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Abstract:
Research on multiracial categorization has focused on majority group social perceivers (i.e., White Americans), demonstrating that they (a) typically categorize Black-White multiracials according to a rule of hypodescent, associating them more with their lower status parent group than their higher status parent group, and (b) do so at least in part to preserve the hierarchical status quo. The current work examines whether members of an ethnic minority group, Black Americans, also associate Black-White multiracials more with their minority versus majority parent group and if so, why. The first two studies (1A and 1B) directly compared Black and White Americans, and found that although both Blacks and Whites categorized Black-White multiracials as more Black than White, Whites’ use of hypodescent was associated with intergroup anti-egalitarianism, whereas Blacks’ use of hypodescent was associated with intergroup egalitarianism. Studies 2-3 reveal that egalitarian Blacks use hypodescent in part because they perceive that Black-White biracials face discrimination and consequently feel a sense of linked fate with them. This research establishes that the use of hypodescent extends to minority as well as majority perceivers but also shows that the beliefs associated with the use of hypodescent differ as a function of perceiver social status. In doing so, we broaden the social scientific understanding of hypodescent, showing how it can be an inclusionary rather than exclusionary phenomenon.
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“In the 1850s the strong fears of abolition and slave insurrections resulted in growing hostility toward miscegenation, mulattoes, concubinage, passing, manumission, and of the implicit rule granting free mulattoes a special, in-between status in the lower south…. Thus, the South came together in strong support of [the rule of hypodescent] in order to defend slavery….”
Davis, 1991, p. 49

“Whites defined the black population in the United States by establishing the [rule of hypodescent], and apparently the whites’ original reasons for doing that are now irrelevant to most blacks. The whites forced all shades of mulattoes into the black community, where they were accepted, loved, married, and cherished as soul brothers and sisters. A sense of unity developed among a people with an extremely wide variation in racial characteristics.”
Davis, 1991, p. 139

Throughout much of United States history, Black-White multiracial individuals were legally defined as Black, a norm that was widely perpetuated by Whites, but seemingly accepted by Blacks (Davis, 1991). Social psychological research examining this categorization bias—called hypodescent—has shown that it persists to this day (at least among White social perceivers, which this research has tended to focus on; Ho, Sidanius, Levin, & Banaji, 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008; Sanchez, Good, & Chavez, 2011). Furthermore, a growing body of research demonstrates that hypodescent is motivated at least in part by White perceivers’ desire to protect their dominant status in the U.S. (Ho, Sidanius, Cuddy, & Banaji, 2013; Krosch & Amodio, 2014; Krosch, Berntsen, Amodio, Jost, & Van Bavel, 2013; Kteily, Cotterill, Sidanius, Sheehy-Skeffington, & Bergh, 2014; Rodeheffer, Hill, & Lord, 2012). As the opening epigraphs suggest, although the rule of hypodescent was developed by Whites for the purposes of social
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stratification, it may also have been adopted (or at least accepted) by Blacks, albeit for very different reasons. Our scientific understanding of hypodescent to date is still largely limited to the perspective of White Americans, and thus, little is known about Black Americans’ use of hypodescent, or the psychological factors this is associated with. In the current studies, we systematically examine whether Blacks categorize Black-White biracials as more Black than White, as Whites do, and if so, why. In doing so, we endeavor to broaden the social psychological understanding of the hypodescent phenomenon.¹

Hypodescent among White Americans

Previous research has established that Whites use hypodescent (Ho et al., 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008), and further, that opposition to equality, perceptions of threats to the dominant status of Whites, and even perceptions of economic scarcity can increase Whites’ use of hypodescent in categorizing Black-White biracials (Ho et al., 2013; Krosch & Amodio, 2014; Krosch et al., 2013; Kteily et al., 2014; Rodeheffer et al., 2012). For example, Ho et al. (2013) found that anti-egalitarian Whites who perceived that Blacks were gaining in social status (and thus posed a threat to Whites’ group position) were more likely to categorize a Black-White biracial target as Black. Similarly, Krosch et al. (2013) found that opposition to equality contributed to politically conservative perceivers’ propensity to categorize racially ambiguous faces as Black, while Kteily et al. (2014) showed that Whites who were opposed to equality or concerned about protecting dominant cultural norms perceived racially ambiguous targets as less

¹ Note that hypodescent is a technical term used in the social sciences to describe the racial categorization rule whereby racial descent is traced to the lower status ancestral parent group (Harris & Kottak, 1963, as cited in Margolis & Kottak, 2003). We use the term hypodescent to signify this pattern of categorization—categorizing a Black-White biracial person as relatively more Black than White—and do not make any assumptions about what motivates hypodescent. That is, we use hypodescent as a value-neutral term, and empirically test what it relates to among both Black and White perceivers. We further note that in examining the categorization and perception of mixed-race individuals, it is not our intention to reinforce the notion that racial groups have unique “essences” (e.g., a clearly defined genetic profile) that can be mixed (see Richeson & Sommers, 2016, on how research on multiracials can unintentionally essentialize race). Rather, we are exploring how social perceivers think about the group membership of individuals who can identify with multiple social groups.
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White when they were said to be, respectively, low-status or non-conformist (compared to when they were said to be high-status or conformist). Of relevance to the current work, all three of these papers operationalized opposition to equality as higher levels of social dominance orientation (SDO): Indeed, SDO is a widely used measure of preferences for intergroup equality, with higher levels signifying opposition to intergroup equality and support for maintaining hierarchy, and lower levels signifying support for intergroup equality and reducing hierarchy (Ho et al., 2015; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

Further highlighting the role of hierarchy-maintenance motives in Whites’ use of hypodescent, Rodeheffer et al. (2012) discovered that making resource scarcity salient led Whites to restrict their definition of who “counted” as White, thus categorizing Black-White biracials as Black. Similarly, Krosch and Amodio (2014) found that non-Black (predominantly White) individuals’ perceptions of zero-sum competition between Blacks and Whites (i.e., perceiving Black gains as implying equivalent White losses) contributed to perceptions of biracial targets as Black. Thus, Whites’ perceptions of resource scarcity and competition trigger behaviors aimed at preserving their dominant status.

Consistent with research documenting that Whites’ use of hypodescent relates to their desire to maintain their high status, research on ingroup overexclusion, which has also focused mainly on social perceivers from high status groups, demonstrates that individuals have a high threshold for accepting individuals whose identities are ambiguous as fellow group members because of concerns about not ‘contaminating’ the ingroup (Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon, & Seron, 2002; Leyens & Yzerbyt, 1992; Yzerbyt, Leyens, & Bellour, 1995).

In sum, then, among members of high status groups, threats to the group’s advantaged social standing appear to trigger a more exclusive definition of group boundaries, with
individuals of ambiguous group membership more likely to be shut out. These research findings align with the increased exclusion of Black-White biracials by dominant Whites observed during the mid-19th century, when the institution of slavery was threatened in the U.S. (Davis, 1991).

**Hypodescent among Black Americans?**

Although there is little empirical research on Blacks’ perceptions of Black-White multiracials, American history suggests that Blacks do use the rule of hypodescent. Several prominent Black leaders, for example, were largely regarded as Black by other Blacks despite their part-White ancestry. The noted sociologist and founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), W.E.B. DuBois, had French and Dutch ancestry, in addition to African ancestry. Walter White, president of the NAACP from 1931 to 1955, was estimated to be at most one sixty-fourth African Black (Davis, 1991). Nevertheless, and despite the fact that he and both of his parents could ‘pass’ as White, he was regarded by most other Blacks as Black (Davis, 1991). More recently, Barack Obama, who is known to have a White mother from Kansas and Black father from Kenya, has widely been regarded as Black by both Blacks and Whites alike.

In addition to historical and recent anecdotal evidence, three existing studies on Black Americans’ perception of biracials provide some suggestive evidence that they may engage in hypodescent. One recent study investigated whether Blacks who were threatened with social exclusion (compared to their non-threatened counterparts) might be more likely to categorize Black-White racially ambiguous faces as Black, and found that this was the case (Gaither, Pauker, Slepian, & Sommers, 2016, Study 2B). Although this study was not focused on the general tendency toward hypodescent, analyzing its descriptive statistics shows that more than 50% of the racially ambiguous faces were categorized as Black by Black participants. Another recent study also revealed patterns consistent with Blacks’ use of hypodescent. Whereas
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individuals often generalize their perceptions of one outgroup member to the whole outgroup, they tend to individuate ingroup members. In one study, Chen and Ratliff (2015, Experiment 3) found that whereas White perceivers generalized their negative perceptions of one Black person to another Black or Black-White person, Black perceivers did not generalize their negative attitudes about one Black person to another Black person or to a Black-White person. These results suggest that Blacks were motivated to individuate both Black and biracial individuals, possibly because biracials are regarded as ingroup members (Chen & Ratliff, 2015, Experiment 3). Perhaps more directly pointing to hypodescent, one recent study demonstrated that college-age Black participants were more likely to categorize Black-White biracial targets as Black than as White, though children did not exhibit this bias (Roberts & Gelman, 2015, Study 2). Indeed, when pictures of the biracial targets’ parents were presented (thus clearly revealing their racial background), 4-6 year-old Black participants actually categorized biracial targets as relatively White (vs. Black). This study focused on the developmental trajectory of hypodescent (i.e., from 4 years old to adulthood), and thus did not have a particularly large college-student sample of Blacks (\(n = 48\)). Nevertheless, this sample of Black adults does suggest that they may use hypodescent. In the present work, we seek to build on preliminary, suggestive evidence that Blacks use hypodescent, by directly and systematically investigating Blacks’ categorization of Black-White multiracials, and by examining possible sociopolitical correlates of hypodescent among Black social perceivers.

Does (Anti-)Egalitarianism Relate to Hypodescent among Black Americans?

Because previous research on perceptions of biracials has focused on high status (i.e., White American) social perceivers, it is no surprise that hypodescent is widely regarded as an exclusionary rule used by anti-egalitarian members of privileged groups who are interested in
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maintaining group boundaries (Ho et al., 2013, Krosch et al., 2013, Kteily et al., 2014). In other words, majority-group perceivers are thought to reject multiracials from their high status ingroup in order to maintain the social hierarchy. In contrast to previous work, the current work focuses on social perceivers from a relatively low power and low status group (i.e., Black Americans; see DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2011; Kahn, Ho, Sidanius, & Pratto, 2009, Macartney, Bishaw, & Fontenot, 2013 on race-based status differences), and examines how their perceptions of Black-White biracials might relate to anti-egalitarianism. In particular, we test the possibility that with Black Americans, a preference for intergroup equality (i.e., intergroup egalitarianism rather than anti-egalitarianism) might be associated with higher levels of hypodescent (i.e., categorizing Black-White biracials as Black, which, in this case, also means categorizing them as ingroup members). We further test the idea that the proposed link between Blacks’ egalitarianism and hypodescent is mediated by Black perceivers’ perception that Black-White biracials are discriminated against, and consequently, their feeling that Blacks and Black-White biracials share a common destiny (i.e., linked fate). Below, we expand on each step of the proposed theoretical model, starting from Black Americans’ egalitarianism and ending with their use of hypodescent in the categorization of Black-White biracials.

**Egalitarianism predicts perceptions of discrimination.** We reason that because egalitarian individuals are generally more attuned to discrimination, egalitarian Blacks will be more likely to perceive discrimination both against the ingroup (Blacks) and against Black-White biracials. Several strands of related research support the idea that those who favor intergroup equality are more likely to perceive discrimination. First, individuals lower in social dominance orientation, including Blacks, are more likely to perceive past and present injustices on the basis of race, agreeing with statements such as “generations of discrimination have created conditions
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that make it difficult for [Blacks/Latinos] to work their way out of the lower class,” or that “… [Blacks/Latinos] have gotten less than they deserve” (Ho et al., 2015). Second, ethnic minorities lower in SDO perceive more discrimination against their own group, consistent with the idea that egalitarians are generally sensitive to discrimination (Thomsen et al., 2010). Third, highlighting the association between low SDO and perception of discrimination at a more abstract level, those lower on SDO (including lower SDO Blacks) are more likely than those high on SDO to perceive and recall inequality, even when all participants are presented with the same information about inequality and given financial incentives to report what they truly perceive (Kteily, Sheehy-Skeffington, & Ho, 2017). Thus, past work clearly links low levels of SDO with a readiness to perceive discrimination and inequality, including in the racial domain. In the current work, we directly test whether this extends, as we predict, to perceptions of discrimination against Black-White biracials.

**Perceptions of discrimination relates to perceptions of linked fate.** We hypothesize that egalitarian Blacks’ perception of discrimination against biracials, in turn, predicts the perception that Blacks and Black-White biracials share a common destiny, or that their fates are inextricably linked. As we reviewed above, previous work suggests that egalitarian ethnic minority group members are more likely to perceive discrimination against the ingroup (Thomsen et al., 2010) and against other ethnic minority groups (Ho et al., 2015). If, as this previous work suggests will be the case, Blacks’ egalitarianism leads them to perceive discrimination against Black-White biracials, egalitarian Blacks should have a strong basis for feeling kinship with Black-White biracials. This theorizing is consistent with work on stigma-based solidarity (Craig & Richeson, 2016), which shows that when minority group members perceive that members of another minority group are discriminated against along a similar
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dimension (e.g., race), they are more likely to feel a sense of solidarity with members of the other group.

