

Supplemental Information: Method

Study Setting

The intervention was conducted at a highly selective, mid-size private university in the United States. URM participants represent 23% of the total population of students. The SAT scores of URM participants were significantly lower ($M = 1380.64$, $SD = 90.29$) than the SAT scores of White and Asian participants ($M = 1489.56$, $SD = 83.26$; $F(1, 405) = 154.26$, $p < .01$). Compared to the population at the university, URM students were overrepresented in our sample. The 156 URM students represented 41% of URM students in the entire freshman class. The 251 White and Asian students represented 20% of White and Asian students in the entire freshman class.

Intervention Recruitment Method

Sampling procedure. As in prior interventions and described in our pre-registration, we used a convenience sampling procedure to recruit participants for the intervention. In order to recruit as many URM and first-generation students as possible, we emailed all URM or first-generation students. We randomly selected a subset of White and Asian continuing generation students and emailed them to participate in the study. We stopped recruiting this group once we had a sufficient number of White and Asian continuing generation students.

Academic preparation of sample. To confirm that URM participants in our study did not differ in academic preparation than URM nonparticipants (i.e. students in the campus-wide control group), we compared the SAT scores of the URM participants in the intervention conditions to the SAT scores of URM nonparticipants. Results indicated no significant difference in SAT scores in the sample of URM participants ($M = 1380.64$, $SD = 90.295$) compared to URM nonparticipants ($M = 1378.56$, $SD = 130.49$, $F(1, 1624) = .12$, $p = .73$). Additional results confirm that URM participants in our study did not differ in their academic preparation between the multicultural condition and the colorblind condition. Indeed, results indicated no significant differences in SAT scores among URM participants in the multicultural condition ($M = 1389.25$, $SD = 92.16$) and the colorblind condition ($M = 1371.58$, $SD = 87.99$; $p = .20$).

Intervention Method

Once participants consented to participate in the study, they were asked to read over and evaluate a potential diversity statement for an incoming student guide. Next, they were randomly exposed to the multicultural condition or the colorblind condition.

Multicultural Diversity Statement:

Diversity Matters at [the University]

[The University] is committed to excellent teaching, innovative research, and the personal and intellectual growth of its students in a diverse and equitable academic environment. The foundation of this pursuit is made possible only by the students, faculty, and staff that have diverse identities and come from different cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds. We believe that the mutual exchange of diverse ideas, experiences, and perspectives sustains the depth of our learning and defines our community.

It is our responsibility to leverage our differences as strengths to ensure that we create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive campus. We have a variety of resources that help us to do so. The Campus Inclusion and Community group

works with the university community to create opportunities for experiential learning, multicultural education, and leadership development aimed at enriching the learning environment for all students.

Additionally, Student Enrichment Services builds an inclusive [University] community by engaging students and their allies with dialogue around their experiences of low-income and/or first-generation students, as well as ethnic and racial minority students' experiences. By recognizing and valuing the different backgrounds, cultures, and identities that people bring with them to [the University], these programs cultivate an inclusive and supportive community.

At [the University], we hope to weave together the fabric of our community as dynamic, vibrant, and just. Only by learning about people with different backgrounds and viewpoints can we challenge our assumptions, test our ideas, and broaden our understanding of the world.

Colorblind Diversity Statement:

Diversity Matters at [the University]

[The University] is committed to excellent teaching, innovative research, and the personal and intellectual growth of its students in a diverse and equitable academic environment. The foundation of this pursuit is made possible only by the students, faculty, and staff that have diverse identities and come from different cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds. We believe that the mutual understanding of each other's shared beliefs and common humanity sustains the depth of our learning and defines our community.

It is our responsibility to leverage our similarities as strengths to ensure that we create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive campus. We have a variety of resources that help us to do so. The Campus Inclusion and Community group works with the university community to create opportunities for experiential learning and leadership development aimed at enriching the learning environment for all students.

Additionally, Student Enrichment Services builds an inclusive [University] community by engaging students and their allies with dialogue around their experiences of low-income and/or first-generation students, as well as ethnic and racial minority students' experiences. By recognizing and valuing the what students have in common and share with one another at [the University], these programs cultivate an inclusive and supportive community.

At [the University], we hope to weave together the fabric of our community as dynamic, vibrant, and just. Only by learning about the unique perspectives and qualities of each and every individual community member can we challenge our assumptions, test our ideas, and broaden our understanding of the world.

