

Running Head: WHITE AMERICANS' TEMPORAL DISTANCING OF RACIST HISTORY

White Americans' Temporal Distancing of Racist History

Kyshia Henderson

B.A., University of California, Los Angeles, 2016

M.A. University of Virginia, 2020

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia
in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology
University of Virginia

April 2023

ABSTRACT

The racist history of the United States has long been dismissed and obscured. This history has come under attack with bans of “Critical Race Theory,” banning teaching of topics related to the history of racism in K-12. This is a systemic way that history is distorted, by preventing its teaching. But this distortion might happen at the individual level as well. History might be distorted by White people temporally distancing race-related historical events. The present work investigates this distancing of race-related history and the factors that might contribute to distancing.

The present studies tested various hypotheses including whether White participants placed race-related events further in the past than race-unrelated events. In the first three studies, I developed a paradigm for measuring temporal distancing of race-related historical events and tested this hypothesis. In Pilot Study 1 and Pilot Study 2, I measured temporal distancing by comparing distancing of events that happened in the same year. In Pilot Study 3, participants placed race-related and race-unrelated events on a timeline. I found, with the latter study, that participants placed race-related events further in the past than the events occurred. Experiments 1 and 2, using the timeline task, tested whether this phenomenon was motivated by group status threat. In both studies, I replicated the Pilot Study 3 findings and also found that group status threat did not impact placement of race-related historical events. Taken together, this work reveals how White people engage with history in dishonest ways by distancing race-related history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents	3
Acknowledgements.....	4-5
Introduction.....	6 – 17
Pilot Study 1.....	17 – 22
Pilot Study 2.....	22 – 30
Pilot Study 3.....	30 – 36
Experiment 1.....	37 – 41
Experiment 2.....	41 – 46
General Discussion.....	46 – 57
References.....	58 – 63
Appendix Table of Contents.....	64
Appendix	65- 115

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge everyone that helped me to complete this dissertation and who supported me throughout the PhD program. First, I'd like to thank Sophie Trawalter, my primary advisor, for all she has done. You have made me a better researcher, mentor, and collaborator. You have been an example of what it means to be great in all of those areas and more. Thank you for your guidance. I'd also like to thank Jazmin Brown-Iannuzzi, whom I consider my secondary advisor, for all she has done to get me through the program and on to my next step. I'd like to also give a massive thank you to Drs. Jenessa Shapiro and Ivuoma Onyeador. You both encouraged me to get into research in psychology as a second-year undergraduate student at UCLA. You provided me with the copious mentorship needed that early in my career. Without you both, I would not be here.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee members, Drs. Sophie Trawalter, Jazmin Brown-Iannuzzi, Noelle Hurd, and Nicholas Winters, for your insight. You all have made this process as enjoyable as it can possibly be. I truly feel that you all care about this work just as much as I do. Thank you to the Ford Foundation for providing me the flexibility needed to do the work I was most passionate about.

A special thank you to Ariana Rivens and Alexis Stanton. You both have been my writing group throughout this dissertation and my support system throughout the PhD program. Thank you for getting me through this. I'd also like to thank Drs. Diane-Jo Bart-Plange and Janelle Billingsley, you two were instrumental in making me feel welcomed in this program. I'd also like to thank my "back home" friends, Stacey Yakimowich Chavez, Victor Chavez, and Benny Chavez. You all were constant reminders that there is a wonderful life outside of the graduate school bubble. Your support has meant the world to me. I truly value your friendship. I

would also like to thank my brothers and friends, Kevon Henderson, Kori Henderson, Kevionte Henderson, and Keon Henderson for being my lifelong support and my gaming buddies, allowing me to step away from this dissertation and have fun. And lastly, thank you to my parents, Fatisha Johnson and Kevin Henderson, for providing me with love, support, and encouragement.

White Americans' Temporal Distancing of Racist History

“Imagine an ignorance that resists. Imagine an ignorance that fights back.”