The theory of racial linked fate was developed by the political scientist Michael Dawson (1994), who advanced the idea that Black individuals’ perceptions of subordination and exploitation of Blacks (i.e., discrimination) underpins a sense that they share a common destiny with other Blacks (i.e., a sense of linked fate). In support of this thesis, Dawson found that Blacks’ perception that they are subordinated economically strongly predicted their perceptions that they share a linked fate with other Blacks. Here, we extend Dawson’s work on racial linked fate, and integrate it with work on stigma-based solidarity, testing the idea that egalitarian Blacks’ perception of discrimination against Black-White biracials will lead them to perceive a common destiny with Black-White biracials (linked fate).

**Linked fate relates to hypodescent.** Lastly, the perception that the fate of one’s ingroup and that of another discriminated-against group are inextricably linked may inspire a sense that the groups are part of the same coalition (e.g., a coalition of marginalized people). Since Black-White biracials are part Black, this feeling of being in a common coalition could naturally manifest itself in inclusive, ingroup categorization (hypodescent). This prediction is further supported by research on entitativity, which shows that when social perceivers perceive that a collection of people share a common fate, that tends to augment their perception that the collective constitutes a common group (Lickel et al., 2000; see Hamilton, Chen, & Way, 2012, for a review).

**Hypotheses and Overview of the Current Research**

Based on the preceding discussion, we derived three major hypotheses: First, based on a historical analysis and suggestive psychological research on Black perceivers, we expected that
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Blacks, like Whites, would use hypodescent (i.e., categorize Black-White biracials as more Black than White; H1). Second, we hypothesized that Blacks and Whites’ (anti-)egalitarianism would differentially relate to hypodescent (H2): Whereas Whites, as in previous studies, should use hypodescent to the extent that they are relatively opposed to equality, Black should use hypodescent to the extent they are relatively supportive of equality. Third, because intergroup egalitarianism is associated with a heightened sensitivity to discrimination (Ho et al., 2015; Kteily et al., 2017, Thomsen et al., 2010) we further predicted that egalitarian Blacks would be especially sensitive to discrimination faced by Black-White biracials. This sense of discrimination against biracials should consequently lead Blacks to perceive that their fates are linked to the fates of Black-White biracials, helping to account for egalitarian Blacks’ use of hypodescent (H3).

We test the hypotheses posed above across four studies (and three supplemental studies), including a nationally representative sample of Blacks and Whites. Studies 1A and 1B represent initial investigations of whether Blacks engage in hypodescent (H1), and if so, whether this is particularly true among Blacks who are relatively low in social dominance orientation (i.e., more egalitarian Blacks). These studies included both Blacks and Whites, allowing us to test whether the perceiver’s race interacts with egalitarianism such that among Whites, higher SDO (i.e., anti-egalitarianism) would be associated with greater hypodescent whereas with Blacks lower SDO (i.e., egalitarianism) would predict hypodescent (H2). Study 2 tests whether perceptions of discrimination against Black-White biracials, and a subsequent feeling of linked fate with them, might mediate lower SDO Blacks’ use of hypodescent (H3). Building on Study 2, Study 3 experimentally manipulates the degree of discrimination biracials face to examine whether highlighting discrimination against biracials augments Blacks’ sense that their destiny is linked
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to the destiny of Black-White biracials, thus increasing their use of hypodescent. Study 3 also examines whether, conversely, presenting evidence that biracials are not discriminated against suppresses Blacks’ perceptions of linked fate, decreasing their tendency to engage in hypodescent.

**Studies 1A-1B: Race Interacts with (Anti-)Egalitarianism to Influence Hypodescent**

In Study 1A, we sought to provide the first direct evidence that Blacks use hypodescent, as well as the first examination of hypodescent among a nationally representative sample of either Black or White Americans. Previous research on hypodescent has primarily examined only White respondents and typically relied on college student or other relatively well-educated and politically liberal samples. Given the potential social and political implications of our research question, we thought that it was important to incorporate more representative samples into this research area (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Henry, 2008; Sears, 1986).

Additionally, Study 1A offers an initial test of our prediction that (anti-)egalitarianism would be differentially related to hypodescent among Blacks and Whites. Specifically, we assessed participants’ social dominance orientation, to examine whether it would interact with participants’ racial group membership such that hypodescent among Whites would be associated with anti-egalitarianism, whereas hypodescent among Blacks would be associated with egalitarianism.

**Method**

**Participants.** A stratified random sample of 214 U.S. born Whites (50% female, $M_{age} = 51.79, SD = 16.47$) and 210 U.S. Born Blacks (54.3% female, $M_{age} = 47.85, SD = 16.09$) were recruited from a nationally representative panel operated by GFK Knowledge Panel (formerly Knowledge Networks). GFK was contracted to collect a sample of 200 Blacks and 200 Whites
and was responsible for ending data collection after this total was reached. For all studies in this paper, we did not analyze data prior to the end of data collection, specified sample sizes prior to the beginning of data collection, and asked the survey firms we contracted to end data collection once the pre-set sample size was obtained. Since the current study involved analyzing a dataset that was collected to address a variety of questions related to intergroup relations and political psychology, we did not conduct a power analysis for this study specifically. Using G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) we determined that a power analysis using the average effect size of $r = .21$ for social psychological research for the critical race by SDO interaction (this is the first test of this interaction effect and thus we would not have had any other basis for estimating effect size; Funder et al., 2014) would have indicated that $n = 173$ was required to achieve 80% power. Our sample size was thus more than double what a reasonable estimate would have suggested.

**Measures.**

**SDO.** Within the context of an omnibus survey on social and political attitudes, respondents completed a 16 item measure of social dominance orientation (SDO; e.g., “Group equality should not be our primary goal;” “We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups (reverse scored);” “Group equality should be our ideal (reverse scored);” 1 = Strongly oppose to 7 = Strongly favor; $\alpha = .89$; $m = 2.57$; $SD = 1.03$; Ho et al., 2015). The full text of all measures analyzed across studies is available in the online supplemental materials.

**Hypodescent.** We measured hypodescent using five items. The first hypodescent item began with the stem, “Imagine a child with 2 Black grandparents and 2 White grandparents...,” followed by the question, “To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?” (1 = Completely Black, 4 = Equally Black and White, 7 = Completely White). Items 2-5 began with
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the stem, “If a Black American and a White American have a kid…,” and subsequently asked 2) Do you think the kid will look more like a Black person or a White person?; 3) Do you think the kid will act more like a Black person or a White person?; 4) Do you think the kid will fit in better with Black people or White people?; and 5) Do you think the kid should be thought of as relatively Black or relatively White? (1 = Relatively Black, 4 = Equally Black and White, 7 = Relatively White; all reverse-coded). The midpoint label for item 4 read, “Equally well with Blacks and Whites” (α = .73; Ho et al., 2013).2

Approximately half of the respondents (selected at random) completed the hypodescent measure first and the other half completed the SDO measure first. Thus, we were able to explore whether the use of hypodescent is influenced by exposure to statements concerning intergroup equality, and further, whether the relationship between intergroup (anti-)egalitarianism and hypodescent is stronger when SDO is measured first. Although it is possible that reminding participants about their (anti-)egalitarian values (as could happen when participants respond to the SDO scale) might accentuate the SDO-hypodescent relationship for both Blacks and Whites, we do not theorize that such reminders will be necessary. In order to ensure that our results are not merely due to (or inflated by) reminding participants about their intergroup egalitarianism, we examined whether measure order impacted our results.

In order to correct for deviations from demographic representativeness (based on the March 2013 Current Population Survey) resulting from survey non-response, we used statistical weights that were created for this purpose by GFK following data collection (see supplemental

---

2 Several other categorization items, examining the categorization of ¼ Black – ¾ White biracials, ¾ Black – ¼ White biracials, or dichotomous, forced-choice (rather than continuous) categorization were included in the survey for exploratory purposes, and are discussed and analyzed in supplemental materials. Throughout all seven studies in the current work, we focus on the categorization of ½ Black – ½ White biracials along a continuum where the midpoint indicates the perception of biracials as equally Black and White. The full text of all theoretically relevant exploratory measures are included in online supplemental materials. We also include a list of all measures included in the omnibus survey in the supplemental materials.
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materials for details about demographic variables used in weights). To account for the effects of statistical weighting and survey sampling designs used by GFK, Taylor series linearization, implemented in SPSS Complex Samples, was used to calculate variance estimates (Heeringa, West, & Berglund, 2010).

Results

We used one sample $t$-tests to examine the use of hypodescent among Blacks and Whites, testing if the mean for each group differed significantly from the midpoint “4” (which signifies the perception that biracials are “equally Black and White”). This revealed that both Black ($m = 4.42, SD = .77; t(206) = 6.30, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = .55$) and White ($m = 4.25, SD = .57; t(211) = 5.28, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = .43$) respondents used hypodescent, categorizing Black-White biracials as more Black than White, consistent with our first hypothesis. Notably, this is the first direct evidence of hypodescent in a nationally representative sample of either Blacks or Whites.

To examine whether anti-egalitarianism is differentially related to hypodescent for Blacks and Whites (H2), we regressed hypodescent on participant race (Black or White), SDO (mean-centered), and the participant race $\times$ SDO interaction. Race significantly interacted with SDO to predict hypodescent ($B = .17, SE B = .07, \beta = .28, t(415) = 2.30, p = .02$; see Figure 1A) such that among Whites, there was a marginally significant positive relationship between SDO and hypodescent (i.e., greater levels of intergroup anti-egalitarianism were associated with a greater tendency to categorize Black-White biracials as more Black than White: $B = .09, SE B = .05, \beta = .15, t(415) = 1.77, p = .08$) and among Blacks, there was a non-significant negative relationship ($B = -.08, SE B = .05, \beta = -.13, t(415) = -1.49, p = .14$). Although the simple slopes were not significant, the significant interaction provides preliminary evidence suggesting that the nature of the relationship between (anti-)egalitarianism and hypodescent is contingent upon the social
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perceiver’s group membership (Black vs. White in this case). Furthermore, this study provides
the first evidence from a nationally representative sample of either White or Black Americans
showing that both groups categorize \( \frac{1}{2} \) Black – \( \frac{1}{2} \) White multiracials as more Black than White.

We also examined whether the order in which participants completed the SDO and
hypodescent measures influenced these results. An independent samples \( t \)-test did not show any
differences in the use of hypodescent as a function of whether participants completed the SDO
measure first or the hypodescent measure first for either Blacks (\( t(206) = -1.65, p = .10 \), Cohen’s
\( d = -.29 \)) or Whites (\( t(211) = -.15, p = .88 \), Cohen’s \( d = -.02 \)). Furthermore, order did not
moderate the SDO hypodescent relationship among either Blacks (\( B = .13, SE B = .11, t(205) =
1.24, p = .22 \)) or Whites (\( B = -.12, SE B = .10, t(210) = -1.27, p = .21 \)).

Study 1B

Although the results in Study 1A were broadly in line with our hypotheses, given that this
was the first test of hypodescent among Blacks, and the first test of the race x SDO interaction,
we examined these questions again in another sample comparing Blacks and Whites.

Method

Participants. We recruited 285 U.S. born Whites (54% female, \( M_{age} = 49.81, SD =
15.10 \)) and 252 U.S. born Blacks (56% female, \( M_{age} = 46.93, SD = 17.03 \)) from Qualtrics Panels.
We contracted Qualtrics to recruit 250 Blacks and 250 Whites, and asked them to end data
collection after the target was met. Based on the effect size estimate we obtained for the race x
SDO interaction in Study 1A (semipartial \( r = .13 \)), a power analysis suggests that 468
participants are needed to achieve 80% power (234 Blacks and 234 Whites).

Measures. Respondents completed the same measure of social dominance orientation (\( \alpha
= .89; m = 2.50; SD = 1.15 \); Ho et al., 2015), followed by a 16-item version of the hypodescent
measure used in Study 1A. The hypodescent measure used here included items 2-5 in Study 1A along with the same question stem (“If a Black American and a White American have a kid…”). In order to measure the same construct more reliably, we also included additional, similar items, such as “Will the kid’s behavior lead those around to categorize him/her as Black or White?” and “Would you consider the kid more Black or more White?” (α = .94; m = 4.35; SD = 0.69; Ho et al., 2013; see supplemental materials).³

Results

We followed the same analytic procedures as in Study 1A. We once again found support for our first hypothesis such that, on average, both Blacks (m = 4.30; SD = 0.62; t(251) = 7.61, p < .001, Cohen’s d = .48) and Whites (m = 4.41, SD = 0.75; t(284) = 9.19, p < .001, Cohen’s d = .54) were significantly more likely to categorize a Black-White biracial as Black than as White (i.e., they engaged in hypodescent).