Supplemental Information: Measures and Analyses

Academic Performance

Academic performance without covariates. There was a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 1622) = 87.40, p < .001$ and no significant main effect of intervention condition, $F(2,$

1622) = 2.07, $p = .13$. There was a significant race x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1622) = 3.81, p = .02$.

There was a significant difference among URM participants across conditions, $F(2, 1622) = 4.61, p = .01$. Specifically, URM participants in the multicultural condition had higher GPAs than URM participants in the colorblind condition ($p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.06, 0.31]$) and had higher GPAs than URM nonparticipants in the campus-wide control group ($p = .02, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.02, 0.22]$). Furthermore, URM participants in the colorblind condition did not differ than URM nonparticipants in the campus-wide control group ($p = .23, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.16, 0.04]$). In contrast, White and Asian participants did not significantly differ across conditions, $F(2, 1622) = .22, p = .80$.

Nevertheless, there still was a significant racial achievement gap in the multicultural condition ($p = .009, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.04, 0.26]$), colorblind condition ($p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.24, 0.47]$), and in the campus-wide control group ($p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.24, 0.35]$).

Academic performance of White students vs. URM students (i.e. excluding Asian students). There was a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 1247) = 24.78, p < .001$, no significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 1247) = .81, p = .44$ and no significant interaction, $F(2, 1247) = 2.82, p = .06$. Consistent with the results reported in the main text, a racial achievement gap emerged between URM participants and White participants in the colorblind condition ($p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.14, 0.40]$), in the campus-wide control group, ($p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.11, 0.24]$), but not in the multicultural condition ($p = .36, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.07, 0.18]$).

Academic performance of Asian students vs. URM students (i.e. excluding White students). There was a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 725) = 16.53, p < .001$ and no significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 725) = 1.06, p = .35$. There was no significant interaction, $F(2, 725) = 0.84, p = .43$.

Academic performance of First-Generation vs. Continuing Generation students. There was no significant main effect of generation status, $F(1, 1619) = 1.98, p = .16$, no main effect of condition, $F(2, 1619) = 0.15, p = .86$, and no significant generation status x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1619) = 0.25, p = .78$.

Academic performance of Advantaged students (i.e. Continuing-Generation White students) vs. Disadvantaged students (i.e. First-generation or URM students). There was a significant main effect of disadvantaged status, $F(1, 1619) = 34.92, p < .001$, no main effect of condition, $F(1, 1619) = 1.14, p = .32$, and no significant disadvantaged status x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1619) = 1.38, p = .25$.

Anticipated Experiences Survey

As noted in the main text, after students read the diversity statement, completed the *saying-is-believing* exercise, and answered the manipulation check, they then answered a variety of questions on their perception of the authenticity of the diversity statement and anticipated experiences in college. Among the 407 participants exposed to the intervention manipulation, 75% of participants ($N = 303$) completed the entire survey (multicultural condition: $n = 160$; colorblind condition: $n = 143$). Among the 303 participants, 126 were URM participants (multicultural condition: $n = 63$, colorblind condition: $n = 60$).

Perceived authenticity of diversity statement. We designed the multicultural and colorblind diversity statements so that they would both convey that the university genuinely appreciated and valued diversity. Yet, URM individuals often interpret colorblindness as a lack of authenticity or genuine commitment to diversity and inclusion. Therefore, in the current study, we sought to ensure that any benefits observed in the multicultural versus colorblind condition were not due to perceiving the multicultural statement as more authentic. Participants reported the extent to which they perceived the diversity statement as authentic on scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The items were “The diversity statement seemed authentic” and “The diversity statement showed that [the university] cares about promoting diversity” ($\alpha = .84$). Suggesting that URM participants perceived the two different diversity statements to be comparably authentic, results indicated no significant main effect of condition, $F(1, 295) = 0.52$, $p = .47$, no main effect of race, $F(1, 295) = 1.47$, $p = .23$, nor an interaction, $F(1, 295) = 0.04$, $p = .84$.

