-identity expression is so effective is because it involves providing higher status peers with something that they are otherwise lacking: knowledge of and familiarity with the lives of minorities. The solution to effective high status identity disclosure may lie in similarly understanding what lower status individuals are lacking, and how high status disclosure can begin to close rather than enlarge an interpersonal gap.

Given that lower status individuals often lack access to resources to which higher status groups are privy (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), an effective approach to expressing a high status identity may involve showing a willingness to share resources with members of lower status groups. Psychological theories predict that high status individuals will find this notion disconcerting – share the benefits of my high status? Sharing such benefits has the potential to threaten intergroup boundaries and hierarchies, diminishing the positive distinctiveness of a high status group (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Yet, this is precisely why it is likely to be an effective way to highlight a high status identity – it has the potential to signal that the individual does not adhere to the historical delineations of group-based hierarchy and is willing to dissolve those boundaries for the other person’s benefit.

There remains much to be understood regarding how individuals can effectively express their identity-based differences while maintaining a sense of inclusion, but the present dissertation provides promising evidence that solutions exist and that members of both low and high status groups have an interest in identifying them. Future work can further differentiate
among approaches to identity disclosure and expression and add to our understanding of how the most effective approaches for identity management depend on one’s position in a broader societal hierarchy.
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APPENDIX

Supplemental Materials for Chapter 1

These supplemental materials include the following: experimental manipulations for each study (when applicable), exploratory measures in each study, and any additional measures that required additional explanation but could not fit in the main paper.

Study 1a

Experimental Manipulations in Study 1a

In Study 1a, participants recalled and described a recent experience based one of four randomly assigned experimental conditions.

Less-rich work-identity expression / Control condition: Think of a recent experience that you had relating to your work, such as an experience that occurred during a work activity or an experience that occurred during everyday work life. (Note that if you cannot think of a recent experience that fits the above description, think instead about any experience that you have had that fits the above description). In the space below, please write 3 full sentences describing the experience, including what occurred, where it occurred, and when it occurred.

Less-rich cultural-identity expression: Think of a recent experience that you had related to your culture (i.e., your race or ethnicity), such as an experience that occurred during a culturally-relevant activity or a culturally-relevant experience that occurred during everyday life. (Note that if you cannot think of a recent experience that fits the above description, think instead about any experience that you have had that fits the above description). In the space below, please write 3 full sentences describing the experience, including what occurred, where it occurred, and when it occurred.

Rich cultural-identity expression: Think of a recent experience that you had related to your culture (i.e., your race or ethnicity), such as an experience that occurred during a culturally-relevant activity or a culturally-relevant experience that occurred during everyday life. (Note that if you cannot think of a recent experience that fits the above description, think instead about any experience that you have had that fits the above description). In the space below, please write 3 full sentences describing the experience, including what occurred, what you thought and felt during the experience, and why you thought and felt the way you did.

Rich personal-identity expression: Think of a recent experience that you had that was unrelated to your work, such as an experience that occurred during a non-work activity or
an experience that occurred during everyday life. (Note that if you cannot think of a recent experience that fits the above description, think instead about any experience that you have had that fits the above description). In the space below, please write 3 full sentences describing the experience, including what occurred, what you thought and felt during the experience, and why you thought and felt the way you did.

**Behavioral Dependent Measure of Participant’s Willingness to Express an Experience to a Majority-Group Coworker (Study 1a)**

Below is a complete description of two behavioral items assessing minority-group participants’ willingness to express an experience to a minority-group coworker. Participants indicated their willingness to let the research team send a message to their coworker that would include the experience that they described for the experimental manipulation. In addition, participants indicated their willingness to send the message to their coworker themselves. Specifically, participants read and responded to the following prompt.

Research suggests that sharing experiences with others can help cultivate more positive relationships with them (Shelton, Trail, West, & Bergsieker, 2010), yet there is not always an opportunity to share experiences with one’s coworkers. Below, we have created a message that could be sent to [coworker initials] and would share your experience with him/her. Please read the message and then answer the questions below regarding your willingness to send this message to [coworker initials]. The parts in brackets are parts that you could edit before sending.

Hi There [You could edit the exact greeting],

I recently participated in a study on workplace relationships. In this study, the researchers asked me to write about an experience, which is pasted below, and then discussed the interpersonal benefits of sharing experiences with others. They also asked me to write down the names of several coworkers with whom I work, and then they randomly selected one coworker with whom I could share the experience. You were the randomly selected coworker so I am sharing this experience with you. I hope you enjoy reading it. [This statement is optional: Please note that at the time that I wrote the experience, I was not aware that it would be shared with others so please excuse any typos, grammatical issues, etc.] Here is the experience I wrote during the study:

{the experience that the participant previously described was piped in}

Thanks and take care, [You could choose how you would like to sign your name so long as it is clear to your coworker that the message came from you specifically]
After reading this prompt, participants completed the following two items on a scale from 1 to 9 (very unwilling - very willing), “to what extent would you be willing to let us send this message to [coworker initials] on your behalf” and “to what extent would you be willing to send this message to [coworker initials] through your own personal or work email?”

**Exploratory Measures in Study 1a**

Participants completed several exploratory measures in Study 1, including: how the participant expected to personally feel during the interaction with their coworker (in terms of anxiety, emotional exhaustion, feeling understood, finding the interaction rewarding), how the participant expected their coworker to respond to the interaction (in terms of the coworker’s perception of the participant’s status, subjective sense of closeness to the participant, anxiety when interacting with the participant, sense that the interaction with the participant would be rewarding, and perception he/she is similar to the participant), and how the participant expected work-related outcomes to be effected moving forward (overall experience of inclusion, job satisfaction, psychological engagement, emotional burnout, and turnover intentions). Participants also completed a series of questions about the information they expressed to their coworker (how long ago the experience they described occurred, perceived valence of information, typicality of sharing this type of information), their organization (industry, culture of inclusion, diversity), their coworker (demographic questions, length of time they worked together, relative status that they and their coworker occupy within their organization). Finally, participants confirmed that they had answered all previous questions with the same coworker in mind.

Additional exploratory measures were created by coding participants’ free-response answers. Specifically, a White research assistant – who was blind to condition – read the experiences that participants described for the experimental manipulation and coded these
responses for strength of impression (i.e., the extent to which the person would be leaving a positive versus negative impression of themselves if they shared this experience with others, coded on a scale of 1 to 7 – very negative impression to very positive impression). In addition, a Black research assistant who was blind to condition read the experiences that participants described during the experimental manipulation as well as participants’ descriptions of how their majority-group colleagues were likely to respond to hearing about the experience. These latter responses were coded for the level of expected coworker supportiveness (i.e., how supportive the participant expects the majority-group colleague to respond, coded on a scale of 1 to 9 – very unsupportive to very supportive).

**Study 1b**

**Exploratory Measures in Study 1b**

Participants in Study 1b completed exploratory questions about their job (a measure of their subjective rank, culture of inclusion, level of diversity, and industry), as well as demographic questions (age, nationality, education).