-Charles Mills

Following the end of the Civil War, White Southerners worked fervently to refashion a narrative about the war, to preserve their honor and identity (Freer, 2020). This so-called "lost cause" narrative is a narrative in which White Southerners rationalize their role in the war and tell events of the war in ways that paint their group in a favorable light (Gallagher and Nolan, 2000). The “lost cause” narrative perpetuates the belief that the Civil War was not fought over slavery and that the South had heroic motives. This narrative persists despite Confederate veterans and generals themselves having stated that slavery was at the center of the conflict (Duggan, 2018; Freer, 2020). In fact, Alexander Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, stated that the Confederacy’s “foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and moral condition,” he plainly stated that slavery is the cornerstone of the Confederacy (Stephens, 1861). Historians largely see the “lost cause” narrative as a myth (Gallagher and Nolan, 2000). Despite this, the aims of this narrative are, in some ways, successful; generations after the war, the lost cause narrative is the narrative taught in many K-12 textbooks (Coleman, 2017; Dean, 2009).

To tell the “lost cause” narrative, White Southerners must distort historical truths. For example, they claim that enslavers treated enslaved people well. Edward A. Pollard, a White Southern editor, exemplifies this. He published what is seen as the keystone of the Southern narrative (Freer, 2020). Pollard wrote “The occasion of that conflict was what the Yankees called ...slavery; but what was in fact ... one of the mildest and most beneficent systems of

servitude in the world” (Pollard, 1866). In this quote, Pollard willfully distorted the conditions of enslaved people in ways that defy historical records. This is done, again, to preserve White Southern identity. In fact, a White Southern general put this intent plainly by stating “If we cannot justify the South in the act of Secession, we will go down in History solely as a brave, impulsive but rash people who attempted in an illegal manner to overthrow the Union of our Country” (Gallagher and Nolan, 2000). White Southerners’ push of the “lost cause” narrative is a blatant example of motivated, willful ignorance. It demonstrates one way many White Americans engaged dishonestly with history. In the present dissertation, I consider whether White Americans, on average, continue to commit the same kind of willful and motivated distortion of historical truths.

On White People’s Dishonest Engagement with History

Many scholars before me have described and discussed the ways White people dishonestly engage with history. For instance, in her book *Killing Rage*, bell hooks argued that White people are willfully ignorant about the US’ racist history and its racist present. She stated “Close to white folks, I am forced to witness firsthand their willful ignorance about the impact of race and racism. The harsh absolutism of their denial. Their refusal to acknowledge accountability for racist conditions past and present” (hooks, 1995). She ties willful ignorance to refusal in acknowledging historical and contemporary racism. James Baldwin, likewise, noted in *The New Yorker* that “whatever white people do not know about Negroes reveals, precisely and inexorably, what they do not know about themselves” (Baldwin, 1962). Baldwin’s quote highlights how White people might ignore histories pertaining to Black people thereby selecting what parts of themselves to acknowledge. More recently, critical scholars across disciplines and

theoretical orientations have pointed to white ignorance as central to the maintenance of white supremacy.

In Philosophy, Charles Mills puts forth the Theory of White Ignorance, a prominent theory of non-knowing in which race plays a causal role. Mills argues that White people maintain white supremacy through ignorance; that is, by believing or at least pretending that White people's current status is unrelated to past and current instances of racism. Mills suggests that white ignorance requires effort and dedication because White people live in a world saturated with evidence of racism and resistance by people of color and there are constant counter narratives to White people's ignorance (Mills, 2007). The Theory of White Ignorance helps us to consider the ways that White people maintain their ignorance and the effort it takes to do so.

Grounded in Mills' Theory of White Ignorance and in Critical Race Theory (CRT), sociologist Jennifer Mueller put forth the Theory of Racial Ignorance (TRI). TRI argues that ignorance is the foundation of White thinking about race relations and that this thinking helps secure and protect the assurances afforded by whiteness (Mueller, 2020). TRI suggests a vast number of motivations behind White ignorance and different strategies White people use to maintain ignorance. These strategies allow for White people to dismiss information that contradicts their beliefs about the state of race relations as this information would challenge the view that their unjust and inequitable power and wealth is legitimate. White ignorance functions as a valuable resource for maintaining racial domination and allows for White people to enjoy the benefits they receive from their investment in systemic racism. TRI asserts, similar to CRT, that White people have little incentive to resist or upend this ignorance as the current system

supported by this ignorance benefits them. The Theory of Racial Ignorance considers the motivations behind White ignorance and reiterates CRT's claims on why this ignorance persists.