Table S1a.
List of Items and Measures in Anticipated Experiences survey

Dependent Variable	Items
Academic Preparedness ($r = .14^*$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I expect that the academic experience at [the University] will be difficult for me. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 2. I am well prepared to be academically successful as a student at [the University].
Control ($r = .59^{**}$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I can do things at my college in a way that is right for me. 2. I have the power to influence my college experience.
Efficacy ($r = .54^{**}$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I'm certain I can master the skills taught at my college this upcoming year. 2. I can do all of the work in class if I don't give up.
Appreciation of Difference ($\alpha = .69$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students with different backgrounds and experiences can find their own ways of being successful at [the University]. 2. There are different ways to be successful at [the University]. 3. My college makes an effort to include ideas and practices that represent a wide variety of backgrounds. 4. I think that my background will help me succeed at [the University].
Social identity threat ($\alpha = .72$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I expect students at my college to be accepting of people who have diverse backgrounds. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 2. I expect other students at my college to make unfair assumptions about me based on my background 3. I expect professors at my college to make unfair assumptions about me based on my background.
Social fit ($\alpha = .75$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I feel a part of the college community at [the University]. 2. I feel like an outsider at [the University]. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 3. It is a mystery to me how things work at [the University]. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 4. I belong at [the University].
Bridging Difference	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In college, I hope to have the opportunity to educate others about my background, culture, and identity

$(r = .56^{**})$	2. In college, I look forward to learning about others' backgrounds, cultures, and identities.
Intergroup comfort $(\alpha = .79)$	1. How comfortable would you be interacting with someone from a different social class background than you? 2. How comfortable would you be interacting with someone from a different racial or ethnic background than you? 3. How comfortable would you be interacting with someone from a different religious background than you?
Help-Seeking $(\alpha = .77)$	Please think about your expectations for your first year of college. Approximately how many times per month (0-5) do you think you will engage in the following actions? 1. Email a professor to ask a question. 2. Meet with a professor outside of class. 3. Meet with other students to study for tests or exams outside of class 4. Meet with other students to study for tests or exams outside of class 5. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on course assignments 6. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on choosing classes or choosing a major 7. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on future aspirations or career goals.
Pride in social identity $(\alpha = .78)$	1. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same racial or ethnic background as me 2. I feel good about my racial or ethnic background 3. I feel ashamed of my racial or ethnic background (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 4. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same social class background as me 5. I feel good about my social class background 6. I feel ashamed of my social class background (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 7. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same gender as me 8. I feel good about my gender; I feel ashamed of my gender (<i>reverse-scored</i>).
Racial self-concept	Participants completed a shortened version of the Twenty Statements Task (TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954). To reduce time to complete the task, they reported 5 identities instead of the typical 20. In this task, students were told: "People have different ways of describing themselves. Below are 5 fill-in the blanks for you to answer the basic question: 'Who am I?' We coded whether participants mentioned their race or not.
Perceptions of Intergroup Relations in the U.S. $(r = .66)$	1. On a scale from 1 = Very good to 7 = Very bad, please rate the quality of race relations today. 2. On a scale from 1 = Very good to 7 = Very bad, please rate the quality of relations between people of different socioeconomic classes relations today.

Table S1b. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition for URM participants in Anticipated Experiences Survey

Measure	URM in Multicultural Condition	URM in Colorblind Condition	<i>F</i> (1, 295)
Academic Preparedness	3.65 (.12)	3.73 (.13)	0.29
Control	5.93 (.12)	6.16 (.12)	2.07
Efficacy	5.49 (.13)	5.74 (.14)	2.03
Appreciation of Difference	6.01 (.10)	5.87 (.11)	0.89
Social Identity Threat	2.77 (.16)	2.49 (.17)	1.69
Social Fit	5.15 (.14)	5.04 (.14)	0.33
Bridging Difference	6.02 (.14)	6.05 (.14)	0.02
Intergroup Comfort	6.32 (.10)	6.39 (.11)	0.30
Average Help Seeking	2.68 (.12)	2.58 (.13)	0.35
Pride in Social Identity	5.61 (.11)	5.66 (.12)	0.14
Racial Self-Concept	41%	28%	2.26
Perceptions of Intergroup Relations in the U.S.	5.39 (.16)	5.30 (.17)	0.18

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. For racial self-concept, we report Pearson Chi-Square results. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S1c. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition in Anticipated Experiences Survey

Measure	Multicultural Condition	Colorblind Condition	<i>F</i> (1, 295)
Academic Preparedness	3.62 (.07)	3.73 (.08)	1.11
Control	5.94 (.07)	6.17 (.08)	5.01*
Efficacy	5.55 (.08)	5.69 (.08)	1.64
Appreciation of Difference	6.06 (.06)	6.10 (.07)	0.19
Social Identity Threat	2.31 (.10)	2.58 (.09)	3.65 ⁺
Social Fit	5.06 (.08)	5.17 (.08)	0.81
Bridging Difference	5.97 (.08)	6.11 (.09)	1.25
Intergroup Comfort	6.40 (.07)	6.37 (.06)	0.12