**Study 2**

**Experimental Manipulations in Study 2**

Depending on experimental condition, participants read one of the following prompts:

*Less-rich cultural-identity expression.* Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that made you aware of his/her cultural background. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said and why this made you aware of his/her cultural background.
Rich cultural-identity expression. Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that helped you to better understand his/her cultural background. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said and why this helped you to better understand his/her cultural background.

Emotion expression. Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that helped you to better understand his/her emotions and feelings. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said and why this helped you to better understand his/her emotions and feelings.

Work discussion / control condition. Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she talked to you about a work-related project. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said.

Manipulation Check Items in Study 2

The original manipulation check measures in Study 2 did not yield significant results. The items used in this early-stage study (compared to items used in subsequent studies), may not have asked the appropriate questions to capture the differences between experimental conditions. For example, the manipulation check items in this study asked about participants’ perceptions of their coworker in general (rather asking about their perceptions of their coworker in the context of the interaction they recalled) and their ability to understand their coworker (rather than directly asking about what their coworker said). Thus, in the main paper, alternative manipulation checks were utilized based on coding by independent coders. Nonetheless, the original manipulation check items are described below.
Salience of minority coworker’s cultural identity

1. To what extent are you aware of what [coworker initials]'s culture (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality) is?
2. When you think about [coworker initials], how salient is his/her cultural background (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality)?
3. When you think about [coworker initials], to what extent do you think about his/her culture (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality) being different from your own?

Richness of cultural-identity expression

1. To what extent do you understand how [coworker initials] is shaped by his/her cultural background (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality)?
2. To what extent do you have a meaningful understanding of [coworker initials] in terms of his/her cultural background (i.e., race, ethnicity, nationality)?

Overall intimacy of information shared

1. To what extent do you understand [coworker initials] in terms of his/her feelings and emotions?
2. To what extent do you understand [coworker initials]’s experiences and background in general?
3. To what extent do you understand [coworker initials]’s perspective and viewpoints in general?
4. To what extent do you “get” [coworker initials] overall?

**Inclusive Behaviors in Study 2**
Below is a complete list of the items used for the dependent measures of inclusive behavior in Study 2.

Professionally Inclusive Behavior

1. To what extent do you value [coworker initials]'s work-related contributions?
2. To what extent do you value [coworker initials]'s input on work-related projects?
3. If you had to assemble a team to work on an important new project, how likely would you be to ask [coworker initials] to join your team?
4. If you encountered a challenge at work, how likely would you be to ask [coworker initials] for his/her input on the best way to proceed?
5. If [coworker initials] and another coworker provided conflicting recommendations for how to best tackle a work-related problem that you were grappling with, how likely would you be to follow [coworker initials]'s recommendation (as opposed to the other coworker's recommendation)?
6. Imagine that [coworker initials] and another coworker approached you and told you that they disagreed about the best way to approach a work-related issue and would like a third opinion. After they explained the issue, how likely would you be to take [coworker initials]'s side?

Socially Inclusive Behavior

1. If you ran into [coworker initials] in passing at work, how likely would you be to stop what you are doing and catch up with him/her?
2. If you wanted to take a quick break during the work day and saw that [coworker initials] and another coworker were each taking a break separately, how likely would you be to join [coworker initials] (as opposed to the other coworker)?

3. If you were about to eat lunch with another coworker and saw [coworker initials] eating alone, how likely would you be to invite [coworker initials] to join?

4. If you were going to a social event after work and were interested in inviting coworkers, how likely would you be to invite [coworker initials]?

5. If a coworker invited you to an event outside of work and [coworker initials] seemed interested, how likely would you be to ask your other coworker if [coworker initials] could join?

Multicultural Appreciation Behavior toward Specific Minority Coworker

1. To what extent are you interested in learning more about [coworker initials]'s cultural background?

2. To what extent would you prefer not to learn more about [coworker initials]'s cultural background?

Multicultural Appreciation Behavior: Endorsement of Multicultural Ideology

1. Our organizational practices should support racial and ethnic diversity.

2. Employees should recognize and celebrate cultural and racial differences.

3. Employees should downplay their racial and ethnic differences.

4. The unity of our company is weakened by employees of different cultural and racial backgrounds emphasizing their separate ways.

5. Cultural and racial minorities in the company should adapt to mainstream ways.
Exploratory Measures in Study 2

Participants in Study 2 also completed exploratory questions about their coworker (length of relationship, whether the coworker was boss, coworker, or subordinate), assessing perceived similarity to their coworker, free-response questions assessing how the interaction they recalled influenced their social and professional relationship, and two additional demographic questions (education and income).

Study 3

Experimental Manipulations in Study 3

Depending on experimental condition, participants read one of the following prompts:

*Less-rich work-identity expression*: Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that made you aware of his/her cultural background. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said, did, thought, and felt.

*Rich work-identity expression*: Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that made you aware of how his/her thoughts, feelings, or less-known experiences relate to his/her cultural background. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said, did, thought, and felt.

*Emotion expression*: Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she said something that made you aware of his/her emotions and feelings. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said, did, thought, and felt.
Work discussion / control condition: Describe a time when you were interacting with [coworker initials] and he/she made you aware of a work-related project that he/she was working on. In the space below, describe the interaction in as much detail as possible, including what each of you said, did, thought, and felt.

Exploratory Measures in Study 3

In addition to the measures included in the main paper, participants in Study 3 also completed the following exploratory measures: perceived valence of information described in their response to the recall prime, perceptions about their coworker and their interaction (empathy, perspective-taking, perceptions that the interaction was rewarding, perceived similarity), demographic questions about their coworker (e.g., race, nationality, gender, age, length of work relationship), free-response questions assessing how the interaction they recalled influenced their social and professional relationship, questions about their job (industry, a measure of subjective rank for themselves and their coworker, personal experience of inclusion, culture of inclusion, diversity), and an individual difference measure (past intergroup contact).

Study 4

Experimental Manipulations in Study 4

Study 4 followed a 3 (identity expression: cultural, personal, and work) by 2 (richness: rich, less-rich) design. Each identity expression condition (cultural, personal, work) began the same way, but ended differently depending on the level of richness. Typos were included intentionally to make responses seem more realistic, and were the same across all conditions.
Cultural-identity expression condition: Last month I decided to start wearing my hair in more Afro-centric styles (tighter/kinkier curls) at work and at home, as opposed to straightening it...

Less-rich condition: In the black community, different people wear their hair in different ways depending on their preferences, as well as other factors and considerations. On the one hand, some people wear their hair in Afro-centric styles, but on the other hand there are people who, well... straighten their hair like I was doing before. Switching my hair to be more Afro-centric has been a big change to how I look on a day-to-day basis.

Rich condition: In the black community, how you wear your hair is often more than just a matter of how you look, but also a matter of embracing one’s unique cultural identity. It’s been a meaningful change and now I really value wearing my hair in Afro-centric styles instead of, well... feeling like I should continue straightening it like I was before. Switching my hair to more Afro-centric styles has been a big leap toward embracing the person I want to be.