Turning to whether Blacks’ and Whites’ use of hypodescent relates differentially to intergroup (anti-)egalitarianism, we again regressed hypodescent on SDO, race, and the SDO x race interaction. This revealed once again that the race of the respondent significantly interacted with SDO to predict hypodescent (H2; B = .35, SE B = .05, β = .29; t(533) = 6.77, p < .001; see Figure 1B) such that among Whites, there was positive relationship between SDO and hypodescent (B = .16, SE B = .03, β = .27; t(533) = 4.87, p < .001) and among Blacks, there was a negative relationship (B = -.19, SE B = .04, β = -.31; t(533) = -4.75, p < .001).

Interim Discussion

Taken together, the first two studies provide clear evidence that Blacks and Whites use hypodescent (i.e., categorizing Black-White biracials as more Black than White) and highlight

---

³ Other measures that were part of this survey but not relevant to the current analyses are listed in the supplemental materials, along with the full text of relevant measures.
that the association between (anti-)egalitarianism and hypodescent is different among Blacks and Whites. For Whites, consistent with previous research (e.g., Ho et al., 2013; Krosch et al., 2013) greater opposition to equality was associated with a greater tendency to use the rule of hypodescent. For Blacks, the opposite was true — Blacks who were relatively supportive of equality were more likely to see Black-White multiracials as more Black than White (though we note that for both Blacks and Whites, the SDO-hypodescent relationship was stronger in Study 1B than in Study 1A, an issue we return to in the general discussion). Our findings among Whites converge with those of previous research, further confirming relatively well-established patterns. On the other hand, the results concerning Blacks’ use of hypodescent (and its association with egalitarianism) are new to the current work. Thus, in five further studies (Studies 2 and 3 and Supplemental Studies 1-3), we sought to replicate these findings with Blacks and additionally, examine mediators underlying the SDO-hypodescent relationship among Blacks.

**Study 2: Why Blacks’ Egalitarianism Relates to Hypodescent**

In Study 2, we began to test our ideas about why lower SDO Blacks tend to categorize Black-White biracials as Black. Specifically, as developed in the Introduction, we examined the possibility that relatively egalitarian Blacks would be more likely to perceive discrimination against Black-White biracials and consequently be more likely to believe that Blacks’ fates are linked to the fates of Black-White biracials (i.e., “what happens to Black-White biracials has

---

4 Studies 1A and 1B also allowed for a test of differences in hypodescent use among Blacks and Whites. In Study 1A, Blacks’ mean use of hypodescent ($m = 4.42, SD = .77$) was significantly greater than Whites’ mean use of hypodescent ($m = 4.25, SD = .57$): $t(417) = 2.15, p = .03$. In Study 1B, Whites’ mean use of hypodescent ($m = 4.41, SD = .75$) was marginally greater than that of Blacks ($m = 4.30, SD = .62$): $t(532.48) = -1.89, p = .06$. Thus further work is needed to determine if there are significant and consistent differences in the extent to which hypodescent emerges across racial groups and to examine possible moderating factors.
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something to do with what happens to Blacks”). We theorized that this, in turn, would predict categorizing biracials as Black (i.e., hypodescent).

Methods

Participants. We recruited 500 U.S. born Blacks through Prodege (https://www.prodege.com/). We contracted Prodege to collect data from 500 participants, and they were responsible for ending data collection after this target was met. Of the 500 who participated, 42 were excluded from final analyses because they participated in one of the three supplemental studies. Thus, 458 participants were in the final sample (49.3% female, \(M_{age} = 35.42, SD = 12.41\); we note that all results remained statistically significant when we kept the excluded participants in our analyses). A power analysis using \(r = -.22\) as the estimate of the SDO-hypodescent correlation among Blacks (derived from averaging the correlations observed among Blacks in Studies 1A and 1B) suggests that 159 participants were needed to achieve 80% power for that association. Because we were also testing a multi-step mediation model, we collected a larger sample.

Measures.

SDO. SDO was assessed using the same scale described in previous studies (i.e., SDO7; \(\alpha = .88, m = 2.22, SD = 1.05\); Ho et al., 2015).

Perceptions of discrimination against biracials. This was measured with a five item measure that we developed (\(\alpha = .86, m = 5.14, SD = 1.21\)): “In your opinion, how much discrimination do Black-White biracials face in America today?” (1 = None to 7 = A lot); “How much does discrimination affect the lives of Black-White biracials?” (1 = Not at all to 7 = A lot); “Black-White biracials are frequently the victims of racial discrimination.” (Items 3-5: 1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree); “Black-White biracials experience negative treatment
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because of their race;” and “Black-White biracials rarely face racial discrimination (reverse-scored).”

Linked fate. This was measured with an 8-item measure that we developed ($\alpha = .83; m = 5.20, SD = 1.08$): “Do you think what happens to Black-White biracial people in this country will have something to do with what happens to Blacks?”; “Do you think what happens to Black-White biracial people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?”; “Do you think what happens to Black people in this country will have something to do with what happens with Black-White biracials?”; “Blacks and Black-White biracials share a common destiny.”; “Issues that affect the Black community also affect Black-White biracials.”; “What happens to Black-White biracials does not have anything to do with what will happen to Blacks.” (reverse-scored); “Racial progress for Black people also means racial progress for biracial individuals.”; “When the way Blacks are treated in the U.S. changes, the way that Black-White biracials are treated will naturally follow.” Items 1-3 used a “1 = No, not at all” to “7 = Yes, a lot” scale and Items 4-7 used a “1 = Strongly disagree” to “7 = Strongly agree” scale.

Hypodescent. Lastly, participants completed a slightly modified 3-item measure of hypodescent ($\alpha = .91, m = 4.69, SD = 1.24$), which began with the stem, “If a Black American and a White American have a kid…,” followed by: “Would you think of the kid as relatively Black or relatively White?” (1 = Relatively Black to 4 = Equally Black and White to 7 = Relatively White); “Would you consider the kid more Black or more White?” (1 = More Black to 4 = Equally Black and White to 7 = More White); and “How would you categorize this child?” (1 = Black to 4 = Equally Black and White to 7 = White; all items reverse scored). Our measure of hypodescent in Studies 1A and 1B included items directly assessing categorization, as well as more indirect questions, tapping perceptions such as the extent to which an individual would act
more like or fit in more with one group versus the other (e.g., Do you think [a Black and White kid] will act more like a Black person or a White person?). Although these items were adapted from past research (Ho et al., 2013), here, we wanted to use a measure that focused purely on categorization, to better assess how egalitarianism affects categorization per se via its relation to perceiving discrimination against, and feeling linked fate with, Black-White biracials.

We randomized the order of measurement of SDO, including it either at the beginning or at the end of the study (before or after the hypodescent measure), allowing us to test whether the order of measuring SDO and hypodescent influences Blacks’ use of hypodescent, or the relation between SDO and hypodescent. There were no additional measures in this study.

**Results and Discussion**

Replicating Studies 1A and B, we again found that Blacks categorized Black-White biracials as more Black than White (i.e., engaged in hypodescent; $t(457) = 11.85, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = .55$) and that this was negatively related to SDO ($r = -.30, p < .001$; see Table 1).

Next, we tested the proposed multistep model (lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination against biracials $\rightarrow$ linked fate between Blacks and biracials $\rightarrow$ hypodescent) using the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Model 6) and found support for each step of the model (see Figure 2; Hayes, 2013): (a) SDO predicted perceptions of discrimination against Black-White biracials: $B_\text{SDO} = -.17$, $SE \beta = .05$, $\\beta = -.15, t = -3.25, p = .001$; (b) perceptions of discrimination predicted linked fate between Black-White biracials and Blacks, controlling for SDO: $B_\text{perceptions of discrimination} = .47$, $SE \beta = .03$, $\\beta = .53, t = 14.35, p < .001$; (c) and linked fate predicted hypodescent, controlling for SDO and perceptions of discrimination: $B_\text{linked fate} = .14$, $SE \beta = .07$, $\\beta = .12, t = 2.14, p = .03$. Furthermore, we observed a significant overall indirect effect (lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination $\rightarrow$ linked fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent): indirect effect with 5000 bootstrap
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samples \((a \times b \times c) = -.01, 95\% \text{ CI} = -.031 \text{ to } -.001\). Study 2 thus provides correlational support for our multi-step model examining how SDO may come to affect hypodescent.

We also tested the possibility that the order of completing the SDO and hypodescent measures could influence our results, but found that overall levels of hypodescent did not vary by order \((t(456) = -1.33, p = .18, \text{ Cohen’s } d = .12\). Furthermore, the SDO-hypodescent relationship was not moderated by the order in which SDO appeared (at the beginning of the survey, or at the end, after hypodescent; \(B_{SDO \times \text{Order}} = -.01, SE \beta = .11, \beta = -.003; t = -.07, p = .95\)). Thus, it appears that the relationship between SDO and hypodescent does not depend on participants being explicitly asked about (and thus potentially primed with) their (anti-)egalitarian values.

Supplemental Studies 1 and 2 were complementary to the current study in that they also show that perceived discrimination mediates the link between SDO and perceptions of linked fate, but do not assess perceived discrimination against biracials directly. Rather, they assess perceived discrimination against disadvantaged groups in general (Supplemental Study 1) and against Blacks (Supplemental Study 2), showing that these perceptions predict a sense of linked fate with multiracials and, thus, hypodescent. These studies are thus consistent with the idea that a broad sensitivity to discrimination is an important basis for Blacks’ linked fate with Black-White biracials (in line with our theorizing), but provide less direct evidence than Study 2 for the specific role of perception of discrimination against Black-White biracials (the central target group).

In Study 3 (and Supplemental Study 3), we experimentally manipulate perceptions of discrimination against biracials to assess its causal impact on linked fate, and thus hypodescent. We also directly replicate the results of Study 2 in Study 3’s no-prime control condition.

**Study 3: The Causal Effect of Perceived Discrimination Against Black-White Biracials**
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In Study 3 (and Supplemental Study 3), we manipulated information about discrimination against biracials to provide causal evidence that the perception of discrimination against biracials increases Blacks’ tendency to perceive linked fate with biracials, with implications for hypodescent. In the high discrimination condition, Blacks were told that Black-White biracials face a great deal of discrimination; in the low discrimination condition, Blacks were told that Black-White biracials face little discrimination. Both of these conditions were contrasted to a control condition, in which Blacks were not provided any explicit information about the degree of discrimination Black-White biracials face (which also allows for a direct replication of Study 2). Based on Study 2, we reasoned that, relative to a control condition, strengthening Blacks’ beliefs that biracials are discriminated against should increase Blacks’ sense of linked fate with biracials and increase their use of hypodescent, whereas weakening Black perceivers’ belief that Black-White biracials are discriminated against should reduce linked fate (and thus, hypodescent). In other words, since Study 2 provided correlational evidence that lower SDO → perceptions of discrimination against biracials → linked fate → hypodescent, here we manipulate discrimination against biracials, the first mediator, and expected linked fate to follow, with implications for hypodescent.

Study 2 showed that Blacks generally perceive that Black-White biracials are discriminated against (i.e., $m = 5.14$ on a 7 point scale where 7 indicated strong agreement with the idea that biracials are discriminated against). Thus, we reasoned that we would see larger differences between the low discrimination condition and control condition than between the high discrimination and control conditions: It is specifically when Blacks perceive that Black-White biracials are not discriminated against that we would expect the basis for feeling linked fate with them to be diminished. Thus, we predicted larger differences between the control and
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low (vs. between control and high) discrimination conditions (a prediction that we pre-registered on AsPredicted.org: https://aspredicted.org/blind.php/?x=bq7eb6). Nevertheless, it is possible (and consistent with our theorizing) that further increasing Blacks’ typical sense that Black-White biracials are discriminated against would accentuate their feelings of linked fate (and use of hypodescent), a possibility we considered here, too.

Method

Participants. We recruited 1535 U.S. Born Blacks via Prodege. We contracted Prodege to collect data from 1500 respondents, and they were responsible for ending data collection after this goal was reached. We pre-registered this study on AsPredicted.org before beginning data collection. We aimed to collect a large sample with 500 participants in each of the three conditions because we wanted to replicate the multistep mediation model we found in Study 2 (which had $N = 500$) in the current study’s control condition, and wanted to have an equal number of participants in each of the low and high discrimination conditions as well. Additionally, this large sample gave us ample power to test the central mediation model of interest in the current study (discrimination condition $\rightarrow$ linked fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent) — Fritz & MacKinnon (2007) suggest that to achieve 80% power given small effects for each of the a and b paths in a mediation model, 462 participants are needed.