Work in Psychology provides some empirical, quantitative support for these observations and theories. Specifically, work on the Marley Hypothesis has shown that White Americans are, in fact, ignorant of historical truths, and more so than Black Americans. The Marley Hypothesis posits that White Americans are not aware of critical historical truths which, in turn, reduces the perception of racism in both individual and systemic manifestations. To test this theory, Nelson, Adams, and Salter (2013) used a signal detection paradigm to test the difference between Black and White Americans in perceptions of racism and critical historical knowledge of past racism. In this signal detection task, participants made true/false judgements of various plausible (some real and some fake) instances of historical racism. Statements that were true were designated as "signals" and statements that were fake were designated "noise". The authors examined participants "hits" (correctly identifying racist historical events that were true) and "false alarms" (identifying fake historical incidents as true). They found that White Americans perceived less racism (fewer "hits") than did Black Americans, and that this is stronger for systemic manifestations of racism rather than individual manifestations of racism. More central to the Marley Hypothesis expectations, they also found that knowledge of critical histories of past racism mediated the relationship between racial group membership (Black American or White American) and perceptions of racism for both individual and systemic manifestations. The authors argued that the denial of racism may in part have reflected ignorance of historical truths. Further experimental work manipulating historical knowledge found that, in fact, knowledge of history lead to less denial of racism (Bonam et al, 2019).

From James Baldwin to contemporary critical scholars across disciplines, the consensus is that White people are willfully ignorant because it benefits them to be ignorant. In this dissertation, I extend this insight. I suggest that White people cannot always remain ignorant--they know slavery and segregation are part of our history, for example--but they remain dishonest in their engagement of this history nonetheless. In particular, I suggest that they are motivated to distort historical time if and when they must contend with historical truths. In this dissertation, then, I aim to understand how White people are motivated in their engagement with history. Specifically, I aim to shed light on the psychological processes that give rise to the distortion of historical truths, namely historical time, related to the history of racism.

On the Psychological Underpinnings of White People's Dishonest Engagement with History

People are motivated to see their ingroups, as opposed to outgroups, favorably (Tajfel, 1979). In the context of group histories, then, people preferred to remember, think about, and tell historical narratives that painted the ingroup in a favorable light (Leach, Zeineddine, & Cehajic-Clancy, 2013). This is exemplified in work by Shadra and colleagues (2007) which found that people were able to recall more positive actions than negative actions of the ingroup. This finding suggests that group members are motivated to forget historical events that do not paint the ingroup in a favorable light (Sahdra & Ross, 2007). Researchers further examined this concept of motivated forgetting, examining whether priming a group identity led to motivated forgetting of historical truths. Rotella & Richeson (2013) assigned American participants to an American identity prime or not and to read about the treatment of Native Americans at the hands of the American colonists (ingroup condition) or European settlers (outgroup condition). The researchers had participants recall the events they read about, finding that participants had poorer recall when the event was about the ingroup and recalled the events more dismissively. Further,

participants that read about the ingroup as perpetrators of violence and were primed to be higher in American identity expressed less collective guilt. The findings suggest that a strategy employed for dealing with information about one's ingroup as the perpetrators of violence is to forget the events. Work by psychologists on ingroup identity and perceptions of historical events suggests that those that share an identity would be motivated not to acknowledge events where the ingroup is portrayed negatively.