Personal-identity expression condition: Last month I decided to start wearing more unconventional glasses (colorful plastic-frames, unique shape) at work and at home, as opposed to wearing wire-frame glasses...

Less-rich condition: The way I see it, different people wear different types of glasses depending on their preferences, as well as other factors and considerations. On the one hand, some people wear glasses that are less conventional, but on the other hand there are people who, well... wear basic wire ones like I was doing before. Switching my glasses to be less conventional has been a big change to how I look on a day-to-day basis.

Rich condition: The way I see it, what glasses you wear is often more than just a matter of how you look, but also a matter of embracing one’s unique personal identity. It’s been a meaningful change and now I really value wearing glasses that are less conventional instead of, well... feeling like I should continue wearing basic wire ones like I wore before. Switching my glasses to be less conventional has been a big leap toward embracing the person I want to be.

Work-identity expression condition: Last month I decided to start wearing different work clothes at my main job, as opposed to wearing the work clothes I had before (both are work appropriate, but just a different look)...

Less-rich condition: Where I work, different people wear different clothes to work depending on their preferences, as well as other factors and considerations. On the one hand, some people wear clothes that are similar to what I wear to work now, but on the other hand there are people who, well... wear clothes like what I wore before. Switching to this new way of dressing to work has been a big change to how I look on a day-to-day basis.

Rich condition: Where I work, what clothes you wear to work is more than just a matter of how you look, but also a matter of embracing one’s unique work
identity. It’s been a meaningful change and now I really value wearing the clothes I wear to work instead of, well… feeling like I should continue wearing the clothes that I was wearing before. Switching to this new way of dressing at work has been a big leap toward embracing the worker I want to be.

**Dependent Measures in Study 4**

Below are complete descriptions of the dependent measures in Study 4.

**Professionally inclusive behaviors.** Participants completed three measures of professionally inclusive behavior.

*Incorporation of coworker’s professional input.* Participants were presented with the same five consulting questions that they completed earlier in the study, were reminded of their own answers, and were shown their coworker’s answers. For each question, the survey asked participants to produce a final answer, using their coworker’s answers as they saw fit. The measure of professional inclusiveness was based on how much participants adjusted their original answer to incorporate their coworker’s answer, indicating that they were taking their coworker’s advice. Incorporating their coworker’s professional input was quantitatively measured using the “weight of advice” (WOA) paradigm from the advice-taking literature (Gino & Moore, 2007; Harvey & Fischer, 1997). WOA = |final estimate - initial estimate| / |advice - initial estimate|.

*Strength of numeric recommendation.* Participants were asked the extent to which they would recommend their coworker for two promotions at TCX Consulting based on their experience working and interacting with the coworker. Specifically, participants indicated on a 1

---

36 When participants completely discount the coworker’s answer and maintain their initial estimate, WOA is equal to 0. When participants completely accept the coworker’s answer, WOA is equal to 1. Following past research, cases were dropped when participants’ initial answers were the same as their coworker’s answer. Also following past research, cases where WOA was greater than 1 were rounded to 1 (Gino & Moore, 2007).
(do not recommend) to 5 (recommend strongly) scale how strongly they would recommend that TurkEnthusiast be promoted to a Senior Consultant job, which they were told required more skill and was associated with higher compensation. Using the same scale, participants also indicated how strongly they would recommend their coworker for a Senior Editor position, which they were told paid more and required “exceptionally strong writing skills and impeccable judgment” ($\alpha = .78$).

**Strength of written recommendation.** Participants were given the opportunity to write their coworker a free-response recommendation for the Senior Editor position. Two coders, who were blind to experimental condition, coded these responses on a 1 (extremely unlikely) to 9 (extremely likely) scale with the following question in mind: “Imagine that you are the person in charge of promotions. Based on the recommendation written, how likely are you to promote this person?” (intraclass reliability coefficient = .95)\(^{37}\)

**Socially inclusiveness behaviors.** Participants completed two measures of socially inclusive behavior.

**Inclusion in a future social activity.** Participants were told that TCX Consulting is interested in recreating an office environment by enabling coworkers to play games together. Participants were informed that they would be playing a game of “cyberball” with the same coworker (TurkEnthusiast) and four other coworkers who were ostensibly completing the study at the same time, and that the six of them needed to be split into two teams of three. Next, participants were told that they were the captain of one of the teams, called the Eagles, and that

\(^{37}\) The coders also identified nine responses that should be excluded due to participants not providing a real response to the question.
this team had a reputation for being more fun, making it seem like the team for which other players would want to be selected. Participants were then asked to rank four potential teammates (including TurkEnthusiast) in the order in which they would pick them for their team. In order to create some variety in participants’ rankings (such that participants did not predominantly select TurkEnthusiast, the coworker with whom they were most familiar), participants were told that their coworkers were listed in decreasing order of self-reported computer game experience and TurkEnthusiast was listed last. Next, the survey asked participants to rank the same four players based on their interest in completing a fun warm-up exercise with each player. To create variation on this measure, participants were told that the other four players were listed in the order of how ready they were to start the game, and TurkEnthusiast was listed last. The two rankings completed by participants during the cyberball game were averaged into a composite measure of inclusion in a future social activity ($\alpha = .70$). After completing these items, participants were then informed that, due to a system error, they would be unable to complete the cyberball game.

*Inclusiveness during a social interaction.* At the end of the study, participants were given the opportunity to complete a free-response “Nice to Meet You” message for their coworker (TurkEnthusiast). Two Black American coders, who were blind to experimental condition, coded these responses on a 1 (extremely unlikely) to 9 (extremely likely) scale with the following question in mind: “Imagine that you work with this person and your paths crossed on a future occasion at work. Based on what they said to you, how likely is this person to want to socially interact with you when you cross paths again?” (intraclass reliability coefficient = .93)

---

38 The coders also identified seven responses that should be excluded due to participants not providing a real response to the question.
Multicultural appreciation. Participants completed two measures of multicultural appreciation.

Multicultural appreciation behavior toward a specific minority coworker. As part of a series of questions during the coffee chat, participants indicated on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much) their interest in their coworker answering coffee chat questions that were likely to elicit cultural-identity expression (“Describe an important component of your heritage or cultural background,” and “How has your nationality, race, or ethnicity shaped you as a person?”). The composite of participants’ responses served as our dependent measure of multicultural appreciation behavior toward their minority coworker (α = .84).

Multicultural appreciation within organization: Endorsement of multicultural appreciation. Participants indicated on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), their agreement with four statements, “Recognizing cultural and racial diversity should be a fundamental characteristic of TCX Consulting,” “TCX Consulting's practices should support racial and ethnic diversity,” “Employees should recognize and celebrate cultural and racial differences,” and “Employees should downplay their racial and ethnic differences” (reverse coded; α = .82).