41 participants were excluded for participating in the current study more than once ($n = 15$), for indicating they were multiracial in an open response ($n = 15$; a multiracial option was prominently displayed first in the demographic section), because they could not read the experimental manipulation vignette due to a technical error ($n = 10$), or because they guessed the main hypothesis ($n = 1$). 58 additional respondents were excluded because they participated in Study 1B, Supplemental Study 1, 2, or 3, or another study we conducted concerning racial
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categorization. Lastly 113 respondents were excluded from analyses because they indicated in an open response that they did not believe the article we used to manipulate perceptions of biracial discrimination (n = 83), typed random letters or words when asked about their thoughts concerning this article or about the purpose of the study (n = 24), expressed disdain for the study (n = 15), or reported not paying attention (n = 2). The final sample thus included 1312 respondents (51.5% female, \(M_{\text{age}} = 39.21, SD_{\text{age}} = 14.63\)). Notably, even with these participants included (and with all participants included except for the 41 noted at the beginning of the paragraph who did not meet the most basic inclusion criteria; total \(N = 1494\)) all of the central results remained statistically significant. The only exception concerned the direct effect of the biracial discrimination manipulation on hypodescent as noted below, though the critical indirect effect of biracial discrimination on hypodescent via linked fate remained significant.5

**Procedure.** After completing the same 16-item social dominance orientation measure used in previous studies (\(\alpha = .87, m = 2.32, SD = 1.05\)), participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions. In the “high discrimination” condition, participants read an article titled “Black-White biracials frequently experience discrimination, recent studies show.” The content of this article was created for the purposes of this manipulation. The article provided statistics indicating that biracials face discrimination in employment and home loan applications, and quotes from 2 biracial interviewees agreeing with the statistics (see Appendix). In the “low discrimination condition,” participants read an article titled “Black-White biracials not affected by discrimination, recent studies show,” which included statistics indicating that biracials do not

---

5 Interestingly, and consistent with the fact that Blacks on average tend to believe that Black-White biracials are discriminated against (in the current study’s no-prime control condition, \(m = 5.28/7\)), 77 of the 83 participants who did not believe the experimental vignette were in the low discrimination condition. We solicited participant responses regarding the manipulation and the study in order to determine whether any participants needed to be disqualified based on criteria such as not believing the manipulation, but due to an oversight, did not include this specific plan under question 7 in the pre-registration form (“Anything else you would like to pre-register?”). We note again that including these participants did not change the results of our predicted mediation.
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experience much discrimination in employment and in the home loan application process. Again, 2 biracial interviewees were quoted as agreeing with the statistics. A no prime control condition, in which participants directly proceeded to the measures discussed below without reading any article, was included for comparison to the low and high discrimination conditions. As previously noted, we predicted that the no-prime control condition would be similar to high discrimination condition, and that both the high discrimination and control conditions would differ from the low discrimination condition (predictions that we pre-registered).

Participants then completed the same 5-item biracial discrimination measure used in Study 2, which served as a manipulation check for the high and low discrimination manipulations, and as a mediator in the no-prime control condition ($\alpha = .89, m = 5.04, SD = 1.40$). Following that came the 8-item linked fate measure used in Study 2 ($\alpha = .86, m = 5.24, SD = 1.22$). Lastly, we administered the 3-item measure of hypodescent as in Study 2 ($\alpha = .92, m = 4.61, SD = 1.18$). There were no additional measures in this study.

Results

We began by conducting one-way ANOVAs to examine the effect of experimental condition on each of perceptions of discrimination against biracials, perceptions of linked fate with biracials, and hypodescent. Analyses revealed that the biracial discrimination manipulation did in fact influence perceptions of discrimination, $F(2, 1309) = 114.52, p < .001$. Moreover, planned contrasts revealed that as expected, the difference between the low ($m = 4.20, SD = 1.47$) and high ($m = 5.48, SD = 1.16$) discrimination condition was significant ($t(1309) = 14.20, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = .97$), as was the difference between the low and control ($m = 5.28, SD = 1.25$) conditions ($t(1309) = 12.22, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = .79$). That is, those in the high discrimination condition perceived more discrimination against biracials than those in the control
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or low discrimination conditions. Of note, and as expected, although the difference between the high discrimination and no prime control condition was significant ($t(1309) = -2.36, p = .02$, Cohen’s $d = .17$), the difference was small compared to the difference between the low discrimination and control conditions (i.e., Cohen’s $d = .79$ v. 17), consistent with the idea that, at baseline, Black perceivers expect that Black-White biracials face discrimination.

Discrimination condition also had an effect on perceptions of linked fate, $F(2, 1309) = 45.12, p < .001$. Planned contrasts revealed that the difference in linked fate in the low ($m = 4.77, SD = 1.30$) versus high ($m = 5.54, SD = 1.13$) discrimination conditions was significant ($t(1309) = 9.31, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = .63$), as was the difference between the low discrimination versus control ($m = 5.32, SD = 1.14$) conditions ($t(1309) = 6.75, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = .45$). Thus, participants in the high discrimination condition felt more linked fate with Black-White biracials than did participants in the low discrimination condition, and participants in the low discrimination condition felt less linked fate with biracials than did those in the control condition. Again, although the difference between the high discrimination and control conditions was significant ($t(1309) = -2.87, p = .004$, Cohen’s $d = .20$), it was relatively weak.

Likewise, condition had an effect on hypodescent, $F(2, 1309) = 3.02, p = .049)$. Planned contrasts revealed that those in the low discrimination condition ($m = 4.48, SD = 1.12$) were less likely to engage in hypodescent than those in the high discrimination condition ($m = 4.65, SD = 1.18; t(1309) = 2.09, p = .04$, Cohen’s $d = .15$) or those in the control condition ($m = 4.66, SD = 1.21; t(1309) = 2.23, p = .03$, Cohen’s $d = .16$). We observed no significant differences between the likelihood of using hypodescent between those in the high discrimination and control conditions ($t(1309) = .11, p = .91$, Cohen’s $d = .01$).⁶

⁶ When we used less restrictive exclusion criteria described above, including people who did not believe the manipulation, the low versus high discrimination condition difference in hypodescent is no longer significant ($t(969)$
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A one sample $t$-test from the midpoint of 4 showed that although Blacks used hypodescent in both high and low discrimination conditions, they did so to a lesser extent in the low discrimination condition ($t(375) = 8.32, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = 0.43$) than the high discrimination condition ($t(447) = 11.77, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = 0.56$). We also observed hypodescent in the no-prime control condition ($t(487) = 12.05, p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = 0.55$).

We then examined whether perceptions of linked fate mediated the effect of perceiving biracials’ experience of discrimination on hypodescent using the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Model 4; Hayes, 2013; see Figure 3). The results showed that (a) the biracial discrimination experimental manipulation (low v. high discrimination) influenced perceptions of linked fate ($B_{\text{condition}} = .77, SE_B = .08, \beta = .30; t = 9.10, p < .001$) and (b) linked fate in turn was related to hypodescent ($B_{\text{linked fate}} = .19, SE_B = .03, \beta = .21; t = 5.75, p < .001$). The indirect effect of the discrimination condition on hypodescent through linked fate, based on 5000 bootstrap samples, was also significant ($a \times b = .14, SE = .03, 95\% \text{ CI} = .09 \text{ to } .21$).

We further theorized (and preregistered) that SDO would moderate the discrimination condition $\rightarrow$ linked fate relationship, with consequences for hypodescent. A feeling of linked fate with biracials when they are discriminated against depends on feeling that one’s own group is also discriminated against. Because high (vs. low) SDO Blacks are less likely to perceive

---

As predicted, when we conducted the same mediation analysis comparing only the low discrimination condition to a no-prime control condition, the results were similar: (a) condition (low v. control) influenced perceptions of linked fate ($B_{\text{condition}} = .55, SE_B = .08, \beta = .22; t = 6.59, p < .001$) and (b) linked fate in turn was related to hypodescent ($B_{\text{linked fate}} = .16, SE_B = .03, \beta = .17; t = 4.88, p < .001$). The indirect effect of the discrimination condition on hypodescent through linked fate, based on 5000 bootstrap samples, was also significant ($a \times b = .13, SE = .03, 95\% \text{ CI} = .09 \text{ to } .18$; PROCESS Macro Model 4 with 5000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013).

Comparing the control condition to the high discrimination condition, the mediation was also significant, though (as predicted) weaker: (a) the biracial discrimination experimental manipulation (control v. high discrimination) influenced perceptions of linked fate ($B_{\text{condition}} = .22, SE_B = .07, \beta = .10; t = 3.00, p < .01$) and (b) linked fate in turn was related to hypodescent ($B_{\text{linked fate}} = .22, SE_B = .03, \beta = .21; t = 6.40, p < .001$). The indirect effect of the discrimination condition on hypodescent through linked fate, based on 5000 bootstrap samples, was also significant ($a \times b = .05, SE = .02, 95\% \text{ CI} = .02 \text{ to } .09$).
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discrimination against Blacks to begin with (e.g., Thomsen et al., 2010; also see Supplemental Study 2), telling them that Black-White biracials face discrimination might be less likely to generate a sense of linked fate among high (compared to low) SDO Blacks. Thus in addition to the central discrimination \( \rightarrow \) linked fate \( \rightarrow \) hypodescent effect documented above we also examined, as a secondary analysis, whether this effect would be particularly pronounced among low (vs. high) SDO Blacks.

To test this, we conducted a test of moderated mediation, in which we predicted that SDO would interact with the discrimination manipulation (low vs. high discrimination) to influence perceptions of linked fate, which would in turn relate to hypodescent. The results of this test supported our prediction (index of moderated mediation = -.06, 95% CI = -.10 to -.03): although perceptions of linked fate mediated the effects of our discrimination manipulation at all levels of SDO, this indirect effect was most pronounced among participants who were 1 SD below the mean on SDO (\( B = .20, SE B = .04, \beta = .09, 95\% CI = .13 \text{ to } .28 \)). At the mean of SDO, the indirect effect was \( B = .14, SE B = .03, \beta = .06, 95\% CI = .09 \text{ to } .19 \), and at 1 SD above the mean, it was \( B = .07, SE B = .02, \beta = .03, 95\% CI = .03 \text{ to } .12 \).

\[ \text{As one would expect based on our predictions, and based on results above, this analysis was similar when we compared the low discrimination and control conditions. That is, the index of moderated mediation = -.03, 95\% CI = -.07 \text{ to } -.01): although perceptions of linked fate mediated the effects of our discrimination manipulation at all levels of SDO, this indirect effect was most pronounced among participants who were 1 SD below the mean on SDO (} B = .12, SE B = .03, \beta = .05, 95\% CI = .07 \text{ to } .19 \). At the mean of SDO, the indirect effect was \( B = .09, SE B = .02, \beta = .04, 95\% CI = .05 \text{ to } .14 \), and at 1 SD above the mean, it was \( B = .05, SE B = .02, \beta = .02, 95\% CI = .02 \text{ to } .10 \). Likewise, when we compared the high discrimination and control conditions, the index of moderated mediation = -.03, 95\% CI = -.0567 \text{ to } -.0004): although perceptions of linked fate mediated the effects of our discrimination manipulation at low and mean levels of SDO, this indirect effect was most pronounced among participants who were 1 SD below the mean on SDO (\( B = .07, SE B = .02, \beta = .03, 95\% CI = .03 \text{ to } .11 \)). At the mean of SDO, the indirect effect was \( B = .04, SE B = .02, \beta = .02, 95\% CI = .01 \text{ to } .07 \), and at 1 SD above the mean, it was not significant (\( B = .01, SE B = .02, \beta = .004, 95\% CI = -.03 \text{ to } .05 \)). When we used less restrictive exclusion criteria described above, including people who did not believe the manipulation, the indices of moderated mediation for the analyses looking at the high discrimination condition on the one hand, and the low or control conditions on the other, remain significant. The index of moderated mediation in the analysis comparing the low discrimination and control conditions becomes marginally significant (index = -.02, 90\% CI = -.045 to -.002).} \]
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The inclusion of a control condition also permitted us to replicate the multi-step mediation model examined in Study 2 using the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Model 6; Hayes, 2013; Figure 4; see Table 1 for bivariate correlations between variables). Among participants in the control condition, and consistent with Study 2, we found that (a) higher levels of SDO were associated with lower levels perceived discrimination against biracials ($B = -.20, SE B = .05, \beta = -.17; t = -3.82, p < .001$); (b) perceptions of biracial discrimination were positively related to perceptions of linked fate, controlling for SDO ($B = .48, SE B = .03, \beta = .52; t = 14.48, p < .001$); and (c) linked fate in turn was related to hypodescent, controlling for SDO and perceptions of discrimination ($B = .15, SE B = .06, \beta = .14; t = 2.49, p = .01$). Importantly, when we examined the full indirect effect with 5000 bootstrap samples (i.e., path a x b x c), we observed that it was significant: a x b x c = -.01, 95% CI = -.032 to -.003). Finally, consistent with previous studies, the correlation between SDO and hypodescent in the control condition was negative and significant ($r = -.23, p < .001$).