This idea that ingroup identity impacts perceptions of historical events is further exemplified in work on how groups are biased in their presentation of history. This work examined whether people were more likely to present history in ways that benefit the ingroup. Researchers found this in Wikipedia articles about national intergroup conflicts where ingroup members wrote about conflicts in ways that benefitted the ingroup (Oeberst et al 2020). Researchers also saw this in representations of Black History Month at middle schools in the US where majority White schools created Black History Month representations that celebrated achievements rather than historical racial barriers and, in a separate study, White participants preferred these representations of Black History Month (Salter & Adams, 2016). Not only did people perceive historical events through the lens of group identity, but people also behaved in ways that ensure their ingroup is represented favorably in history.

Further, research in autobiographical memory found that perceptions of time itself were not subjective (Janssen, 2017; Ross & Wilson, 2002). In particular, Ross and Wilson (2002) concluded that to protect perceptions of their current self, individuals' distanced past negative events as opposed to positive events. Furthermore, work in this area found that individual identity influenced appraisal of past self and how individuals recalled their past selves was influenced by their memory of the past (Ross, 1989; Wilson & Ross, 2003). Extending these

findings to group level processes, I would expect that people that share a group identity would distance negative events that paint the ingroup in a negative light.

In fact, research suggests that this is the case. Group members distance themselves from negative historical events; they also distort historical time. Work by Peetz and colleagues (2010) showed this clearly in the context of the Holocaust, the state-sponsored persecution and murder of Jewish people by Nazi Germany in the late 1930s and early 1940s. In their study, the researchers examined this historical atrocity, measuring subjective time, self-esteem, support for compensation, and collective guilt. Participants placed in the threat condition (Germans reading about the Holocaust) reported lower collective self-esteem. They also found that, when reminded of the Holocaust but not of reparations, Germans were likely to place the Holocaust further back in subjective time than Canadians. Further, Germans that distanced the Holocaust reported higher self-esteem, reduced feelings of collective guilt, and lower motivation to compensate victims. This work is important as it demonstrates differences in subjective time based on identity relevance and the threat of negative historical events. This work also suggests that the perception of historical events is motivated, it can impact self-esteem and willingness to support reparations. In the present work, I expanded by measuring, in some studies, the difference in subjective time of two historical events, one race-related and one race-unrelated, that happen in the same year. In other studies, I measured whether White participants placed race-related historical events further in the past on a timeline than the events actually happened. Subsequent experiments tested the theory that White Americans are motivated in their perceptions of time for race-related events. I tested whether this perception of time was motivated by group status threat.

Relatedly, speaking to how White people distort historical truth across time, Onyeador and colleagues examined perceptions of racial progress across time and attempted to improve

White people's accuracy in these perceptions. They found, unexpectedly, that rather than changing estimates of contemporary racial equality, participants distorted past racial equality by reporting that the past was more equitable than it actually was (Onyeador et al., 2021). This work suggests that White people in the US, instead of shifting views to be more accurate, distort the past to better fit the view of the US as positive.

A common thread across the highlighted literature is that when facing threat to identity, like with historical events that paint the ingroup in a negative light, people temporally distanced the information and report less willingness to engage with the information. In the United States context, the group most likely to engage in this process is White Americans. This is because White Americans instigated and perpetrated a lot of historical atrocities in the US as they built the country on stolen land and by means of racial exploitation. White Americans were and are the dominant group in the US. Therefore, White Americans have the most incentive to maintain the status quo by temporally distancing race-related history because they are the group that benefits most from the status quo.

On the Importance of Individual Differences: National Identity and Conservatism

However, there is reason to think that there might be variance among White people in how much they temporally distance race-related history. Some White people may be especially likely to feel threatened by racist history and, therefore, distance it. Here, I consider two related individual differences: National identity and pride, and conservatism.