Exploratory Measures in Study 4
For exploratory purposes, participants in Study 4 completed measures of competence perceptions, empathy, perspective-taking, trust, similarity to their coworker, coworker’s racial prototypicality, salience of the coworker’s personal identity, attention checks to confirm that they knew their coworker’s gender and race, suspicion about whether their coworker was a real person, and a free-response question assessing their overall thoughts about their coworker.
Participants completed a demographic question regarding country of birth, and individual difference measures of previous intergroup contact, and race-based self-consciousness.

Study 5

Experimental Manipulations in Study 5

During the group “getting to know you” session, one of the questions asked participants to describe one thing that they enjoyed doing during the summer and what they enjoyed about it. The confederate’s response to this question served as our manipulation of identity expression using four experimental conditions: control condition / less-rich personal-identity expression, less-rich cultural-identity expression, rich cultural-identity expression, rich + frustrated cultural-identity expression. The confederate’s answers were as follows:

*Less-rich personal identity expression (control):* I went to a porch festival, which was a lot of fun. It’s like a neighborhood music festival that happens in Somerville. There were lots of activities, food like funnel cake and also barbecue, and lots of music. Like there were different parts of the festival where bands would just play sets of music, so I got to hear a lot of really good music as I went through the festival. And I also hung out with a couple of my friends. I’m really glad I went.

*Less-rich cultural-identity expression:* I went to a Caribbean festival, which was a lot of fun. My family is from Jamaica, although I was born in the U.S. There were lots of activities, food like Jamaican rum cakes and also jerk chicken, and lots of reggae music. Like there were different parts of the festival where bands would just play sets of music, so I got to hear a lot of really good reggae music as I went through the festival. And I also hung out with a couple of my Jamaican friends. I’m really glad I went.

*Rich cultural-identity expression:* I went to a Caribbean festival, which was a lot of fun. My family is from Jamaica, although I was born in the U.S. There were lots of activities, food like Jamaican rum cakes and also jerk chicken, and lots of reggae music. But going meant more to me than just good food and music though. There is just something really nice about feeling connected to my Jamaican heritage and where my family comes from. It’s like I get a small piece of the island, even though I am in the States. I’m really glad I went.

*Rich + frustrated cultural-identity expression:* I went to a Caribbean festival, which was a lot of fun. My family is from Jamaica, although I was born in the U.S. There were lots of activities, food like Jamaican rum cakes and also jerk chicken, and lots of reggae music. But going meant more to me than just good food and music though. A lot of people don’t
really know much about black people with Caribbean roots, or just see us in terms of stereotypes, so going to festivals like these helps me to feel connected to people who get me and my background for a change. I’m really glad I went.

**Exploratory Measures in Study 5**

Participants in Study 5 also completed the following exploratory measures: perspective taking, empathy, perceived reward from the interaction, personal experience of inclusion, and interest in receiving input from their coworkers. Participants also completed individual difference measures of openness to experience from the Big 5 Personality Inventory (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008) and past intergroup contact. At the end of the study, participants completed attention checks to confirm that they recalled the confederate’s name and were also asked whether anything was suspicious about the study.
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## Additional Tables for Chapter 1

Table 5. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 1a (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Expected Professionally Inclusive Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Square d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>12771.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12771.8</td>
<td>3192.84</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1240.05</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14127.33</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1260.77</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .016 (Adjusted R-Squared = .007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Personal Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 1a (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>10313.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10313.48</td>
<td>2387.64</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1339.05</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11722.25</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1375.10</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .026 (Adjusted R-Squared = .017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Personal Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 1a (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Expected Multicultural Appreciation Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11728.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11728.61</td>
<td>2212.26</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1643.51</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13426.25</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1680.01</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .022 (Adjusted R-Squared = .012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Personal Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 1a (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Willingness to Express</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>181.18</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181.66</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>181.44</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .001 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Personal Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Expected Professionally Inclusive Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>40.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.27</td>
<td>170.05</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 7.79, p = .002$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .92$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Expected Socially Inclusive Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>70.89</td>
<td>160.55</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 14.37$, p = .001, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .87$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise Comparisons Using Bonferroni Adjustment</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression Condition</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Expected Multicultural Appreciation Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>101.83</td>
<td>166.31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, χ² (2) = 10.24, p = .006, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (ε = .90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise Comparisons Using Bonferroni Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Personal Appreciation Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed*</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed*</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had not been violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 2.45, p = .29$, therefore sphericity was assumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Willingness to Express</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>159.77</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>91.08</td>
<td>147.63</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser*</td>
<td>99.57</td>
<td>161.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 13.75, p = .001$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = .88$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Repeated-measures ANOVA results from Study 1b (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Preference for Expression</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed*</td>
<td>106.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.26</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed*</td>
<td>130.29</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had not been violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 2.94, p = .23$, therefore sphericity was assumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise Comparisons Using Bonferroni Adjustment</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 2 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Professionally Inclusive Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .018 (Adjusted R-Squared = .011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 2 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Social Inclusive Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11867.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11867.25</td>
<td>5981.70</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>864.99</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12803.32</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>882.83</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .020 (Adjusted R-Squared = .013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 2 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Multicultural Appreciation Behavior Toward Coworker</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>9600.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9600.07</td>
<td>9069.51</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>461.51</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10119.75</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>479.89</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .038 (Adjusted R-Squared = .032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 2 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Endorsement of Multicultural Ideology</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11701.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11701.47</td>
<td>7426.43</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>686.98</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12471.56</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>700.50</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .019 (Adjusted R-Squared = .013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 3 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Professionally Inclusive Behavior</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>272.36</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274.14</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>272.87</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .002 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 3 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>17506.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17506.04</td>
<td>5732.39</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1160.48</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18726.32</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1165.46</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .004 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 3 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Multicultural Appreciation Behavior Toward Coworker</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3590.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3590.38</td>
<td>2486.19</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>548.77</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4141.00</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>557.85</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .016 (Adjusted R-Squared = .009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22. Univariate ANOVA results from Study 3 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Endorsement of Multicultural Ideology</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial- eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>8841.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8841.28</td>
<td>7728.38</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression Condition</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>434.72</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9302.24</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>439.51</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .011 (Adjusted R-Squared = .003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Contrasts</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Expression (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Professionally Inclusive Behavior (Strength of Numeric Promotion Recommendation)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7352.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7352.65</td>
<td>7358.52</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>694.45</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8051.25</td>
<td>701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>697.23</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .004 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Professionally Inclusive Behavior (Strength of Written Promotion Recommendation)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>30817.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30817.33</td>
<td>12613.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1663.87</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32498.25</td>
<td>687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1690.97</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .016 (Adjusted R-Squared = .009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Socially Inclusive Behavior (Inclusiveness During a Social Interaction)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>24452.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24452.12</td>
<td>29543.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>566.12</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25035.50</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>578.02</td>
<td>689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .021 (Adjusted R-Squared = .013)

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6370.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6370.73</td>
<td>6024.84</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>692.60</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7067.25</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>693.94</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .002 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.006)

