

Supplemental Materials

Table of Contents

- I. Method.....2
 - A. Study Setting.....2
 - B. Sampling Procedure.....2
 - C. Academic Preparation of Sample2
 - D. Diversity Statements.....2
 - 1) Multicultural Diversity Statement.....2
 - 2) Colorblind Diversity Statement3
- II. Additional Measures and Results4
 - A. Academic Performance.....4
 - 1) Academic performance without covariates.....4
 - 2) Academic performance of URM students vs. White students (i.e. excluding Asian students)4
 - 3) Academic performance of URM students vs. Asian students (i.e. excluding White students)4
 - 4) Academic performance of first-generation vs. continuing-generation students4
 - 5) Academic performance of advantaged students (i.e. continuing-generation white students) vs. disadvantage students (i.e. first-generation or URM students).....5
 - 6) Academic performance and difficulty of course selection in college.....5
 - 7) Academic performance over time.....6
 - B. Anticipated Experiences Survey.....6
 - 1) Perceived Authenticity of Diversity Statement.....6
 - 2) Anticipated Engagement and Experiences in College.....6
 - C. End-of-year Survey.....10

I. Method

A. 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. 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. The SAT scores of URM participants were significantly lower ($M = 1380.64$, $SD = 90.29$) than the SAT scores of White and Asian participants ($M = 1489.56$, $SD = 83.26$; $F(1, 405) = 154.26$, $p < .01$).

B. 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.

C. 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 SAT scores in the multicultural condition ($M = 1389.25$, $SD = 92.16$) and the colorblind condition ($M = 1371.58$, $SD = 87.99$; $p = .20$). Nevertheless, we use SAT scores as a control in our central analyses.

D. Diversity Statements

1) 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.

2) 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.

II. Additional Measures and Results

A. Academic Performance

1) Academic performance without covariates

We conducted a 2 (race: URM vs. White and Asian) x 3 (condition: multicultural vs. colorblind vs. campus-wide control) analysis of variance (ANOVA). We found a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 1622) = 87.40, p < .001$ and no significant main effect of intervention condition, $F(2, 1622) = 2.07, p = .13$. These main effects were qualified by a significant race x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1622) = 3.81, p = .02$.

URM participants in the multicultural condition earned significantly higher GPAs than URM participants in the colorblind condition ($p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.06, 0.31]$) and the campus-wide control group ($p = .02, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.02, 0.22]$). Furthermore, URM participants in the colorblind condition did not differ in their GPAs compared to URM nonparticipants in the campus-wide control group ($p = .23, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.16, 0.04]$). There still was a significant racial performance 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 ($p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.24, 0.35]$). White and Asian participants did not significantly differ across the three conditions, $F(2, 1622) = .22, p = .80$.

2) Academic performance of URM students vs. White students (i.e. excluding Asian students)

We conducted a 2 (race: URM vs. White) x 3 (condition: multicultural vs. colorblind vs. campus-wide control) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) controlling for the same set of covariates. We found 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 performance 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. ($p = .36, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.07, 0.18]$).

3) Academic performance of URM students vs. Asian students (i.e. excluding White students)

We conducted a 2 (race: URM vs. Asian) x 3 (condition: multicultural vs. colorblind vs. campus-wide control) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) controlling for the same set of covariates. 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, $F(2, 725) = 0.84, p = .43$.

4) Academic performance of first-generation vs. continuing-generation students

We conducted a 2 (generation status: first-generation vs. continuing-generation) x 3 (condition: multicultural vs. colorblind vs. campus-wide control) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) controlling for the same set of covariates. There was no significant main effect of generation status, $F(1, 1618) = 1.98, p = .16$, no main effect of condition, $F(2, 1618) = 0.15, p = .86$, and no significant generation status x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1618) = 0.25, p = .78$.

5) Academic performance of advantaged students (i.e. continuing-generation white students) vs. disadvantage students (i.e. first-generation or URM students)

We conducted a 2 (disadvantaged status: disadvantaged vs. not disadvantaged) x 3 (condition: multicultural vs. colorblind vs. campus-wide control) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) controlling for the same set of covariates. There was a significant main effect of disadvantaged status, $F(1, 1618) = 34.92, p < .001$, no main effect of condition, $F(1, 1618) = 1.14, p = .32$, and no significant disadvantaged status x intervention condition interaction, $F(2, 1618) = 1.38, p = .25$.

6) Academic performance and difficulty of course selection in college

To rule out the possibility that multicultural condition improved participants' grades by altering their selection of courses during their time in college, 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. 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 vs. campus-wide control) analyses 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 performance were not due to course selection, we conducted an additional 2 (race: URM vs. White and Asian) x 2 (intervention condition: multicultural vs. colorblind) analysis of covariances (ANCOVA) 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, $F(1, 379) = 3.43, p = .07, \eta^2 = .009$ and a significant effect of condition, $F(1, 379) = 5.02, p = .03, \eta^2 = .013$. The predicted race x intervention condition interaction remained significant, $F(1, 379) = 7.14, p = .008, \eta^2 = .02$.