National identity, a sense of belonging to one's nation and the importance placed on being a member of the nation, is important in thinking about perceptions of historical events and group identity. Individuals who have a strong national identity feel deeply tied to their nation's history. Consequently, they react strongly--and sometimes defensively--to historical events

related to that identity. In this line, researchers have examined ingroup members' reactions to past wrongdoings against an outgroup. In the study, participants first indicated their level of national identification with being Dutch and were then assigned to one of three conditions featuring a summary of the history of Dutch colonization of Indonesia: 1) a favorable history of Dutch colonization by explaining that the Dutch improved Indonesian infrastructure and started a good educational system 2) an unfavorable history of Dutch colonization which described how the Dutch exploited, abused, and killed Indonesians and 3) an ambiguous history featuring aspects of the history that were both favorable and unfavorable. Participants then responded to measures of collective guilt and support for reparations. The researchers found that when historical events were presented in an ambiguous way (e.g. discussing both positive and negative aspects of an event), people that reported low identification with national identity experienced higher collective guilt and were more in favor of reparations than those high in national identity (Doosje et al., 1998). Interestingly, not identifying with a national identity allowed one to feel guilt for the past actions of the nation and support redress while identifying with a nation does not. High national identification seemed to shield one from the negative history of the nation. Essentially, national identity may affect the subjective interpretation of historical events.

Further, researchers found that Americans high in national identity endorsed celebrating Columbus Day despite historical inaccuracies undergirding the holiday and the erasure of indigenous history (Eason et al, 2021). Relatedly, a group of researchers have examined representations of Thanksgiving. In one study, for instance, participants responded to items assessing their national identity as an identity prime, before or after reading one of three speeches about Thanksgiving. One speech made no mention of indigenous people. The second mentioned indigenous people but did not acknowledge the genocide of indigenous people in the

US. The third speech mentioned indigenous people and described the genocide of indigenous people. After reading one of the speeches, participants responded to various measures assessing their opinions of the speech. The researchers found that participants (a predominately White American sample) that received the identity prime (responding to a national identity measure) at the beginning of the study compared to at the end were more likely to believe that the speech that discussed the genocide of indigenous people was less relevant to their personal observation of Thanksgiving and liked that representation of Thanksgiving less. Further, those that identified the most with being American reported that they would be the least likely to recommend the speech to people that did not know the true meaning of Thanksgiving (Kurtis, Adams, & Yellow Bird, 2010). This suggests that people act in identity protective ways, specifically when threatened by historical truths where the ingroup is the perpetrator of violence. Ingroup members are less likely to like the interpretation of the events, less likely to see it as relevant and, importantly, less likely to recommend this telling of history to someone that does not know the history.

Ideology is associated with national identity in the US. Conservatives affirmed their pride in being American and saw themselves as the typical American more than liberals did, according to the Pew Research Center in 2014 and 2020. Additionally, conservatives agreed more with American exceptionalism ideals, believing that the US “stands above all other countries”, more than liberals (Pew, 2017). Further, Conservatives were more likely to believe that racism itself did not exist (Sears & Henry, 2005). In the context of the present work, I argue that conservatives deny the existence of racism and the racist history of the US to maintain ideas about American exceptionalism. In my dissertation, I examined whether conservatives distorted historical time by temporally distancing race-related historical events.

The Proposed Work

Building off previous research, the present work investigates how White people might engage with history in dishonest ways and distort historical truths by subjectively perceiving historical time in motivated ways. In initial Pilots 1 and 2, I tested a paradigm for measuring distortion of historical time, based on work by Ji and colleagues (2009). I used this paradigm to test whether White people placed race-related (vs. race-unrelated) events further in the past. In Pilot Study 3, I introduced a different paradigm for measuring distortion of historical time. I used it to test whether White people placed race-related (vs. race-unrelated) events further in the past *than the events actually happened*. Moreover, I examined whether ideology predicted distortions of historical time, as a first test of whether such distancing is motivated. Subsequently, in Experiments 1 and 2, I directly tested whether this kind of distancing is motivated. I did this experimentally, by manipulating group status threat and measuring perceptions of historical time using the paradigm I developed in Pilot Study 3. I hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 1: White participants will place race-related historical events further in the past than race-unrelated events.

Hypothesis 2: White participants will place race-related historical events further in the past (Hypothesis 1) because these race-related historical events are threatening. More specifically:

Hypothesis 2A: White participants will temporally distance race-related historical events further in the past (Hypothesis 1) when these events are negative vs. positive.