Average Help Seeking	2.65 (.07)	2.58 (.08)	0.35
Pride in Social Identity	5.56 (.07)	5.44 (0.07)	1.47
Racial Self-Concept	21%	15%	1.72
Perceptions of Intergroup Relations in the U.S.	5.20 (.10)	5.15 (.10)	0.17

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. For racial self-concept, we report Pearson Chi-Square results. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S1d. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of race in Anticipated Experiences Survey

Measure	URM	White and Asian	$F(1, 295)$
Academic Preparedness	3.69 (.09)	3.66 (.07)	0.04
Control	6.07 (.07)	6.05 (.09)	0.03
Efficacy	5.61 (.10)	5.63 (.08)	0.01
Appreciation of Difference	5.94 (.08)	6.23 (.06)	6.83**
Social Identity Threat	2.63 (.12)	2.27 (.10)	4.56*
Social Fit	5.09 (.11)	5.14 (.08)	0.08
Bridging Difference	6.05 (.08)	6.03 (.10)	0.01
Intergroup Comfort	6.35 (.08)	6.43 (.06)	0.43
Average Help Seeking	2.63 (.09)	2.60 (.07)	0.06
Pride in Social Identity	5.63 (.09)	5.36 (.07)	5.08*
Racial Self-Concept	35%	7%	37.31***
Perceptions of Intergroup Relations in the U.S.	5.34 (.12)	5.01 (.10)	3.94*

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. For racial self-concept, we report Pearson Chi-Square results ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Actual Experiences Survey

At the end of the first year in college, participants who completed the Anticipated Experiences Survey (Time 1 survey) were invited to complete a second survey. This survey asked them to report their actual college experiences during their past year, rather than their

anticipated college experiences. For example, instead of reporting how many times per month they expected to ask for help, they reported the number of times they asked for help. Additionally, participants were asked to report their use of resources in college. Among the 206 participants who completed this survey, 79 were URM students.

Table S2a.

List of Items and Measures in Actual Experiences Survey

Dependent Variable	Items
Academic Preparedness ($r = .39^*$)	1. I feel that the academic experience at [the University] is difficult for me. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 2. I am well prepared to be academically successful as a student at [the University].
Control ($r = .53^{***}$)	3. I can do things at my college in a way that is right for me. 4. I have the power to influence my college experience.
Efficacy ($r = .56^{***}$)	3. I'm certain I can master the skills taught at my college this upcoming year. 4. I can do all of the work in class if I don't give up.
Appreciation of Difference ($\alpha = .73$)	1. Students with different backgrounds and experiences can find their own ways of being successful at [the University]. 2. There are different ways to be successful at [the University]. 3. My college makes an effort to include ideas and practices that represent a wide variety of backgrounds. 4. I think that my background will help me succeed at [the University].
Social identity threat ($\alpha = .68$)	1. Students at my college to be accepting of people who have diverse backgrounds. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 2. Students at my college make unfair assumptions about me based on my background. 3. Professors at my college to make unfair assumptions about me based on my background.
Social fit ($\alpha = .76$)	1. I feel a part of the college community at [the University]. 2. I feel like an outsider at [the University]. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 3. It is a mystery to me how things work at [the University]. (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 4. I belong at [the University].
Bridging Difference ($r = .45^{***}$)	1. In college, I have sought to educate others about my background, culture, and identity. 2. In college, I have learned about others' backgrounds, cultures, and identities.
Intergroup comfort ($\alpha = .87$)	1. How comfortable are you interacting with someone from a different social class background than you? 2. How comfortable are you interacting with someone from a different racial or ethnic background than you? 3. How comfortable are you interacting with someone from a different religious background than you?
Help-Seeking ($\alpha = .78$)	Please think about your first year at [the University]. In a typical month, approximately how many times per month (0-5) did you engage in the following actions? 1. Email a professor to ask a question.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Meet with a professor outside of class. 3. Meet with other students to study for tests or exams outside of class 4. Meet with other students to study for tests or exams outside of class 5. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on course assignments 6. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on choosing classes or choosing a major 7. Meet with a mentor or advisor to seek feedback or advice on future aspirations or career goals.
Pride in social identity ($\alpha = .78$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same racial or ethnic background as me 2. I feel good about my racial or ethnic background 3. I feel ashamed of my racial or ethnic background (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 4. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same social class background as me 5. I feel good about my social class background 6. I feel ashamed of my social class background (<i>reverse-scored</i>) 7. I feel a strong sense of pride about people with the same gender as me 8. I feel good about my gender; I feel ashamed of my gender (<i>reverse-scored</i>).
Events and Activities	Participants listed and described the events, clubs, activities, and/or organizations that they were involved in throughout their first year. We summed the number of responses.