**Internal Meta-Analysis**

To provide an overall estimate of the robustness of the SDO x race interaction from Studies 1A and 1B, in line with recent calls to conduct internal meta-analyses in multi-study reports (Maner, 2014), we used Stouffer’s method (Mosteller & Bush, 1954; see also Rosenthal and Rosnow, 1991, p. 504) and found that this effect, significant in both studies, is robust (weighted $z = -6.16, p < .001$).

Furthermore, we tested the robustness of (a) Blacks’ use hypodescent and (b) the relationship between low SDO and hypodescent (i.e., negative correlation), by meta-analyzing our findings across Studies 1(A and B) to 3 and Supplemental Studies 1 and 2, examining those participants ($n= 2128$) who were not exposed to a low or high discrimination manipulation (i.e.,
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including only the no prime control condition in Study 3 and not including Supplemental Study 3). This analysis revealed both that the use of hypodescent (weighted $z = -13.96$, $p < .001$) and its negative relationship with SDO (weighted $z = -10.64$, $p < .001$) among Black perceivers are quite robust.9

**General Discussion**

Across seven studies, we find clear and consistent evidence that both Blacks and Whites use hypodescent in judging Black-White biracials, categorizing them as more Black than White. Importantly, however, their use of hypodescent correlates differently with (anti-)egalitarianism. In Studies 1A-1B, participant race significantly interacted with social dominance orientation such that among Whites, anti-egalitarianism (higher levels of SDO) was associated with hypodescent whereas among Blacks, egalitarianism (lower levels of SDO) was associated with hypodescent. Studies 2 and 3 (and Supplemental Studies 1-3) replicated Blacks’ use of hypodescent and showed again that SDO was negatively associated with hypodescent among Blacks. Moreover, these studies demonstrated that Blacks’ tendency to use hypodescent is mediated by perceptions of discrimination against Black-White biracials and a subsequent sense that Blacks and Black-White biracials share a linked fate. The conclusions of the current studies thus stand in stark contrast to previous studies outlining Whites’ motivations for hypodescent, demonstrating that whereas both Whites and Blacks may ‘arrive’ at hypodescent in their categorization of biracial targets, the routes underlying these categorizations are not only different, but opposite in spirit. Thus, when one takes the perspective of minority group social perceivers, it is clear hypodescent can be understood as an inclusionary phenomenon, a finding that resonates with the historical inclusion of Black-White biracials by Blacks (Davis, 1991).

---

9 When we include participants that were exposed to a low or high discrimination prime (i.e., including data across all 7 studies, from 3,447 Black participants), the use of hypodescent (weighted $z = -18.12$, $p < .001$) as well as its negative relation to SDO is similarly robust (weighted $z = -13.11$, $p < .001$).
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Our findings also inform research on “ingroup overexclusion,” which has primarily been investigated from the perspective of dominant group members. Extending our understanding of the boundaries of this phenomenon, we show that there are certain contexts where individuals apply more inclusive rather than exclusive group boundaries and thus more liberally allow ambiguous targets to ‘enter’. Our finding that the phenomenon of ingroup over-exclusion may operate differently among disadvantaged group members is consistent with unpublished data (Capozza, Voci, & Toaldo, 1998; as cited in Yzerbyt, Castano, Leyens, & Paladino, 2000) showing that overexclusion did not hold among southern Italians (lower in status compared to their northern Italian counterparts). Our results build on these preliminary results, and demonstrate that a tendency toward ingroup overexclusion may indeed by moderated by the status of one’s group, an idea that warrants future research.

The current research also represents a relatively rare exploration of how intergroup egalitarianism (i.e., lower levels of SDO) relates to consequential intergroup phenomena in society. Most research in social and political psychology has focused on anti-egalitarianism or prejudice among members of high status groups, examining how such individual differences operate to maintain systems of social inequality (e.g., Chow, Lowery, & Hogan, 2013; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Ho et al., 2012; Knowles et al., 2009; Pratto et al., 1994; Sears & Henry, 2005; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; but see Chen, Moons, Gaither, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2014; Levin, Kteily, Pratto, Sidanius, & Matthews, 2016; Levin, Pratto, Matthews, Sidanius, & Kteily, 2012; Pratto et al., 2014; van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). By focusing on the egalitarian beliefs of a minority group, our work sheds light not only on the phenomenon of hypodescent, but extends intergroup relations research on minority political consciousness (also see Craig & Richeson, 2016).
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Notably, our work is compatible with current theoretical accounts on intraminority intergroup relations, in particular, the stigma-based solidarity model (Craig & Richeson, 2012; 2016). According to this model, minority groups that feel stigmatized along the same dimension (e.g., race) as another group come to feel more of a coalition with that group. The current work demonstrates that Blacks’ tendency to categorize Black-White biracials as part of their ingroup reflects a sense of linked fate with biracials in line with the stigma-based solidarity model. This model also theorizes that person-based factors (such as individual differences in sociopolitical attitudes) may amplify the tendency to perceive discrimination and subsequently activate a common stigmatized-identity, consistent with our finding that lower SDO Blacks are more likely to perceive discrimination against Black-White biracials, promoting Black perceivers’ sense of linked fate with and tendency to include Black-White biracials in the ingroup. Thus, our findings extend the examination of stigma-based solidarity to encompass the group categorization of ambiguous targets and highlights a novel person-based factor that may contribute to the activation of a common stigmatized-identity.

Ironically, although Blacks’ use of hypodescent may derive from their egalitarian beliefs and an associated sense of common fate with multiracials, the categorization of multiracials as Black may have some less desirable consequences. For one, categorizing multiracials as Black (rather than multiracial) may contribute to the reification of entrenched (and socially-constructed) color lines (Chen & Hamilton, 2012; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Furthermore, categorizing multiracials as Black may stand in opposition to the preferences and social identification of multiracials themselves, reducing their sense of self-determination and personal autonomy (Gaither, 2014; Remedios & Chasteen, 2013; Townsend, Fryberg, Wilkins, & Markus, 2012; Townsend, Markus, & Bergsieker, 2009). Indeed, multiracial advocacy was critical to
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changing the U.S. Census to allow individuals to select more than one race (Hickman, 1997; Lucas, 2014; Prewitt, 2013) and thus opposition to such changes by minority groups (e.g., the NAACP’s opposition to the change in the 2000 U.S. Census; Prewitt, 2013) and their use of hypodescent may place greater pressure and more constraints on multiracial individuals’ identity options (Harris & Sim, 2002; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). The denial of identity options may have other downstream consequences for multiracials’ self-esteem and achievement motivation (Townsend et al., 2009). Thus, the use of hypodescent, even if it relates to egalitarianism, may need to be reconciled with multiracials’ rights and desires to define their own social identities.

Furthermore, although the present work demonstrates that multiracials are categorized as more Black than White, social perceivers may nevertheless treat monoracial and multiracial Black individuals differently on some dimensions. For example, some research has shown that darker skinned Blacks face greater discrimination than lighter skin Blacks, a phenomenon known as colorism or skin tone bias (Eberhardt, Davies, Purdie-Vaughns, & Johnson, 2006; Maddox, 2004; Maddox & Gray, 2002). Perhaps in part due to these differences in treatment, differences in skin tone have also sometimes been the source of tension within Black communities (e.g., Dyson, 2016; see Harvey, LaBeach, Pridgen, & Gocial, 2005, on how this may be moderated by context). Thus, despite their general categorization in the ingroup, a similar divide could separate multiracial from monoracial Black individuals, perhaps especially to the extent that a multiracial person is also less phenotypically Black. Thus, it cannot be assumed that a propensity toward categorizing Black-White individuals as Black automatically results in full acceptance of Black-White biracial individuals. Indeed, although 58% of Black-White biracials report feeling “very” well accepted by Blacks, 35% of biracials report feeling only “somewhat” well accepted by
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Blacks, and 7% report feeling “not too” or “not at all” accepted by Blacks (Pew Research Center, 2015).

The present work documents one avenue through which egalitarian beliefs among Black Americans relates to their ingroup categorization of Black-White multiracials. However, just as research with Whites has found that the use of hypodescent is multiply determined by a variety of social and cognitive underpinnings (Ho, Roberts, & Gelman, 2015), other social and cognitive factors likely underpin the use of hypodescent among Blacks as well, including both factors that are independent of egalitarianism, as well as additional mediators of the egalitarianism-hypodescent link. In particular, it may be interesting for future research to explore whether a desire for collective action additionally explains why egalitarianism is related to hypodescent among Blacks. For example, Blacks who desire to bring about intergroup equality and reduce social hierarchy might want to include more individuals in their ingroup as a means of gaining “strength in numbers” in a collective effort to achieve social change. Indeed, as we note above, Black (and other ethnic minority) leaders opposed giving multiracials the option to identify as “multiracial” prior to the change to the US Census in 2000, because they were concerned that they would lose political power if multiracials started identifying with a group outside their ethnic minority group.

In addition, egalitarians have also been found to be more inclusive (Pratto et al., 2013; Unzueta, Knowles, & Ho, 2012)—generally more likely to include others around them as part of their sphere of concern—and thus it may also be interesting for future research to examine whether an overall tendency to be inclusive mediates egalitarian Blacks’ tendency toward categorizing Black-White multiracials as Black (i.e., hypodescent). Likewise, seen from another perspective, egalitarian Whites’ avoidance of hypodescent could be interpreted as a form of
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inclusive categorization (i.e., a propensity to include biracials as part of the ingroup). Thus, on the one hand, the fact that the use of hypodescent is associated with more egalitarianism among blacks and less egalitarianism among Whites highlights how different beliefs relate to applying the rule of hypodescent (the central research question we focus on here). But on the other hand, egalitarian Blacks and egalitarian Whites both include biracials in the ingroup more, highlighting how the same belief can relate to ingroup categorization. Thus, future work should examine inclusiveness rooted in egalitarianism as a mediator of multiracial categorization for both Whites and Blacks.

Future work could also aim to explore these phenomena in another nationally representative probability sample. Although the findings from Study 1A, the general population sample, were mostly consistent with Study 1B (a direct replication), revealing hypodescent among Blacks and Whites and a SDO x race interaction in predicting hypodescent, the SDO-hypodescent relationship among both Blacks and Whites was weaker in this sample compared to other samples in this paper. Additional studies with representative samples would help determine whether this is the result of natural variation in effects across studies (irrespective of the population sampled) or whether there is some other characteristic of representative samples that would make this effect weaker.

Lastly, it would be worthwhile to examine these processes with other ethnic groups. The present research focuses on Blacks and Whites, because they are the lowest and highest status ethnic groups in the U.S., respectively, and because Black-White multiracials historically have been the largest and most visible multiracial group and remains the single largest multiracial group (Davis, 1991; Jones & Bullock, 2012; Kahn et al., 2009). However, research in political psychology suggests that Blacks may be “exceptional” among racial minority groups in having a
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heightened sense of racial and political consciousness (Sears, Fu, Henry, & Bui, 2003; Sears & Savalei, 2006). Therefore, future work should examine the political motives of social perceivers belonging to other ethnic minority groups, as they pertain to how multiracials, Black-White biracials and others, are categorized. Studying these psychological phenomena among other minority groups would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how factors such as group status and political consciousness underpin perceptions of biracial individuals. For example, it would be interesting to examine how Asian Americans, who occupy an intermediate status position in the U.S. (Kahn et al., 2009), and who have a lower political consciousness relative to Blacks (Sears et al., 2003) would categorize Asian-White biracials.

Although much remains to be understood, our research begins to uncover how multiracial individuals are categorized as a function of perceivers’ sociopolitical beliefs and importantly, as a function of their membership in minority versus majority social groups. With levels of interracial marriage and mixed race increasing rapidly in the U.S. (Jones & Bullock, 2012), understanding how those with mixed race background are categorized and subsequently treated will be increasingly important to understanding the nature of intergroup dynamics in the 21st century.
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Appendix

High Discrimination Against Biracials Condition

WASHINGTON (AP) — Social scientists examining the experience of Black-White biracial individuals in the 21st century have found that Black-White biracial individuals frequently experience discrimination. In one recent national survey, released in June by the Pew Research Center, Black-White biracial people were found to face discrimination in the labor market. Specifically, 5.7% of Black-White biracial job seekers reported that they had been granted an interview after submitting an application, compared to 13.5% of job seekers nationally. And among Black-White biracial respondents who interviewed for at least one job in the last year, 22.1% were selected for the job, compared to 39.1% nationally. These findings follow findings released earlier in the year by researchers at Princeton University showing that Black-White biracials are denied home loans at significantly higher rates compared to the nationwide average – in 2015, 23.2% of Black-White biracial home loan applicants were rejected, compared to a 6.2% rejection rate nationally.

Interviewed about these reports, Joshua Davis, a 27-year-old Black-White biracial man who works as an accountant in Illinois, said, “Yes, those statistics don't surprise me at all. We experience a lot of discrimination on an everyday basis.”