Hypothesis 2B: White participants will place-related historical events further in the past (Hypothesis 1) among White participants for whom such historical events are especially threatening; namely, White conservatives.

Hypothesis 2C: White participants will place race-related historical events further in the past (Hypothesis 1) under group threat; that is, when group threat is experimentally heightened.

Pilot Study 1

In Pilot Study 1, I began to test an initial paradigm for measuring historical time distortion. To do so, I developed four pairs of historical events matched by year, one event was race-related and one event was race-unrelated. I examined whether White participants in this study placed race-related events further in the past than race-unrelated events that happened in the same year.

Method

Participants

Five hundred and one self-identified White participants were recruited from MTurk. Fifteen participants in the experimental condition and 20 in the control condition failed attention checks and were removed. Four hundred and sixty-six participants were included in the final analyses. In the final dataset, 263 participants identified as female, 193 identified as male, six identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, three identified as transgender, and one indicated that their gender identity was not listed. The average age was 40.44 ($SD= 13.10$). The modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure

This pilot study was included in a larger study featuring measures not relevant to this project. In the broader study, participants received a manipulation of historical knowledge or a control where they received no historical knowledge. This manipulation did not significantly impact differences between race-related and race-unrelated events and is therefore not relevant to the pilot discussed here. Relevant to the pilot, participants responded to various measures before

responding to the historical time distortion items, these items appeared last for participants in the study.

Historical Events

To assess historical time distortion, I generated eight items for an initial test of the concept. The items included various historical events that happened in four separate years. Each year represented had two events, one event explicitly tied to racism (race-related) and one event not explicitly tied to racism (race-unrelated; see Table 1 for items). For example, in 1963, white supremacists bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services killing four young Black girls. In the same year, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated as he rode in a motorcade in Dallas, Texas. Participants saw both events and rated how close or far the event felt. Of note, all but one of the pairings included a negative race related event and a negative race-unrelated event. The pairing for the year 1967 included a negative race-related event and a positive race-unrelated event. Participants saw each event and responded to one question to assess historical time placement: “How far away does this event feel to you” on a 1-7 scale (1= feels like yesterday, 7= feels like ages ago; Ji et al., 2009). I calculated a difference score for each year pairing.

Results

Hypothesis 1: Did Participants Place Race-related vs. Race-unrelated Historical Events

Further in the Past?

To test this question, I conducted a repeated-measures ANOVA on participants' temporal distance ratings with time points and whether events were race-related or race-unrelated as within-person variables. Results revealed a 2-way interaction between time points and whether an event is race-related or race-unrelated, $F(3, 1287) = 9.13, p < .001$.

Table 1*Historical event items used in Pilot Study 1*

Year	Race-related	Race-unrelated
1955	Emmett Till, a 14 year old Black boy in Chicago, was murdered in 1955 by two white men for allegedly harassing a white woman. His murderers were found not guilty by an all white jury. The murderers later admitted to beating and shooting Till.	U.S. Judge Curtis Eugene Chillingworth was declared missing in 1955 and later found to have been murdered. A coworker of Chillingworth later confessed to hiring someone to murder the judge. The coworker and the hired assassin were found guilty of murder.
1963	In late 1963, white supremacists bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services; four young Black girls were killed in the explosion. The church bombing was the third in 11 days, after the federal government had ordered the integration of Alabama schools.	In late 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated as he rode in a motorcade in Dallas, Texas. Kennedy's assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was later arrested and killed before standing trial. Kennedy was the fourth president to have died as a result of an assassination attempt.
1967	In the summer of 1967, nearly 160 riots occurred across the United States. In what became known as the "long, hot summer" of 1967, injustice stemming from the frustrations of poverty and unemployment, the systematic denial of employment opportunities by white-owned businesses and city services by white-led municipal governments, and mistreatment by white or mostly white police forces led to explosive confrontations between black residents and the forces that oppressed them.	In the summer of 1967, the media began to recognize the hippy movement, the underground alternative youth culture that had been brewing in America for several years. While they were mostly known for their clothing and hair, Hippy culture also embraced travel as a way to find oneself and communicate with others. They hitchhiked, traveled by public transport or used revamped double-decker buses and camper vans, always living as cheaply as possible.
2019	In August of 2019, 23 people were killed and 23 injured by a lone gunman at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas. The white nationalist gunman intended to murder Hispanic people, he was later charged with a hate crime as well as murder.	In August of 2019, a gunman in Dayton, Ohio shot and killed nine people and injured 17 others outside a bar. The gunman was fatally shot by police officers at the scene. No motive for these murders was identified.