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Personal</td>
<td>Relative to Work</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Personal</td>
<td>Relative to Work</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal Relative to Work</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Personal</td>
<td>Relative to Work</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4474.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4474.04</td>
<td>3192.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>975.44</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5472.00</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>994.04</td>
<td>701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared = .019</td>
<td>(Adjusted R-Squared = .012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Expression Conditions</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Factorial ANOVA results from Study 4 (in Chapter 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Partial-Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>19593.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19593.81</td>
<td>14565.28</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Expression x Richness</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>928.22</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20532.50</td>
<td>696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>932.01</td>
<td>695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .004 (Adjusted R-Squared = -.003)

Pairwise Comparisons with Bonferroni Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richness Condition</th>
<th>Identity Expression Condition</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Personal (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural (Relative to Work)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on professionally inclusive behavior in terms of incorporation of the coworker’s professional input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionally Inclusive Behavior: Incorporation of Professional Input</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on professionally inclusive behavior in terms of strength of a numeric recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Inclusive Behavior: Strength of Numeric Recommendation</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on professionally inclusive behavior in terms of strength of a written recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionally Inclusive Behavior: Strength of Written Recommendation</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on socially inclusive behavior in terms of inclusion in future social activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socially Inclusive Behavior: Inclusion in Future Social Activities</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on socially inclusive behavior in terms of inclusion during a social interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socially Inclusive Behavior: Inclusion during a social interaction</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>51.27</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on multicultural appreciation toward coworker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicultural Appreciation Toward Coworker</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on endorsement of multicultural ideology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsement of Multicultural Ideology</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on status perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Perceptions</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on closeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closeness</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38. Results of multilevel model analysis for Study 5 (in Chapter 1). This table shows fixed effects of each experimental condition (relative to the control condition of small talk) on anxiety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>b-value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>95% CI: Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI: Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich + Frustrated Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Rich Cultural Expression (Relative to Small Talk)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplemental Materials for Chapter 2

Study 1: Third Party Expectation of High Status Identity Concealment

Results for Identity Concealment Likelihood

Using a scale of 1 to 7 (extremely unlikely – extremely likely), participants indicated how likely they thought the middle passenger would be to share “what college they currently attend” and “that they are a student at [Ivy League School]” (both items reverse-scored; $\alpha = .95$). Consistent with our results using expected identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, a least-squares regression using identity concealment likelihood as the dependent variable revealed non-significant results, $b = .10$, $p = .61$, 95% CI [-0.28, 0.48], $\beta = .04$.

Study 2: Concealment in a Field Setting

Results without Exclusions

At the end of Study 2, participants completed an attention check assessing whether they read the pre-selected student’s introduction (which included our experimental manipulation). The attention check listed items likely to be included in an introduction (e.g., the high and low status alma maters used in our experimental manipulation, as well as hobbies and hometowns), and participants were asked to check all of the items that were true of the pre-selected student. Of note, this study was conducted during high traffic campus events where students are not accustomed to being stopped to participate in a study. Therefore, many students completed only the necessary information to enter the raffle (which was their incentive for participating) and gave only a cursory glance at the study materials. We made an a priori decision to exclude participants ($n = 36$) who did not pass the attention check by correctly selecting the pre-selected student’s undergraduate alma mater (either because they did not select an alma mater for the pre-
selected student, or because they selected the incorrect alma mater for the pre-selected student), as this served as an indicator that they may not have read the study materials (including the experimental manipulation). This exclusion criterion resulted in a sample of 93 participants, and the analyses with this sample are reported in the main paper. Below, we report additional analyses conducted with fewer exclusions – first with all participants in the analysis (n= 129), and alternatively with all participants except those who selected the incorrect school for the pre-selected student (n=124).

The analysis with all participants included (n=129) trended in the direction of our predictions, but did not yield a significant interaction between participant status and peer status, $b = 0.01, p = .27, 95\% CI [-0.01, 0.03], OR = 1.01$. The analysis with all participants except those with an incorrect attention check (n=124) trended in the direction of our predictions, and yielded marginally significant results, $b = 0.02, p = .10, 95\% CI [-0.003, 0.04], OR = 1.02$.

**Study 3: Concealing High Status Identities**

**Full List of Measures**

Participants completed several exploratory measures throughout Study 3. A full list of measures is provided here. Participants completed three qualifying questions assessing country citizenship and undergraduate affiliation. Participants then completed several demographic questions, including: gender, age, race, country of birth, region of USA in which they live, subjective socioeconomic status (adapted from Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000), family’s social class, parent’s annual household income, number of siblings, anticipated graduation year, anticipated major, school identity collective self-esteem (adapted from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), school identification (adapted from Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto,
1997), need to belong (Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, 2001), power and achievement values (Schwartz et al., 2001), and self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965).

Participants then read the experimental manipulation, followed by a free response question used for the dependent measure of concealment decisions. Subsequently, participants completed free-response questions asking additional questions about the interaction (e.g., what they considered saying or refrained from saying to the peer). Participants then completed several multiple choice questions, including 2 questions measuring concealment intentions, questions about what they considered doing and discussing during the interaction (e.g., whether they considered sharing their hometown), questions about how they perceived the peer (e.g., what gender they imagined, whether they thought of the person as a potential colleague), and an attention check. Participants responded to a word completion task assessing the accessibility of negative and positive high-status stereotypes, followed by a state-trait anxiety measure (Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, 1972). Participants answered questions about potential high status stereotypes (e.g., smart, snobby, socially awkward), including: perceived positivity and negativity of the stereotypes, outsiders’ likelihood of applying the stereotypes to their identity group, discomfort with the stereotypes being applied to the self, and self-identification with the stereotypes. Participants then completed a questionnaire measuring fear of negative evaluation (Leary, 1983), social dominance orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), and overall thoughts about disclosing their high status identity in everyday life (e.g., “When I meet new people, I feel completely comfortable telling them that I attend [my school],” “When I tell people that I go to [my school], I am concerned that they will assume negative things about me”). Participants then rated the status of several schools, including the two schools mentioned in each experimental condition. Participants then completed questions
about financial aid status, marital status, frequency with which they talk to strangers on planes, the number of psychology studies completed previously, and what they thought the study was about.