Similarly, when asked for her thoughts about these findings, Stephanie Rogers, 24, who is also Black-White biracial, simply stated, “Tell me something I don’t know. Discrimination against biracials is a real problem.”
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Low Discrimination Against Biracials Condition

WASHINGTON (AP) — Social scientists examining the experience of Black-White biracial individuals in the 21st century have found that Black-White biracial individuals rarely experience discrimination. In one recent national survey, released in June by the Pew Research Center, there was no evidence of Black-White biracial people experiencing discrimination in the labor market. Specifically, 13.6% of Black-White biracial job seekers reported that they had been granted an interview after submitting an application, compared to 13.5% of job seekers nationally. Among Black-White biracial respondents who interviewed for at least one job in the last year, 39.4% were selected for the job, compared to 39.1% nationally. These findings follow findings released earlier in the year by researchers at Princeton University showing that Black-White biracials are granted home loans at similar rates compared to the nationwide average — in 2015, 5.4% of Black-White biracial home loan applicants were rejected, compared to a 6.2% rejection rate nationally.

Interviewed about these reports, Joshua Davis, a 27-year-old Black-White biracial man who works as an accountant in Illinois, said, “Yes, those statistics don’t surprise me at all. I don’t think we really experience much discrimination.”

Similarly, when asked for her thoughts about these findings, Stephanie Rogers, 24, who is also Black-White biracial, simply stated, “These findings sound right to me. My racial background hasn’t felt like a big factor to me.”
Table 1. Correlations between Variables in Studies 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SDO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceptions of biracial discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linked fate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hypodescent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 3 Control Condition (N = 488)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SDO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceptions of biracial discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linked fate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hypodescent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 3 High Discrimination Condition (N = 448)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SDO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceptions of biracial discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linked fate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hypodescent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 3 Low Discrimination Condition (N = 376)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SDO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceptions of biracial discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linked fate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hypodescent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01; ***p < .001
**Figure 1A.** Interaction between participant race and SDO in predicting hypodescent in Study 1A. For both Figures 1A and 1B, low SDO represents participants scoring 1 standard deviation below the mean on SDO and high SDO represents those scoring 1 standard deviation above the mean.

**Figure 1B.** Interaction between participant race and SDO in predicting hypodescent in Study 1B.
**Figure 2.** Multi-step mediation model in Study 2. Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients. The unstandardized regression coefficient representing the relationship between SDO and hypodescent, controlling for perceptions of discrimination and linked-fate, is in parentheses. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.
Figure 3. Mediation model with the first mediator from the multi-step process model presented in previous study (biracial discrimination) manipulated (Study 3 low v. high discrimination conditions, $N = 824$). Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients. The unstandardized regression coefficient representing the relationship between condition and hypodescent, controlling for linked-fate, is in parentheses. *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$. 
Figure 4. Multi-step mediation model in control condition (Study 3 control condition, N = 488). Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients. The unstandardized regression coefficient representing the relationship between SDO and hypodescent, controlling for perceptions of discrimination and linked-fate, is in parentheses. *p < .05; ***p < .001.
Supplemental Studies and Analyses

Supplemental Study 1

In the first supplemental study, we tested the basic idea, discussed in the introduction of the main text, that Blacks lower in SDO would be more likely to perceive discrimination against disadvantaged groups in general (which would include Blacks and Black-White biracials). We reasoned that this general perception of discrimination against disadvantaged groups would then serve as a basis for feeling a sense that Blacks and Black-White biracials share a linked fate, and consequently predict the categorization of biracials as Black.

Method

Participants

497 U.S. born Blacks were recruited by Prodege (https://www.prodege.com/) via TurkPrime. We aimed to recruit a large sample of 500 respondents to test our proposed multi-step mediation model and data collection ended after TurkPrime’s last recruitment attempt yielded 497 complete surveys. Of the 497 who participated, 1 was excluded for inconsistently reporting their race, 3 others were excluded for participating in this study more than once, and 20 participants were excluded for indicating that they had completed a similar survey in the past year. 15 other respondents were excluded because they participated in Study 1B, Supplemental Study 2, Supplemental Study 3, or another racial categorization study we conducted. Thus, 458 participants were in the final sample (53.5% female, $M_{age} = 34.78, SD = 13.10$). All results remain statistically significant when we include the latter 35 participants (i.e., only exclude 4 participants who participated in the current study more than once or who reported they are not Black). A power analysis using $r = -.22$ as the estimate of the SDO-hypodescent correlation among Blacks (derived from averaging the correlations found in Studies 1A and 1B in the main
text) suggests that 159 participants were needed to achieve 80% power to detect that correlation. We collected a larger sample to examine mediators of this correlation.

**Measures**

SDO was assessed using the same scale described in the main text (i.e., $SDO_7; \alpha = .86, m = 2.15, SD = 0.99$; Ho et al., 2015). Perceptions of discrimination were measured with a seven item measure we developed for the current study, asking participants if they agreed with statements such as “People from lower status groups suffer from discrimination in this country” or “All racial groups have similar opportunities in society today” (reverse-scored; $1 = “Strongly disagree”$ to $7 = “Strongly agree”; $\alpha = .75, m = 5.61, SD = 1.03$). Linked fate with biracials was measured using the same 8-item measure reported in the main text ($\alpha = .87; m = 4.93, SD = 1.30$). Lastly, participants completed the same 16-item explicit measure of hypodescent used in Study 1B ($\alpha = .91, m = 4.47, SD = 0.75$).

**Results**

Replicating all the previous studies, we again found that on average, Blacks were more likely to perceive Black-White biracials as Black (vs. White) ($t(457) = 13.41, p < .001, Cohen’s d = 0.63$). Furthermore, this tendency was again negatively related to SDO ($r = -.21, p < .001$).

We used Hayes’ PROCESS macro (Model 6; Hayes, 2013) to explore the possibility that perceptions of discrimination and of linked fate with biracials might mediate the relationship between egalitarianism and hypodescent among Blacks (i.e., lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination $\rightarrow$ linked fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent). Importantly, these data revealed support for each step of our model: (a) SDO predicted perceptions of discrimination against minorities in general:

---

1 A racial morphing task was included in the survey for exploratory purposes and not analyzed as part of the current study. Throughout all seven studies in the current work, we focus on the categorization of $\frac{1}{2}$ Black $-\frac{1}{2}$ White biracials along a continuum where the midpoint indicates the perception of biracials as equally Black and White. Other measures that were part of this survey but not relevant to the current analyses are listed in the supplemental online document with survey instruments, along with the full text of relevant measures.
$B_{SDO} = -.53, SE B = .04, \beta = -.50; t = -12.47, p < .001$; (b) perceptions of discrimination predicted
linked fate between Black-White biracials and Blacks, controlling for SDO: $B_{\text{perceptions of discrimination}}$
$= .30, SE B = .07, \beta = .24; t = 4.61, p < .001$; (c) linked fate predicted hypodescent, controlling
for SDO and perceptions of discrimination: $B_{\text{linked fate}} = .07, SE B = .03, \beta = .11; t = 2.42, p = .02$.
Furthermore, the overall indirect effect (lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination $\rightarrow$ linked
fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent) was significant: indirect effect with 5000 bootstrap samples $(A \times B \times C) = -0.01, 95\%$ CI = -.024 to -.002). Thus this study provided evidence that lower SDO is related to
perceptions of discrimination against disadvantaged groups in general (which, as Studies 2 and 3
suggest, also extends to perception of discrimination against Black-White biracials specifically),
and that this in turn is related to perceptions of linked fate and hypodescent.

**Supplemental Study 2**

Supplemental Study 2 explores the same model as the last study, but assesses perceptions
of discrimination against Blacks rather than perceptions of discrimination in general. This allows
for a direct test of whether Black Americans lower in SDO perceive discrimination against the
ingroup, one of the factors that we reason contributes to experiencing a sense of linked fate with
biracials.

**Method**

**Participants**

290 U.S. born Blacks (53.1% female, $M_{age} = 46.77, SD = 15.79$) were recruited by
Qualtrics Panel to participate in an omnibus social attitudes survey. Qualtrics was contracted to
recruit 250 participants and was responsible for ending data collection when this goal was
reached. 14 participants also participated in Study 1B in-text and were therefore excluded from
the current study. All results remain statistically significant with these participants included. The
data for this study were collected as part of a larger effort to assess Black Americans’ social and political attitudes. Thus, we did not conduct a power analysis specifically for this study.

**Measures**

SDO was assessed using a validated eight item brief version of the scale used in the studies in text (i.e., the SDO short scale; \( \alpha = .81, m = 2.39, SD = 1.19 \); Ho et al., 2015). The validated short scale was used here due to space constraints in this omnibus study. Perceived discrimination was assessed with four items, asking participants if they agree, for example, that “Black Americans as a group have been victimized because of their race” (\( \alpha = .90, 1 = \) Strongly disagree to \( 7 = \) Strongly agree; \( m = 5.97, SD = 1.18 \)). Linked fate was measured with one item assessing the extent to which participants believed that “what happens to Black-White biracial people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life,” consistent with how this variable is typically operationalized in the social science literature (e.g., Gay, 2004; \( 1 = \) “No, not at all” to \( 7 = \) “Yes, a lot”; \( m = 4.31, SD = 1.93 \)). Lastly, participants completed the same 16-item measure of hypodescent used in Study 1B (\( \alpha = .92, m = 4.44, SD = .74 \)).

**Results**

Replicating the studies in text, we found that Blacks used hypodescent (\( t(267) = 9.84, p < .001, \) Cohen’s \( d = .60 \)), and that this was negatively related to SDO (\( r = -.24, p < .001 \)).

---

2 Participants were also asked about their perceptions of linked fate with other Blacks (same 7-point scale; \( m = 4.91, SD = 1.90 \)). Notably these items were highly intercorrelated (\( r = .71 \)), providing prima facie evidence that at least some respondents believe that Blacks and Black-White biracials share a common, linked fate.

3 Two other categorization items, examining the categorization of a \( \frac{1}{4} \) Black – \( \frac{3}{4} \) White biracial target or \( \frac{3}{4} \) Black – \( \frac{1}{4} \) White biracial target, were included in the survey for exploratory purposes. The tendency to categorize the \( \frac{3}{4} \) Black target as Black was negatively related to SDO (\( r = -.18, p = .004 \)), consistent with categorization of a half-Black target in the current study as reported below. The categorization of the \( \frac{1}{4} \) Black target as Black was positively correlated with SDO (\( r = .12, p = .04 \)). This is inconsistent with the null correlation found using the same item below in an exploratory analysis of Study 1 data, and inconsistent with every other relationship between SDO and racial categorization in this and every other study in this paper, and thus we cannot interpret this finding. A racial morphing task was included in the survey for exploratory purposes and not analyzed as part of the current study. Throughout all seven studies in the current work, we focus on the categorization of \( \frac{1}{2} \) Black – \( \frac{1}{2} \) White biracials along a continuum where the midpoint indicates the perception of biracials as equally Black and White. Other measures that were part of this survey but not relevant to the current analyses are listed in the supplemental online document with survey instruments, along with the full text of relevant measures.
This study also provided evidence for the multi-step mediation model (lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination $\rightarrow$ linked fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent). Specifically, these data revealed support for each step: (a) SDO predicted perceptions of discrimination against Blacks: $B_{SDO} = -.49$, $SE_B = .05$, $\beta = -.49$; $t = -9.18$, $p < .001$; (b) perceptions of discrimination predicted linked fate between Black-White biracials and Blacks, controlling for SDO: $B_{\text{perceptions of discrimination}} = .32$, $SE_B = .11$, $\beta = .19$; $t = 2.78$, $p < .01$; (c) linked fate predicted hypodescent, controlling for SDO and perceptions of discrimination: $B_{\text{linked fate}} = .05$, $SE_B = .02$, $\beta = .13$; $t = 2.12$, $p = .03$.

Furthermore, the overall indirect effect (lower SDO $\rightarrow$ perceptions of discrimination $\rightarrow$ linked fate $\rightarrow$ hypodescent) was significant: indirect effect with 5000 bootstrap samples $(A \times B \times C) = -.01$, 95% CI = -.021 to -.001; PROCESS macro Model 6, Hayes, 2013).

Thus, consistent with the idea that lower SDO individuals have a heightened perception of discrimination against disadvantaged groups (which we theorize serves as the basis for their feeling linked fate with Black-White biracials), Blacks lower in SDO perceived more discrimination against their own ingroup. This perception, in turn, predicts individuals’ feeling that the fates of Blacks and Black-White biracials are linked, which predicted greater use of hypodescent.