To probe this interaction, I conducted a series of one sample t-tests, comparing each difference score (both race-related and race-unrelated events for each year) against zero. As can be seen in Table 2, as year gets closer to the present, both race-related and race-unrelated events

were placed closer to the present. Further, I found, unexpectedly, that race-related historical events were placed closer to the present than race-unrelated historical events. These results were inconsistent with Hypothesis 1 which posited that race-related historical events would be placed further in the past than race-unrelated historical events.

Hypothesis 2B: Does Ideology Play a Role in the Placement of Race-related Historical Events?

The design of Pilot Study 1 did not allow me to test Hypothesis 2A as I did not systematically include historical events of varying valence. All events featured a negative race-related event. As such, I could not test whether White participants temporally distanced race-related historical events when events were negative as opposed to positive.

Table 2

Means and statistics for event type and year for Pilot Study 1 temporal distance ratings

Race related or unrelated	1955	1963	1967	2019	Mean across items
Race-related	5.34 (1.72) $t= 64.80,$ $p<.001$	5.34 (1.56) $t= 71.43, p<.001$	5.08 (1.63) $t= 64.89, p<.001$	2.85 (1.68) $t= 35.51, p<.001$	4.66 (1.23) $t= 78.83, p<.001$
Race-unrelated	5.98(1.27) $t=98.19,$ $p<.001$	5.45 (1.66) $t= 68.58, p<.001$	5.42 (1.51) $t= 75.06,$ $p<.001$	3.26 (1.80) $t=$ $37.90, p<.001$	5.03 (1.04) $t= 101.08, p<.001$

Therefore, I next examined whether the aforementioned unexpected results were in part due to differences in political ideology. To assess the role of political ideology, I first created an ideology variable. To do so, I created a composite of two items: how socially liberal or conservative, and how fiscally liberal or conservative they were on a scale of 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*). Participants that scored between 1 and 3.99 were coded as liberal and participants that scored 4.01 to 7 were coded as conservative. Participants that scored 4 were

removed from analyses as moderates were few in number and did not act in linear ways.

Meaning, they did not fall squarely between liberals and conservatives. Then, I conducted a repeated-measures ANOVA with time points and whether events were race-related or not as within-person variables, and ideology as a between-person variable. I found main effects of whether an event was race related or race-unrelated ($F(1, 415)= 65.07, p < .001$) and time point ($F(3, 1245)= 484.01, p < .001$). These were qualified by two-way interactions with whether an event was race related or race-unrelated and ideology ($F(1, 415)= 27.68, p < .001$) as well as time point and ideology ($F(3, 1245)= 3.11, p = .026$). These, in turn, were qualified by the three-way interaction with of whether an event was race related or race-unrelated, time point, and ideology ($F(3, 1245)= 5.72, p < .001$).

Table 3

Means and statistics for ideology and year for Pilot Study 1

Ideology	1955	1963	1967	2019	Mean across years
Liberals	-.96 (1.74) $t = -8.42, p < .001$	-.46 (1.69) $t = -4.12, p < .001$	-.52 (1.86) $t = -4.31, p < .001$	-.44 (1.33) $t = -5.07, p < .001$	-.60(1.03) $t = -8.85, p < .001$
Conservatives	-.26 (1.20) $t = -2.99, p = .003$.29 (1.44) $t = 2.79, p = .006$	-.14 (1.40) $t = -1.51, p = .134$	-.38 (1.29) $t = -4.02, p > .001$	-.13 (.72) $t = -2.04, p = .018$

To deconstruct this three-way interaction, I computed difference scores between race-related and race-unrelated items for each time point pair, and then tested whether each difference score was different from zero, for each ideological group (conservative and liberal). Means, standard deviations, and test of statistics can be found in Table 3. As can be seen, liberal participants placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated events.