**Results for Identity Concealment Intentions**

Identity concealment intentions were measured by having participants indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale: “I considered saying that I am a student at [high status school]” and “I considered telling them what college I attend” (both items reverse scored; \( \alpha = .90 \)). Consistent with our logistic-regression results using identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, a least-squares regression using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed significant results, \( b = 0.61, p = .01, 95\% CI [0.15, 1.08], \beta = .22. \)

**Study 4: Concealing in Professional Contexts**

**Full List of Measures**

Participants completed several exploratory measures throughout the Study 4. A full list of measures is provided here. Participants completed two eligibility questions confirming their undergraduate affiliation. Participants then completed background and demographic questions, including: gender, age, race, citizenship status, country of birth, region of USA in which they live, subjective socioeconomic status of family growing up (adapted from Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000), family’s social class, parent’s annual household income, financial aid status, number of siblings, anticipated graduation year, anticipated major, identification with their university identity and with a general college-student identity (adapted from Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto, 1997), self-identity overlap for both their university identity and general college-student identity (adapted from Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000),
sociotropy vs. autonomy (Robins et al., 1994), empathy (Davis, 1983), discomfort with being associated with high status stereotypes, status maintenance (Blader & Chen, 2011), status striving (Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006), competitiveness (Smither & Houston, 1992), self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), and big five personality traits (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

Participants then read the experimental manipulation, followed by a free response question used for the dependent measure of concealment decisions. Subsequently, participants completed free-response items asking additional questions about the interaction (e.g., what they considered saying or refrained from saying to the peer). Participants then completed several multiple choice questions, including 3 questions measuring concealment intentions, questions about what they considered doing and discussing during the interaction (e.g., whether they considered sharing their hometown), a manipulation check of concealment costs, additional thoughts about the scenario, attention checks, imagined gender and race of the individuals in the prior scenario, interest in being involved in organizations similar to the ones in the prior scenario, and the number of psychology studies they completed previously.

**Results for Identity Concealment Intentions**

Identity concealment intentions were measured by having participants indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale: “I considered not mentioning my school,” “I considered saying that I am a student at [high status university]” (reverse-coded), and “I considered telling them what college I attend” (reverse coded). While the reliability between the latter two items was high (α = .96), the 3-item measure exhibited low reliability (α = .63). Because the first item most directly assessed identity
concealment decisions, the latter two items were dropped from the analysis. Conducting the analyses with a composite of all three measures did not alter the significance of the results.

We conducted a multiple least-squares regression since this variable is continuous. Both independent variables, as well as their interaction, were entered into the analysis, with relatively similar status and high concealment cost conditions serving as reference groups. Compared to the high concealment cost condition \( (M = 4.15, SD = 2.08) \), there was no main effect of low concealment cost \( (M = 3.84, SD = 1.97) \), \( b = -0.27, p = .23, 95\% CI [-0.72, 0.18], \beta = -.07 \), nor was there a main effect of moderate concealment cost \( (M = 4.08, SD = 2.01) \), \( b = -0.05, p > .25, 95\% CI [-0.51, 0.41], \beta = -.01 \). We once again found a significant main effect of relative status, \( b = 0.80, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.44, 1.16], \beta = .20 \), such that concealment intentions were higher when participants were relatively high status \( (M = 4.41, SD = 1.97) \), as opposed to relatively similar status peers \( (M = 3.60, SD = 1.99) \), compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, we observed no significant interactions. Specifically, compared to the effect of relative status in the high concealment cost condition, the effect of relative status did not differ significantly in the low concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.21, p > .25, 95\% CI [-1.11, 0.69], \beta = -.03 \), nor the moderate concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.51, p > .25, 95\% CI [-1.43, 0.40], \beta = -.06 \).

**Key Results with Non-American Exclusions**

In addition to the analyses conducted based on a priori exclusion criteria \( (n = 459) \), we conducted analyses that were limited to participants who indicated that they are American citizens or permanent residents \( (n = 403) \). These latter analyses are reported below.

**Manipulation check: concealment cost.** A univariate ANOVA revealed significant differences in concealment costs between the low, moderate, and high concealment cost conditions.
conditions, $F(2, 400) = 21.24$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$, $p < .001$. Planned comparisons indicated that, compared to the moderate concealment cost condition ($M = 4.88, SD = 1.17$), concealment costs were perceived as significantly greater in the high concealment cost condition, ($M = 5.35, SD = 1.00$), $b = 0.47$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, $p = .001$, and significantly lower in the low concealment cost condition ($M = 4.47, SD = 1.12$), $b = -0.40$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, $p = .002$.

**Concealment decisions.** We conducted a multiple logistic regression in which we entered the relatively similar status and high concealment cost conditions as reference groups. Compared to the high concealment cost condition (39% concealment), there was no main effect of low concealment cost (47% concealment), $b = 0.34, p = .17$, 95% CI [-0.15, 0.83], $OR = 1.40$, nor moderate concealment cost (48% concealment), $b = 0.38, p = .14$, 95% CI [-0.12, 0.88], $OR = 1.46$. We observed a significant main effect of relative status, $b = 0.44, p = .03$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.84], $OR = 1.55$, such that participants concealed more when they were relatively high status (50% concealment), as opposed to relatively similar status (39% concealment), compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, no significant interactions were found. Specifically, compared to the effect of relative status in the high concealment cost condition, the effect of relative status was not significantly different in the low concealment cost condition, $b = 0.78, p = .12$, 95% CI [-0.21, 1.77], $OR = 2.18$, nor the moderate concealment cost condition, $b = 0.20, p > .25$, 95% CI [-0.79, 1.20], $OR = 1.22$.

**Concealment intentions.** We conducted a multiple least-squares regression using our second dependent variable, concealment intentions. Compared to the high concealment cost condition ($M = 4.21, SD = 2.09$), there was no main effect of low concealment cost ($M = 3.90, SD = 1.96$), $b = -0.27, p > .25$, 95% CI [-0.75, 0.22], $\beta = -.06$, nor was there a main effect of moderate concealment cost ($M = 4.09, SD = 2.05$), $b = -0.08, p > .25$, 95% CI [-0.57, 0.42], $\beta = -$.
.02. We once again found a significant main effect of relative status, \( b = 0.68, p = .001, 95\% CI [0.28, 1.07], \beta = .17 \), such that concealment intentions were higher when participants were relatively high status (\( M = 4.39, SD = 2.03 \)), as opposed to relatively similar status peers (\( M = 3.71, SD = 1.97 \)), compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, we observed no significant interactions. Specifically, compared to the effect of relative status in the high concealment cost condition, the effect of relative status did not differ significantly in the low concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.42, p > .25, 95\% CI [-1.39, 0.55], \beta = -.05 \), nor the moderate concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.52, p > .25, 95\% CI [-1.50, 0.46], \beta = -.06 \).

**Key Results without Attention-Check Exclusions**

In addition to the analyses conducted based on a priori exclusion criteria (\( n = 459 \)), we conducted analyses without attention checks exclusions (\( n = 537 \)). These latter analyses are reported below.

**Manipulation check: concealment cost.** A univariate ANOVA revealed significant differences in concealment costs between the low, moderate, and high concealment cost conditions, \( F(2, 534) = 22.77, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .08, p < .001 \). Planned comparisons indicated that, compared to the moderate concealment cost condition (\( M = 4.93, SD = 1.16 \)), concealment costs were perceived as significantly greater in the high concealment cost condition (\( M = 5.28, SD = 1.08 \), \( b = 0.35, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .02, p = .004 \), and significantly lower in the low concealment cost condition (\( M = 4.48, SD = 1.14 \), \( b = -0.46, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .03, p < .001 \)).