**Supplemental Study 3**

The current study complements Study 3 in the main text. A critical difference is that rather than experimentally manipulating discrimination against biracials alone (as we did in the main Study 3), it manipulates a linked fate between Blacks and Black-White biracials rooted in a shared experience of discrimination. Thus, whereas this study combines discrimination against biracials and linked fate, both central to the theoretical model described in text, Study 3 in text more clearly distinguishes each step in our theoretical model.
Method

Participants and Procedure

540 U.S. Born Blacks were recruited via Qualtrics Panel. Qualtrics was contracted to collect data from 500 respondents and was responsible for ending data collection after this goal was reached. 3 respondents were excluded because they reported in an open response that they were biracial and 23 respondents were excluded because they participated in Study 1B, Supplemental Study 2, or another racial categorization study we conducted. 26 additional respondents were excluded from analyses, because they indicated in an open response that they did not believe the article we used to manipulate perceptions of biracial discrimination (n = 21), typed random letters when asked about their thoughts concerning this article or about the purpose of the study (n = 2), or expressed disdain for the study (n = 2). The final sample thus included 489 respondents (48.7% female, $M_{age} = 47.56$, $SD_{age} = 16.58$). All results remained statistically significant when we analyzed the data including all participants except for the 3 who identified as biracial. Although we did not know what the effect of the current experimental manipulation on hypodescent would be, using the average effect size in social psychology research as a standard ($r = .21$, Funder et al., 2014), 174 participants were needed to achieve 80% power to detect this effect. Thus the current study was well powered to detect the central effect of interest.

After completing the same 16-item social dominance orientation measure used in previous studies ($\alpha = .85$, $m = 2.13$, $SD = 0.94$), participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions. In the high biracial discrimination condition, participants read an article titled “Black-White Biracials Are as Likely as Blacks to Experience Racial Discrimination.” This article recounted the story of a Black-White biracial man’s experience.

---

4 These participants did not indicate they were biracial on the race question even though that option was present, as well as an “other” option.
with discrimination, and cited statistics from a Pew Research Center survey (2015) indicating that biracials do in fact experience similar rates of discrimination relative to Blacks. In the low discrimination condition, participants read an article titled “Black-White Biracials Not as Likely as Blacks to Experience Racial Discrimination,” which included a biracial man’s account of feeling accepted by people of all races, and statistics indicating that biracials in fact experienced less discrimination than Blacks.

Participants then completed a manipulation check, which consisted of 2 items \( (r = .54; \) “Black-White biracials are just as likely as Blacks to experience racial discrimination” and “Black-White biracials do not have to deal with as much discrimination as Blacks do” – reverse coded; \( 1 = \text{Strongly disagree} \) to \( 7 = \text{Strongly agree} \)\). Following that, we assessed linked fate using the 8-item measure used in Studies 2-3 \( (\alpha = .87, m = 5.21, SD = 1.29) \). Lastly, we administered the 16-item measure of hypodescent used in Study 1B and Supplemental Studies 1 and 2 \( (\alpha = .93, m = 4.43, SD = 0.79) \).

**Results**

First, we checked that the experimental manipulation concerning biracials’ experience of discrimination indeed had an effect on perceptions that biracials are discriminated against to the same extent as Blacks, and found that this was the case \( (m_{\text{high biracial discrimination}} = 5.78, SD = 1.35 \) vs. \( m_{\text{low biracial discrimination}} = 4.00, SD = 1.73; t(452.03) = -12.63, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = 1.15) \). The manipulation also had an effect on Blacks’ perceptions of linked fate with biracials \( (m_{\text{high biracial discrimination}} = 5.78, SD = 1.35 \) vs. \( m_{\text{low biracial discrimination}} = 4.00, SD = 1.73; t(452.03) = -12.63, p < .001, \text{Cohen’s } d = 1.15) \).

---

5 Other measures that were part of this survey but not relevant to the current analyses are listed in the supplemental online document with survey instruments, along with the full text of relevant measures.

6 Note that this \( t \)-test and associated degrees of freedom did not assume equal variances, as Levene’s test for equality of variances was significant \( (F(1, 487) = 6.11, p = .01) \).
discrimination = 5.67, SD = 1.11 v. m_{low} biracial discrimination = 4.72, SD = 1.28; t(471.47)^7 = -8.74, p < .001, Cohen’s d = 0.79).

Since we directly manipulated a sense of linked fate rooted in shared discrimination, we examined the direct effect of the manipulation on Blacks’ use of hypodescent without also looking at linked fate as a mediator (i.e., consistent with the recommendation to avoid using a manipulation check as a mediator; Zhao, Lynch, & Chen, 2010). This revealed a significant effect of our manipulation on hypodescent (m_{high} biracial discrimination = 4.53, SD = 0.78 v. m_{low} biracial discrimination = 4.33, SD = 0.79; t(487) = -2.84, p < .01, Cohen’s d = 0.26). Thus, just as the biracial discrimination manipulation affected linked fate with consequences for hypodescent in Study 3 (i.e., manipulating the first mediator in our model influenced our dependent variable through the second mediator in our model), the current study shows that when we manipulate a sense of linked fate rooted in shared discrimination (i.e., when we manipulate the two mediators jointly), it directly affects hypodescent. Thus, although the main Study 3 allows for finer theoretical differentiation and provides evidence that perceived discrimination can cause perceptions of linked fate, both that study and the current one are consistent with our overall theoretical model.

A one sample t-test from the midpoint of 4 showed that although Blacks used hypodescent in both conditions, they did so to a lesser extent in the low discrimination condition (low discrimination: t(239) = 6.43, p < .001, Cohen’s d = 42; high discrimination: t(248) = 10.69, p < .001, Cohen’s d = .68). We also replicated the finding that Blacks use hypodescent in general (i.e., collapsing across conditions, m = 4.43, SD = 0.79; one sample t-test assessing difference from midpoint: t(488) = 12.03, p < .001, Cohen’s d = .54). Furthermore, as in our other studies, SDO has a negative overall relationship with hypodescent in this sample (r = -.16, p < .001).

**Study 1A Supplemental Methods and Analysis**

---

^7 Levene’s test was significant here as well (F(1, 487) = 8.37, p = .004).
In Study 1A, we also included several other categorization items, examining the categorization of ¼ Black – ¾ White biracials, ¾ Black – ¼ White biracials, or dichotomous, forced-choice (rather than continuous) categorization. These were included for exploratory purposes (all of the other studies only included the central measure of interest, which asked participants to categorize ½ Black – ½ White biracials on a continuous 7 point scale, where the mid-point indicated the perception of a target as equally Black and White; though see footnote 3 above for exception in Supplemental Study 2). Specifically, the questions were as follows:

Imagine a child with 2 Black grandparents and 2 White grandparents...
- If the child needed to check only one census box for “race,” should he/she check “Black” or “White”? (1 = He/she should check Black and 2 = He/she should check White)

- To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White? (1 = Completely Black to 4 = Equally Black and White to 7 = Completely White)
- If the child needed to check only one census box for “race,” should he/she check “Black” or “White”? (1 = He/she should check Black and 2 = He/she should check White)

These measures did not allow participants to respond that the target matched the given background (e.g., a ½ Black – ½ White target is *equally* Black and White, or a ¼ Black – ¾ White target is ¼ White – ¾ Black) and thus we could not assess hypodescent as we did in-text, and consistent with the way it has been assessed in past work (e.g., Ho et al., 2011).

Nevertheless, we explored whether SDO would relate to categorization as assessed by these measures differently among Blacks and Whites (i.e., the SDO x race interaction examined in-text). These analyses did not reveal any significant SDO x race interactions across the 5 measures, each regressed on SDO, race, and the SDO x race interaction term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>SDO x Race Interaction</th>
<th>SDO-Hypodescent Slope Among Blacks</th>
<th>SDO-Hypodescent Slope Among Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE B)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ Black – ¾ White</td>
<td>-.03(.12)</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¾ Black – ¼ White</td>
<td>-.10(.11)</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Black – ½ White Census</td>
<td>.02(.36)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 1A Sampling Stratification:

Here, we provide information given to us by GfK (formerly Knowledge Networks) concerning sampling stratification and the demographic variables they used to adjust for sample non-representativeness following data collection. Exact information on deviation of the current sample from the general population is not available:

Study-Specific Post-Stratification Weights

Once the sample has been selected and fielded, and all the study data are collected and made final, a post-stratification weight is computed to adjust for any survey non-response as well as any non-coverage or under- and over-sampling resulting from the study-specific sample design. Demographic and geographic distributions for non-institutionalized, Non-Hispanic/Black and Non-Hispanic/White adults (18 and older) who are native born to the U.S. from the most recent supplement CPS data (March 2013) are used as benchmarks in this adjustment. Internet access distributions are from the most current special supplement CPS (October 2012). Political party identification distributions were from the KnowledgePanel Public Affairs Profile data collected January 1, 2013 to January 6, 2014.

The following benchmark distributions were utilized for this post-stratification process. More specifically, the following demographic distributions were nested within White/Non-Hispanic and Black/Non-Hispanic by order condition:

- Age
  - White/Non-Hispanic: (18–44, 45–59, and 60+)
  - Black/Non-Hispanic: (18–29, 30–44, 45–59, and 60+)
- Gender (Male/Female)
- Education (Less than High School/High School, Some College, Bachelors and higher)
- Household income
  - White/Non-Hispanic: (under $50K, $50K to <$75K, $75K+)
  - Black/Non-Hispanic: (under $25K, $25K to <$50K, $50K to <$75K, $75K+)
- Internet Access (Yes, No)

In addition to the demographic distributions listed above, the following demographic distributions were nested within White/Non-Hispanic and Black/Non-Hispanic (not by order condition) and used in the post-stratification process:

- Census Region (Northeast, Midwest, South, West)
• Metropolitan Area (Yes, No)

In addition to demographic distributions used for Black/Non-Hispanic and White/Non-Hispanic by order condition and for Black/Non-Hispanic and White/Non-Hispanic (not by order condition), the following demographic distributions were used to calculate the post-stratification weight for the overall sample – weight1, weight1a, weight1b, and weight1c:

• Age (18–29, 30–44, 45–59, and 60+) by Gender (Male/Female)
• Education (Less than High School, High School, Some College, Bachelor and higher)
• Household income (under $25K, $25K to <$50K, $50K to <$75K, $75K+)
• Party ID (Republican, Democrat, Independent/Other) – Party ID was only used in the calculation of weight1b and weight1c

Weight2 and weight3 are scaled weights based on weight1. Weight2a and weight3a are scaled weights based on weight1a. Weight2b and weight3b are scaled weights based on weight1b. Weight2c and weight3c are scaled weights based on weight1c.

Comparable distributions are calculated by using all completed cases from the field data (n = 451)8 and controlling demographics within Black/Non-Hispanic and White/Non-Hispanic by order condition. Since study sample sizes are typically too small to accommodate a complete cross-tabulation of all the survey variables with the benchmark variables, a raking procedure is used for the post-stratification weighting adjustment. Using the base weight as the starting weight, this procedure adjusts the sample data back to the selected benchmark proportions. Through an iterative convergence process, the weighted sample data are optimally fitted to the marginal distributions.

After this final post-stratification adjustment, the distribution of the calculated weights are examined to identify and, if necessary, trim outliers at the extreme upper and lower tails of the weight distribution. The post-stratified and trimmed weights are then scaled to the sum of the total sample size of all eligible respondents.

When we conduct the analyses in Study 1A without statistical weighting, results are the same. That is, both Blacks (m = 4.47, SD = .78, t(206) = 8.66, p < .001) and Whites (m = 4.24, SD = .56, t(211) = 6.25, p < .001) use hypodescent and the SDO x race interaction is significant (B = .16, SE B = .06, t = 2.64, p = .01). The simple slope for Blacks is negative and non-significant (B = -.05, SE B = .05, t = -1.00, p = .32), whereas the slope for Whites is positive and significant (B = .11, SE B = .04, t = 2.83, p < .01).

---

8 Note that 27 participants were part of a pretest that differed somewhat from the final survey administered (and thus were not part of the final sample we analyzed).
Study 1A

Half of the participants completed hypodescent first and half completed SDO first. Participants completed measures as follows: social dominance orientation, ethnic identity, right wing authoritarianism, purity/sanctity (from Moral Foundations Questionnaire), zero sum competition, symbolic threat, race conceptions scale, essentialism, feeling thermometer, perceptions of racial group status, political conservatism, ethnic activism, disadvantage consciousness, loyalty of Black-White biracials, intergroup contact, hypodescent, opposition to racial passing, punitiveness, old fashioned racism, racial policy support, system justification, Machiavellianism, empathy, stereotyping, bisexual categorization, and perceptions of warmth and competence. The full text of theoretically relevant measures is included below.

Social Dominance Orientation

Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Somewhat oppose</th>
<th>Slightly oppose</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly favor</th>
<th>Somewhat favor</th>
<th>Strongly favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Some groups of people must be kept in their place.
2. It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
3. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.
4. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
5. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.
6. No one group should dominate in society.
7. Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place.
8. Group dominance is a poor principle.
9. We should not push for group equality.
10. We shouldn’t try to guarantee that every group has the same quality of life.
11. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.
12. Group equality should not be our primary goal.
13. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.
14. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
15. No matter how much effort it takes, we ought to strive to ensure that all groups have the same chance in life.
16. Group equality should be our ideal.

Hypodescent

Imagine a child with 2 Black grandparents and 2 White grandparents...