Table S2b. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition for URM participants in Actual Experiences Survey

Measure	URM in Multicultural Condition	URM in Colorblind Condition	<i>F</i> (1, 198)
Academic Preparedness	4.03 (.20)	3.78 (.20)	1.08
Control	5.32 (.16)	5.32 (.16)	0.00
Efficacy	4.89 (.98)	5.09 (.19)	0.86
Appreciation of Difference	5.28 (.18)	5.14 (.17)	0.35
Social Identity Threat	2.87 (.19)	3.19 (.18)	1.75
Social Fit	4.62 (.19)	4.59 (.19)	0.02
Bridging Difference	5.46 (.18)	5.28 (.18)	0.56
Intergroup Comfort	6.03 (.15)	6.31 (.15)	1.85
Average Help Seeking	1.97 (.18)	1.96 (.18)	0.00
Pride in Social Identity	5.34 (.15)	5.44 (.14)	0.28
Events and Activities	7.69 (.85)	8.22 (.83)	0.22

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender)

are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2c. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition in Anticipated Experiences Survey

Measure	Multicultural Condition	Colorblind Condition	$F(1, 198)$
Academic Preparedness	4.12 (.12)	3.94 (.12)	1.14
Control	5.55 (.10)	5.46 (.10)	0.38
Efficacy	5.14 (.11)	5.29 (.11)	0.90
Appreciation of Difference	5.36 (.11)	5.45 (.10)	0.33
Social Identity Threat	2.71 (.11)	2.82 (.11)	0.51
Social Fit	4.79 (.12)	4.95 (.11)	0.94
Bridging Difference	5.31 (.11)	5.33 (.10)	0.01
Intergroup Comfort	5.95 (.09)	6.24 (.09)	5.02*
Average Help Seeking	2.02 (.11)	1.97 (.11)	0.11
Pride in Social Identity	5.63 (.09)	5.36 (.07)	0.37
Events and Activities	8.51 (.51)	9.0 (.50)	0.46

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2d. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of race in Anticipated Experiences Survey

Measure	URM	White and Asian	$F(1, 198)$
Academic Preparedness	3.92 (.15)	4.14 (.11)	1.17
Control	5.32 (.12)	5.69 (.09)	5.24*
Efficacy	4.98 (.14)	5.46 (.11)	6.55*
Appreciation of Difference	5.21 (.13)	5.60 (.10)	4.70*
Social Identity Threat	3.03 (.14)	2.50 (.10)	8.12**
Social Fit	4.60 (.14)	5.14 (.08)	7.61**
Bridging Difference	5.37 (.13)	5.27 (.10)	0.32
Intergroup Comfort	6.17 (.11)	6.02 (.09)	0.93

Average Help Seeking	1.97 (.13)	2.03 (.10)	0.12
Pride in Social Identity	5.39 (.10)	5.20 (.08)	1.61
Events and Activities	7.95 (.63)	9.55 (.47)	3.53 ⁺

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Third Year Survey

Table S3a.

List of Items and Measures in Third Year Survey Not Included In Main Text

Dependent Variable	Items
Social identity threat ($\alpha = .78$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students at my college have made unfair assumptions about me based on my background. 2. Professors at my college have made unfair assumptions about me based on my background. 3. People who have backgrounds like my own are included [the University]. <i>reverse-scored</i>
Social fit ($\alpha = .78$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have felt like I am part of [the University] community. 2. I have had to become a different person to fit in at [the University]. <i>reverse-scored</i> 3. I have belonged as a student at [the University].
Perception of college climate ($\alpha = .89$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At [my University] differences are valued. 2. [My University] helps students understand that differences in backgrounds and experiences can lead to different values and ways of thinking. 3. [My University] exposes students to the important differences in ideas and values that exist in the world. 4. [My University] values multiple perspectives on campus (i.e. from different cultures, races, ethnicities).
Perception of Bias ($\alpha = .60$)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have encountered bias at [My University]. 2. Other people have treated me fairly at [My University]. <i>reverse-scored</i> 3. People at [my University] hold biased or prejudicial views.
Help-Seeking ($\alpha = .77$)	<p>Since you started at [the University], in a typical month, approximately many times per month (0-5) do did you engage in the following actions?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emailed a professor to ask a question. 2. Met with a professor outside of class. 3. Gone to the writing center
Activities	<p>Participants listed and described the activities that they were involved in so far at [the University]. We summed the number of responses.</p>