**Concealment decisions.** We conducted a multiple logistic regression in which we entered the relatively similar status and high concealment cost conditions as reference groups. Compared to the high concealment cost condition (40% concealment), there was no main effect
of low concealment cost (48% concealment), \( b = 0.31, p = .14, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.11, 0.74], OR = 1.36, \)

nor was there a main effect of moderate concealment cost (49% concealment), \( b = 0.34, p = .12, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.09, 0.76], OR = 1.40. \)

We observed a significant main effect of relative status, \( b = 0.51, p = .004, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.16, 0.85], OR = 1.67, \) such that participants concealed more when they were relatively high status (52% concealment), as opposed to relatively similar status (40% concealment), compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, no significant interactions were found. Specifically, compared to the effect of relative status in the high concealment cost condition, the effect of relative status was not significantly different in the low concealment cost condition, \( b = 0.67, p = .12, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.18, 1.51], OR = 1.95, \) nor the moderate concealment cost condition, \( b = 0.69, p = .11, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.16, 1.53], OR = 1.99. \)

**Concealment intentions.** We conducted a multiple least-squares regression using our second dependent variable, concealment intentions. Compared to the high concealment cost condition (\( M = 4.09, SD = 2.08 \)), there was no main effect of low concealment cost (\( M = 3.9, SD = 1.98 \)), \( b = -0.20, p = .35, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.62, 0.22], \beta = -0.05 \), nor was there a main effect of moderate concealment cost (\( M = 3.94, SD = 2.08 \)), \( b = -0.14, p = .50, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.56, 0.28], \beta = -0.03 \). We once again found a significant main effect of relative status, \( b = 0.75, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.41, 1.09], \beta = .18, \) such that concealment intentions were higher when participants were relatively high status (\( M = 4.35, SD = 2.02 \)), as opposed to relatively similar status peers (\( M = 3.60, SD = 2.01 \)), compared to a peer. Contrary to our predictions, no significant interactions were found. Specifically, compared to the effect of relative status in the high concealment cost condition, the effect of relative status did not differ significantly in the low concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.09, p = .82, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.93, 0.74], \beta = -.01 \), nor the moderate concealment cost condition, \( b = -0.42, p = .33, 95\% \text{ CI } [-1.26, 0.42], \beta = -.05. \)
Study 5: Concealing Minimizes Interpersonal Threats

Full List of Interpersonal Threat Mediation Items

Interpersonal Threat measure in Study 5.

Threats to Self

1. I worried that sharing my educational background might cause my partner to resent me
2. I worried that sharing my educational background might cause my partner to assume things about me
3. I worried that sharing my educational background might cause my partner to react negatively towards me
4. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner think that I am snobby or arrogant
5. I worried that sharing my educational background might come across as boastful
6. I worried that sharing my educational background might make me seem inconsiderate
7. I worried that sharing my educational background might make me seem mean or not nice
8. I worried that sharing my educational background might come across as inappropriate
9. I worried that sharing my educational background might come across as unnecessary

Threats to Other

1. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner feel awkward
2. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner feel judged
3. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner feel bad about themselves
4. I worried that sharing my educational background might threaten my partner
5. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner feel like I was looking down on them

Threats to Belonging

1. I worried that sharing my educational background might create too much distance between my partner and me
2. I worried that sharing my educational background might make my partner and me seem too different
3. I worried that sharing my educational background might make it seem like my partner and I can’t relate to one another
4. I worried that sharing my educational background might make it difficult to have a good relationship with my partner

Additional Measures

In addition to measures discussed in the main paper, additional measures for Study 5 are listed here. At the beginning of the study, participants answered additional demographic questions, including: country of birth, subjective social status of self in relation to MTurk community (adapted from Goodman et al., 2001), subjective social status of family growing up in relation to American society, social class of family when growing up, parents combined annual income, parents’ highest level of education.

In addition to completing a measure of desire for belonging, participants also completed a measure of desire for authenticity (4 items, e.g., “It is important that I provide an accurate picture of who I am,” “I really value showing my partner the real me,” $\alpha = .85$).
After all dependent variables were collected, participants were asked additional questions, including: additional mediation items assessing participants’ respect for their partner (“I thought highly of my partner,” “I respect my partner,” “I didn’t have much interest in getting to know my partner,” “I thought my partner was worth getting to know,” “I think my partner and I would get along well in real life,” \( \alpha = 0.82 \)), additional thoughts about their decision to share or conceal their educational background (e.g., “I thought I was expected to share my educational background”), imagined race and gender (if any) of their partner, their desire to work with their partner again in the future, and thoughts about the overall study.

**Results for Identity Concealment Intentions**

Identity concealment intentions were measured by having participants indicate the extent that they agreed with the following questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree): “I was comfortable with sharing my education level” (reverse-scored) and “I was hesitant to share my education level” \( \alpha = .92 \). Consistent with our logistic-regression results using identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, a least-squares regression using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed significant results for the effect of relative status, \( b = 1.25, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.88, 1.62], \beta = .39 \).

Following the same mediation analysis approach as we used for identity concealment decisions, we conducted a mediation analysis using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable. This analysis revealed a non-significant direct effect of relative status, \( b = 0.01, 95\% CI [-0.35, 0.36], \beta = .002 \), and a significant indirect effect via interpersonal threat, \( b = 1.25, 95\% CI [0.94, 1.59], \beta = .39 \).
Compared to our moderation results using identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, our moderation results using identity concealment intentions differed somewhat. Using multiple least-squares regression, we found that desire for belonging marginally moderated identity concealment intentions, \( b = .30, p = .09, 95\% CI [-0.05, 0.66], \beta = .10 \). Simple slopes analysis revealed that a greater desire for belonging led to greater identity concealment intentions when participants were relatively high status, \( b = .27, p = .03, 95\% CI [0.02, 0.52], \beta = .18 \), but did not have an effect on identity concealment intentions when participants were relatively similar status, \( b = -.03, p > .25, 95\% CI [-0.28, 0.22], \beta = .02 \), compared to a peer.

**Additional Mediation Analysis Including Respect for Partner**

In addition to the mediation items assessing interpersonal threat (described in the full paper), Study 5 also included five items assessing respect for others (described above under Additional Measures). By definition, lower status peers are likely to be respected less (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015). This lack of respect may or may not be a driving reason for concealment. Thus, Study 5 investigated whether a lack of respect for others underlies high status identity concealment.