7) Academic performance over time

We examined the effect of the intervention on the trajectory of students' academic performance over each term. To do so, we conducted a GLM Repeated Measures, with time as the within-subject factor and Greenhouse-Geisser's correction. Results indicated no significant effect of time, $F(1.91, 2947.10) = 2.91, p = .06$, no significant time x condition interaction, $F(3.822, 2947.10) = 0.33, p = .71$, no significant time x race interaction $F(1.91, 2947.10) = .30, p = 0.73$, and time x race x condition interaction, $F(3.82, 2947.10) = 1.68, p = .16$.

B. 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 answered a variety of questions on their perception of the authenticity of the diversity statement and anticipated experiences for their first year 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 students (multicultural condition: $n = 63$, colorblind condition: $n = 60$).

1) 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 vs. 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,” ($\alpha = .84$) Results indicated no significant main effect of condition, $F(1, 295) = 0.52, p = .47$, no main effect of race, $F(1, 295) = 1.47, p = .23$, and no interaction, $F(1, 295) = 0.04, p = .84$, suggesting that URM participants perceived the two different diversity statements to be comparably authentic.

2) Anticipated Engagement and Experiences in College

Table S1a. *List of Items and Measures in Anticipated Engagement and Experiences Survey*

Dependent Variable	Items
<p>Engagement (i.e. tendency to seek out help) ($\alpha = .78$)</p>	<p>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?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
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 $(r = .56^{**})$	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In college, I hope to have the opportunity to educate others about my background, culture, and identity. 2. In college, I look forward to learning about others' backgrounds, cultures, and identities.
Intergroup comfort $(\alpha = .79)$	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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?

<p>Pride in social identity ($\alpha = .78$)</p>	<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>).
<p>Perceptions of Intergroup Relations in the U.S. ($r = .66$)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 today.
<p>Racial self-concept</p>	<p>3. Participants completed a shortened version of the Twenty Statements Task (TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954). To reduce the 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?’ Simply write in an answer in each blank space and make each answer different.” We coded whether participants mentioned their race or not. We used a Logistic regression with the same set of covariates to analyze this measure. Results indicated no main effect of condition, $B = -.40, p = .67$, no main effect of race, $B = -.91, p = .49$, and no significant race x condition interaction, $B = .20, p = .82$.</p>

Table S2b. *Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Main Effects of Condition for URM Participants in Anticipated Engagement and Experiences survey*

Measure	URM in Multicultural Condition	URM in Colorblind Condition	$F(1, 295)$
Engagement	2.68 (.12)	2.58 (.13)	0.35
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
Pride in Social Identity	5.61 (.11)	5.66 (.12)	0.14
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, ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2c. *Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Main Effects of Condition in Anticipated Engagement and Experiences Survey*

Measure	Multicultural Condition	Colorblind Condition	$F(1, 295)$
Engagement	2.65 (.07)	2.58 (.08)	0.35
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
Pride in Social Identity	5.56 (.07)	5.44 (0.07)	1.47
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, ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S2d. *Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Main Effects of Race in Anticipated Engagement and Experiences Survey*

Measure	URM	White and Asian	$F(1, 295)$
Engagement	2.63 (.09)	2.60 (.07)	0.06
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
Pride in Social Identity	5.63 (.09)	5.36 (.07)	5.08*
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, ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

C. End-of-year Survey

At the end of students first year, participants answered a series of follow up questions on their experiences over their past year. Among the 206 participants, 79 were URM participants. Post hoc power analysis using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), indicated that we had the 33% power to detect our largest observed effect size of $\eta^2 = .01$.

Table S2a. *List of Items and Measures in End-of-Year Survey*

Dependent Variable	Items
Engagement (i.e. tendency to seek out help) ($\alpha = .78$)	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? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
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 ($r = .53^{***}$)	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 ($r = .56^{***}$)	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?
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>).

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. We used Poisson regression with the same set of covariates. Results indicated no main effect of condition, $\chi^2(1) = 0.57, p = .45$ and a significant main effect of race, $\chi^2(1) = 26.15, p < .01$ such that URM participants engaged in fewer events and activities than White and Asian participants. Results indicated no significant race x condition interaction, $\chi^2(1) = .01, p = .92$.
------------------------------	--

Table S2b. *Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Main Effects of Condition for URM Students in End-of-Year Survey*

Measure	URM in Multicultural Condition	URM in Colorblind Condition	F(1, 198)
Engagement	1.97 (.18)	1.96 (.18)	0.00
Academic Preparedness	4.06 (.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
Pride in Social Identity	5.34 (.15)	5.44 (.14)	0.28

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 End-of-Year Survey*

Measure	Multicultural Condition	Colorblind Condition	F(1, 198)
Engagement	2.02 (.11)	1.97 (.11)	0.11
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*
Pride in Social Identity	5.63 (.09)	5.36 (.07)	0.37

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 S4d. *Multivariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Main Effects of Race in End-of-Year Survey*

Measure	URM	White and Asian	$F(1, 198)$
Engagement	1.97 (.13)	2.03 (.10)	0.12
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
Pride in Social Identity	5.39 (.10)	5.20 (.08)	1.61

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