Table S2b. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition for URM participants in Third Year Survey

Measure	URM in Multicultural Condition	URM in Colorblind Condition	<i>F</i> (1, 242)
Social identity threat	3.76 (.21)	3.77 (.22)	0.00
Social fit	4.34 (.19)	4.48 (.21)	0.26
Perception of college climate	3.88 (.20)	3.93 (.22)	0.02
Perception of Bias	4.19 (.16)	4.31 (.18)	0.30
Help-Seeking	1.38 (.17)	1.61 (.18)	1.97
Activities	3.96 (.35)	3.48 (.35)	1.12

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2b. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of condition in Third Year Survey

Measure	Multicultural Condition	Colorblind Condition	<i>F</i> (1, 242)
Social identity threat	3.45 (.13)	3.37 (.13)	0.21
Social fit	4.54 (.11)	4.75 (.12)	1.52
Perception of college climate	4.24 (.12)	4.33 (.13)	0.25
Perception of Bias	4.10 (.10)	4.03 (.10)	0.24
Help-Seeking	1.43 (.10)	1.53 (.11)	0.53
Activities	3.41 (.20)	3.82 (.20)	2.10

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2b. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for main effects of race in Third Year Survey

Measure	URM	White and Asian	<i>F</i> (1, 242)
Social identity threat	3.76 (.16)	3.06 (.12)	11.08**
Social fit	4.41 (.15)	4.87 (.11)	5.34*
Perception of college climate	3.90 (.16)	4.67 (.11)	13.75***
Perception of Bias	4.25 (.12)	3.88 (.09)	5.08*
Help-Seeking	1.50 (.13)	1.46 (.09)	0.05

Activities	3.72 (.25)	3.51 (.18)	0.42
------------	------------	------------	------

Note: The same covariates (highest SAT scores, family income, generation status, and gender) are included in the model and mean values indicate marginal means. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors of the mean. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Supplemental Information: Additional Analyses

Cumulative GPA and difficulty of course selection in first year. To rule out the possibility that multicultural condition improved participants' grades by altering their selection of courses during their first year, we conducted a series of follow up analyses. Specifically, we examined whether participants across conditions took classes that were comparably difficult. To do so, we followed the same procedure as in Stephens, Hamedani & Destin (2014) intervention. First, we calculated the difficulty of each of the 102 subject areas. Specifically, we took the mean GPA for each subject area across the nonparticipants in the campus-wide control group. This allowed us to examine the average GPA of each subject area (e.g., in the fall term, Chemistry's mean GPA was 3.12, Art History's mean GPA was 3.74, Econ's mean GPA was 2.97). Higher average GPAs across subject area indicate easier courses. Next, for each participant (i.e. those in the multicultural condition and colorblind condition), we calculated the mean subject area GPA for each quarter in the first year. For example, if a participant took a Chemistry course, an Art history course, and an Econ course in the Fall semester, that participant's mean subject area GPA would be 3.28.

We then conducted a series of 2 (race: URM vs. White and Asian) x 2 (intervention condition: multicultural vs. colorblind) analysis of covariances (ANCOVAs) predicting mean subject area for each quarter. Results indicated no differences in subject area GPA that could explain the effects of the intervention on participants' academic performance. For all terms, there was no significant main effects of condition [first year fall, $p = .245$; first year winter, $p = .42$; first year spring, $p = .44$; second year fall, $p = .27$; second year winter, $p = .51$; second year spring, $p = .15$]. Additionally, there was no race x intervention condition interaction [first year fall, $p = .551$; first year winter, $p = .93$; first year spring, $p = .34$; second year fall, $p = .33$; second year winter, $p = .98$; second year spring, $p = .55$].

To lend additional support to the claim that the intervention effects on academic achievement were not due to course selection, we conducted an additional of 2 (race: URM vs. White and Asian) x 2 (intervention condition: multicultural vs. colorblind) analysis of covariances (ANCOVAs) predicting academic performance, and included the mean of the first year fall, first year winter, first year spring, second year fall, second year winter, and second year spring subject area GPAs as additional covariates. There was no significant effect of race, $F(1, 393) = 3.12, p = .08, \eta^2 = .008$ and a significant effect of condition, $F(1, 393) = 5.13, p = .02, \eta^2 = .01$. The predicted race x intervention condition interaction remained significant, $F(1, 393) = 6.97, p = .009, \eta^2 = .02$.