To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Black</th>
<th>Predominantly Black</th>
<th>Somewhat more Black than White</th>
<th>Equally Black and White</th>
<th>Somewhat more White than Black</th>
<th>Predominantly White</th>
<th>Completely White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…
Do you think the kid will look more like a Black person or a White person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid will act more like a Black person or a White person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid will fit in better with Black people or White people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better with Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally well with Blacks and Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better with Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid should be thought of as relatively Black or relatively White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory Hypodescent Items

Imagine a child with 2 Black grandparents and 2 White grandparents...

If the child needed to check only one census box for “race,” should he/she check “Black” or “White”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He/she should check Black</td>
<td>He/she should check White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imagine a child with 1 Black grandparent and 3 White grandparents...

To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Black</td>
<td>Predominantly Black</td>
<td>Somewhat more Black than White</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>Somewhat more White than Black</td>
<td>Predominantly White</td>
<td>Completely White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the child needed to check only one census box for “race,” should he/she check “Black” or “White”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He/she should check Black</td>
<td>He/she should check White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imagine a child with 3 Black grandparents and 1 White grandparent...

To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Black</td>
<td>Predominantly Black</td>
<td>Somewhat more Black than White</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>Somewhat more White than Black</td>
<td>Predominantly White</td>
<td>Completely White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the child needed to check only one census box for “race,” should he/she check “Black” or “White”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He/she should check Black</td>
<td>He/she should check White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study 1B**

Participants completed measures as follows: feeling thermometer, social dominance orientation, distractor personality measure, hypodescent, perceptions of police officers. The full text of theoretically relevant measures is included below.

Social Dominance Orientation

See Study 1A

Hypodescent

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…

Do you think the kid will look more like a Black person or a White person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Black</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>More White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will others likely label the kid as a Black person or a White person, based on looks alone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More likely Black</td>
<td>Equally likely Black and White</td>
<td>More likely White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the kid resemble his/her Black parent or White parent more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>Equally likely</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More his/her Black parent

Equally Black and White parents

More his/her White parent

Overall, will the kid look more like other Black people or other White people?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
More like Black people
Equally like Black and White people
More like White people

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…

Do you think the kid will act more like a Black person or a White person?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
More Black
Equally Black and White
More White

Will the kid’s behavior lead those around to categorize him/her as Black or White?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
As Black
Equally Black and White
As White

Is the kid more likely to act in ways that can be identified with Black culture or with White culture?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
More with Black culture
Equally with Black and White culture
More with White culture

Will the kid copy the actions of Black or White celebrities more?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
More Black
Equally Black and White
More White

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…

Do you think the kid will fit in better with Black people or White people?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Better with Blacks
Equally well with Blacks
Better with Whites
Do you think the kid will be accepted more by Black people or by White people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More by Blacks</td>
<td>Equally by Blacks and Whites</td>
<td>More by Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid will feel most comfortable hanging out with Black people or White people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More comfortable with Blacks</td>
<td>Equally comfortable with Blacks and Whites</td>
<td>More comfortable with Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid will end up hanging out with Black people or with White people more?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More with Blacks</td>
<td>Equally with Blacks and Whites</td>
<td>More with Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…

Do you think the kid should be thought of as relatively Black or relatively White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Black</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>Relatively White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the kid give off the general impression of being more Black or more White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Black</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>More White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you consider the kid more Black or more White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Black</td>
<td>Equally Black and White</td>
<td>More White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the kid will be more like his/her Black parent or his/her White parent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More like</td>
<td>Equally like</td>
<td>More like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 2

Half of the participants completed hypodescent first and half completed SDO first. Participants completed measures as follows: social dominance orientation, perceptions of discrimination against biracials, linked fate, hypodescent. The full text of all measures is included below.

Social Dominance Orientation

See Study 1A

Perceptions of Discrimination Against Biracials

Please use the given scales to respond to the next set of questions or statements.

In your opinion, how much discrimination do Black-White biracials face in America today?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
None A lot

How much does discrimination affect the lives of Black-White biracials?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all A lot

Black-White biracials are frequently the victims of racial discrimination.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Black-White biracials experience negative treatment because of their race.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Black-White biracials rarely face racial discrimination.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Linked-Fate

Do you think what happens to Black-White biracial people in this country will have something to do with what happens to Blacks?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
No, not at all       Yes, a lot

Do you think what happens to **Black-White biracial people** in this country will have something to do with what happens in **your life**?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
No, not at all       Yes, a lot

Do you think what happens to **Black people** in this country will have something to do with what happens with **Black-White biracials**?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
No, not at all       Yes, a lot

Blacks and Black-White biracials share a common destiny.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree       Strongly Agree

Issues that affect the Black community also affect Black-White biracials.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree       Strongly Agree

What happens to Black-White biracials does not have anything to do with what will happen to Blacks.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree       Strongly Agree

Racial progress for Black people also means racial progress for biracial individuals.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree       Strongly Agree

When the way Blacks are treated in the U.S. changes, the way that Black-White biracials are treated will naturally follow.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree       Strongly Agree

Hypodescent

If a Black American and a White American have a kid…

Would you think of the kid as relatively Black or relatively White?
Would you consider the kid more Black or more White?

More Black  
Equally Black and White  
More White

How would you categorize this child?

Black  
Equally Black and White  
White

**Study 3**

Participants completed measures as follows: social dominance orientation, read experimental vignette, perceptions of discrimination against biracials, linked fate, hypodescent. The full text of all measures is included below.

**Social Dominance Orientation**

See Study 1A

High Discrimination OR Low Discrimination OR No prime (Experimental Manipulation)  
See Appendix in the Main Text

**Perceptions of Discrimination Against Biracials (Manipulation Check)**

See Study 2

**Linked-Fate**

See Study 2

**Hypodescent**

See Study 2

**Supplemental Study 1**

Participants completed measures as follows: social dominance orientation, linked fate, inclusiveness, trust in Black-White biracials, system justification, perceptions of discrimination, multidimensional inventory of Black identity, hypodescent, and racial morphing. The full text of theoretically relevant measures is included below.

**Social Dominance Orientation**
See Study 1A

Linked-Fate

See Study 2

Perceptions of Discrimination

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. People from lower status groups suffer from discrimination in this country.
2. Great inequality continues to exist in this country.
3. Subtle discrimination is still widespread in this country.
4. Women face more injustice today compared to men.
5. All racial groups have similar opportunities in society today.
6. There are no major barriers in society that prevent poor people from moving up.
7. Immigrants are made to feel welcome in this country.

Hypodescent

See Study 1B

Black-White Morph Task

Note: The order of the Black-White Morph Task and the White-Black Morph Task is counterbalanced.

The instructions below will not be repeated. Please read them carefully before proceeding.

The person pictured on the next page is of Black descent. As you progress through each page, the person will begin to look part White. AS SOON AS YOU CONSIDER THE PERSON TO BE WHITE, select yes, and then press the forward arrow button again. The face WILL NOT change in equal increments, so you should only rely on what you see.

Do you consider this person to be White?
White-Black Morph Task

The instructions below will not be repeated. Please read them carefully before proceeding.

The person pictured on the next page is of White descent. As you progress through each page, the person will begin to look part Black. **AS SOON AS YOU CONSIDER THE PERSON TO BE BLACK, select yes, and then press the forward arrow button again. The face WILL NOT change in equal increments, so you should only rely on what you see.**

Do you consider this person to be Black?

__ Yes  
__ No

**Supplemental Study 2**

Participants completed measures as follows: ethnic identity, linked fate with Blacks, linked fate with Black-White biracials, political conservatism, awareness of Charleston church shooting, feeling thermometer, social dominance orientation, ingroup dominance, inversion of dominance hierarchy, perceptions of discrimination against Blacks, collective action, hypodescent, racial morphing task, ascent of man, dehumanization, meta-dehumanization, meta-prejudice, expectations for group dominance, system justification, feeling thermometer, affect toward Whites, responses to Charleston attack, punitiveness towards Dylann Roof, resilience following Charleston attack, and anti-police attitudes. The full text of theoretically relevant measures is included below.

**Linked-Fate with Blacks**

Do you think what happens to Black people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Linked-Fate with Black-White Biracials
Do you think what happens to Black-White biracial people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?

1. No, Not at All
2. Yes, A lot

Social Dominance Orientation (Short Scale)
Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best.

1. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.
2. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
3. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.
4. No one group should dominate in society.
5. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.
6. Group equality should not be our primary goal.
7. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.
8. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.

Perceptions of Discrimination Against Blacks
Please read each statement carefully and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree. Please, answer as truthfully as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Black Americans as a group have been victimized by society.
2. Black Americans as a group regularly encounter racism.
3. Prejudice and discrimination against Black Americans exists.
4. Black Americans as a group have been victimized because of their race.

Hypodescent
See Study 1B

Exploratory Hypodescent Items
Imagine a child with 1 Black grandparent and 3 White grandparents...

To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?

 Completely    Predominantly    Somewhat    Equally    Somewhat    Predominantly    Completely
Imagine a child with 3 Black grandparents and 1 White grandparent...

To what extent do you consider this child to be Black or White?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Black</th>
<th>Predominantly Black</th>
<th>Somewhat more Black than White</th>
<th>Equally Black and White</th>
<th>Somewhat more White than Black</th>
<th>Predominantly White</th>
<th>Completely White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Black-White and White-Black Morph Task

See Supplemental Study 1

**Supplemental Study 3**

Participants completed measures as follows: ethnic activism, social dominance orientation, read experimental vignette, manipulation check, linked fate, collective action with Black-White biracials and Whites, hypodescent, beliefs about biracials’ identity rights, and trust in Black-White biracials. The full text of theoretically relevant measures is included below.

Social Dominance Orientation

See Study 1A

**Manipulation – High Discrimination**

Please read the article below and reflect on the information presented. We are interested in your reactions.

**Black-White Biracials Are as Likely as Blacks to Experience Racial Discrimination**

CHICAGO – Joshua Davis, a 25-year-old Black-White biracial man, shared his story about being the victim of a hate-crime at a community meeting on race relations Tuesday evening.

“When I had just moved to Chicago, I got punched in the neck walking back from the train station. It was definitely racist,” Davis recalls. “As the guy who hit me ran away, his two friends stared at me and shouted racial epithets.”

Davis continued, “But that type of violence is not the only thing that gets to me. It’s the small things that happen everyday, like being ignored by waiters at a restaurant, or having a store clerk watch me suspiciously.”

Davis’s experiences are consistent with the findings of a recent national survey released in June by the Pew Research Center. The survey found that compared to Black Americans, Black-White biracials are just as likely to face racial discrimination. 41% of Black-White biracial people report they’ve been unfairly stopped by the police, almost identical to the 42% of Blacks who experienced unfair police stops. Similarly, Black-White biracials are equally likely as Blacks to receive day-to-day mistreatment – 57% of both Black-White biracials and Blacks report they had received poor service in a restaurant or other business.

After Davis shared his story, Cecil Williams, a local reverend and civil rights activist spoke. Williams thanked Davis for sharing and added, “The amount of racial bigotry that members of this community face is outrageous. And as brother Davis bravely shared, it affects all of us – it doesn’t matter whether you are single race or multiracial– we all suffer and we must all stand together in the fight for justice.”
Please share with us any reactions you have to this article.

Manipulation – Low Discrimination
Please read the article below and reflect on the information presented. We are interested in your reactions.

Black-White Biracials Not as Likely as Blacks to Experience Racial Discrimination

CHICAGO – Joshua Davis, a 25-year-old Black-White biracial man, shared his views about racial progress at a community meeting on race relations Tuesday evening.

“I’m not sure if it’s because I’m only half-Black, but to be honest, I’ve always felt accepted by people of all races, and honestly can’t think of a time where my race was an issue.”

Davis continued, “Growing up, my race was never a factor in my interactions with teachers, classmates, or anybody else. It was nothing like what you hear about how people who are fully Black are treated.”

Davis’s experiences are consistent with the findings of a recent national survey released in June by the Pew Research Center. The survey found that compared to Black Americans, Black-White biracials are not as likely to face racial discrimination. 13% of Black-White biracial people report they’ve been unfairly stopped by the police, compared to 42% of Blacks who experienced unfair police stops. Similarly, Black-White biracials are about one-quarter as likely as Blacks to receive day-to-day mistreatment – 15% of Black-White biracials report they had received poor service in a restaurant or other business, while 57% of Blacks reported such mistreatment.

After Davis shared his story, David Williams, 33, who is also Black-White biracial, spoke. Williams thanked Davis for sharing, and added, “I would have to agree. Race hasn’t been much of a factor in my life either – it really seems to matter whether you are single race or multiracial. In some ways, I feel lucky to be biracial.”

Please share with us any reactions you have to this article.

Manipulation Check
Please indicate how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement.

1. Strongly disagree 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

1. Black-White biracials are just as likely as Blacks to experience racial discrimination.
2. Black-White biracials do not have to deal with as much discrimination as Blacks do.

Linked-Fate
See Study 2

Hypodescent
See Study 1B