A factor analysis including interpersonal threat and respect for others revealed two distinct factors that were aligned with our expectations – interpersonal threat and respect for others. We conducted mediation analysis employing Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% confidence intervals for the direct effect of relative status and the indirect effects via interpersonal threat and respect for others on identity concealment decisions. This analysis revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, \( b = 1.56, 95\% CI [.23, 2.89], OR = 4.76 \), a significant indirect effect via interpersonal
threat, \( b = 1.80, 95\% CI [1.15, 2.65], OR = 6.05 \), and a non-significant indirect effect via respect for others, \( b = .08, 95\% CI [-.02, .36], OR = 1.08 \). A similar analysis with identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed a non-significant direct effect of relative status, \( b = -0.03, 95\% CI [-.38, .33], \beta = -.01 \), a significant indirect effect via interpersonal threat, \( b = 1.23, 95\% CI [.93, 1.59], \beta = .39 \), and a non-significant indirect effect via respect for others, \( b = .05, 95\% CI [-.01, .14], \beta = .01 \). Thus, we did not find that lack of respect for others accounts for concealment of relatively high status identities. Including respect for others in the mediation analysis did not change the findings regarding interpersonal threat, which still emerged as a mechanism underlying the effect of relative status on identity concealment.

**Study 6: Concealing When Perceived Intentionality is Low**

**Results for Identity Concealment Intentions**

Identity concealment intentions were measured by having participants indicate the extent that they agreed with the following questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree): “I was comfortable with sharing my education level” (reverse-scored) and “I was hesitant to share my education level” (\( \alpha = .95 \)). Consistent with our logistic-regression results using identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, a least-squares regression using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed a non-significant interaction between relative status and disclosure source, \( p = .15 \). Consistent with our mediation results using identity concealment decisions as the dependent variable, a similar analysis using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, \( b = 0.59, 95\% CI [0.23, 0.94], \beta = .16 \), and a significant indirect effect via threat to self, \( b = 1.10, 95\% CI [0.81, 1.43], \beta = .30 \).
**Mediation Analysis Using Overall Interpersonal Threat as a Mechanism**

Using all items assessing interpersonal threat, we conducted a Maximum Likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation and Kaiser criteria of eigenvalues greater than 1. Factor scores were derived from SPSS using the regression method. All three forms of interpersonal threat loaded on one factor. In the main paper, we presented mediation results using only threat to self as the mediator; here, we report the results using the overall measures of interpersonal threat as the mediator.

We conducted a mediation analysis employing Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure, utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. This analysis estimated the effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions directly, and indirectly via interpersonal threat. The results revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, $b = 1.80$, 95% CI [0.86, 2.75], OR = 6.05, and a significant indirect effect via interpersonal threat, $b = 1.84$, 95% CI [1.22, 2.57], OR = 6.30. A similar analysis using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable revealed a significant direct effect of relative status, $b = 0.50$, 95% CI [0.15, 0.86], $\beta = .14$, and a significant indirect effect via interpersonal threat, $b = 1.19$, 95% CI [0.88, 1.52], $\beta = .32$.

It is possible that these mediation results will be moderated by perceived intentionality, with threat to self no longer serving as a mediator when perceived intentionality is low. In other words, compared to when participants are to blame for disclosure (high perceived intentionality), when participants cannot be blamed for disclosure (low perceived intentionality), interacting with a relatively lower status peer may no longer result in elevated threat to self, and thus threat to self may no longer influence concealment decisions. To examine whether this was the case, we conducted a moderated mediation analysis employing Hayes (2013) bootstrapping procedure,
utilizing 10,000 resamples with replacement to reach 95% confidence intervals. This analysis estimated the effect of relative status on identity concealment decisions both directly and indirectly through interpersonal threat, with both direct and indirect effects moderated by perceived intentionality. The index of moderated mediation was non-significant, as the 95% confidence interval included zero (-0.91, 0.90). The same was true when using identity concealment intentions as the dependent variable (-0.56, 0.53). Thus, the effect of relative status on concealment was driven by concerns with interpersonal threat just as much in the low perceived intentionality condition as in high perceived intentionality condition.
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### Additional Tables for Chapter 2

Table 39. Regressing expected identity concealment on relative status in Study 1 (in Chapter 2).

\[ + p < .10 \quad * p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Individual's Relative Status (0 = Similar, 1 = High)</th>
<th>Expected Identity Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal Individual's Relative Status (0 = Similar, 1 = High)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.20***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Descriptive statistics by condition for expected identity concealment in Study 1 (in Chapter 2). Exact proportions are provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concealment</th>
<th>Expected Identity Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively High Status</td>
<td>10% (9/88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Similar Status</td>
<td>10% (9/90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41. Regressing identity concealment and concealment of other information (e.g., hometown) on relative status in Study 3 (in Chapter 2).

\[ + p < .10 \quad * p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Relative Status (0 = Similar, 1 = High)</th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Hometown Concealment</th>
<th>Current Town Concealment</th>
<th>Year in College Concealment</th>
<th>College Major Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.30***</td>
<td>-1.39***</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>-0.59*</td>
<td>-1.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42. Descriptive statistics by condition for identity concealment and concealment of other information (e.g., hometown) in Study 3 (in Chapter 2). Exact proportions are provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concealment</th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Hometown Concealment</th>
<th>Current Town Concealment</th>
<th>Year in College Concealment</th>
<th>College Major Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively High Status</td>
<td>48% (32/66)</td>
<td>14% (9/66)</td>
<td>55% (36/66)</td>
<td>44% (29/66)</td>
<td>24% (16/66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Similar Status</td>
<td>21% (15/70)</td>
<td>20% (14/70)</td>
<td>64% (45/70)</td>
<td>36% (25/70)</td>
<td>23% (16/70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Descriptive statistics by condition for identity concealment and hometown concealment in Study 4 (in Chapter 2). Exact proportions are provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concealment Cost</th>
<th>Relatively High Status</th>
<th>Relatively Similar Status</th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Hometown Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>56% (46/82)</td>
<td>37% (31/84)</td>
<td>11% (9/82)</td>
<td>25% (21/84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>58% (46/79)</td>
<td>40% (31/77)</td>
<td>5% (4/79)</td>
<td>19% (15/77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>42% (31/73)</td>
<td>36% (23/64)</td>
<td>23% (17/73)</td>
<td>14% (9/64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44. Regressing identity concealment and learner type concealment on relative status in Study 5 (in Chapter 2).

\[ + p < .10 \quad * p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Learner Type Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Relative Status (0 = Similar, 1 = High)</td>
<td>3.06***</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.71***</td>
<td>-1.99***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45. Descriptive statistics by condition for identity concealment and learner type concealment in Study 5 (in Chapter 2). Exact proportions are provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concealment</th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Learner Type Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively High Status</td>
<td>34% (41/119)</td>
<td>9% (11/119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Similar Status</td>
<td>2% (3/125)</td>
<td>12% (15/125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46. Descriptive statistics by condition for identity concealment and learner type concealment in Study 6 (in Chapter 2). Exact proportions are provided in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Perceived Intentionality</th>
<th>Identity Concealment</th>
<th>Learner Type Concealment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively High Status</td>
<td>56% (31/55)</td>
<td>5% (3/55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Similar Status</td>
<td>4% (3/73)</td>
<td>15% (11/73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Perceived Intentionality</td>
<td>Relatively High Status</td>
<td>44% (27/61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Similar Status</td>
<td>8% (5/61)</td>
<td>8% (5/61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>