Conservative participants also placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated

events but not to the extent that liberals did. Altogether, then, these data were inconsistent with Hypothesis 1.

Discussion

In Pilot Study 1, I found that overall, participants unexpectedly placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated events. However, upon breaking findings down by ideology, I saw that it was consistently liberals that placed race related events closer to the present. Conservatives were more variable and, in one pairing, placed race-related events further in the past.

In the present study, I included one item that featured a negative race-related event and a positive race-unrelated event while the other three items featured a negative race-related event and a negative race-unrelated event. This difference in valence could be important for understanding participants' perceptions of historical time. One could argue that negative race-related events would be placed further from the present because they are not favorable. To test the impact of events and the potential impact of valence, I generated more pairings with varying valence in Pilot Study 2. Therefore, Pilot Study 2 tested the impact of valence. Specifically, I examined whether perceptions of temporal distance for race-related events hinged on how negative or positive the events were.

Pilot Study 2

Pilot Study 1 suggested that White people perceived historical time differentially depending on if the event was race-related compared to race-unrelated. However, the measure used in Pilot Study 1 only featured four pairings. It also had an unequal representation of valence pairings, three featured a negative race-related event and a negative race-unrelated event and only one featured a negative race related event and a positive race-unrelated event, which may be

a confound. Therefore, in Pilot Study 2, pairings were matched or opposed on valence. Pairings were as follows: positive race-related event and positive race-unrelated event, negative race-related event and negative race-unrelated event, positive race-related event and negative race-unrelated event, negative race-related event and positive race-unrelated event. Therefore, in addition to testing whether race-related and race-unrelated events were differentially distanced, I also tested Hypothesis 2A, whether valence matters for historical time distortion. Pilot Study 2 also added seven outcome variables which further assessed differences between race-related and race-unrelated events, see appendix for these results.

Method

Participants

Six hundred White American participants were recruited from Prolific, 618 participated in the study. Fifteen participants did not finish the study and were removed. Two participants indicated that they did not think their data should be used in analyses so were removed. Seven did not identify as White and were removed. The final dataset consisted of 594 participants. In the final dataset, 340 identified as women, 245 as men, nine identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, six identified as transgender, and one indicated that their gender identity was not listed. The average age was 38.69 ($SD= 13.61$) and the modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure

After they consented to participate, participants were told that they would read about some historical events and provide their opinions on these events. Specifically, they were told: *“In this study, we want to know about your opinions on American history. You will read about 8 historical events and answer some questions about each event.”* Participants were then randomly

assigned to one of four valence conditions: (1) positive race-related event and positive race-unrelated event, (2) negative race-related event and negative race-unrelated event, (3) positive race-related event and negative race-unrelated event, (4) negative race-related event and positive race-unrelated event. In each condition, participants saw eight historical events in random order. After each event, participants responded to eight items. Participants then responded to demographic questions and were debriefed.

Historical Events

With the aid of research assistants, 13 pairs of historical events were added. Events were matched by year for a total of 16 pairings ranging from 1919 to 1983. From Pilot Study 1, the 2019 year pairing was dropped to keep events objectively further in the past. As with Pilot Study 1, each year represented in the pairings had two events, one event explicitly tied to racism (race-related) and one event not explicitly tied to racism (race-unrelated; see appendix for full list of items and Table 4 for examples). Each historical event summary was closely matched on length such that one event in the pairing was not significantly longer than the other event. I also aimed to have specifics of the event as similar as possible. For example, if one event involved a group of people, I aimed to find a paired event that also featured a group of people.

Table 4

Examples of Race-Related and Race-Unrelated events from each valence condition in Pilot Study 2

Condition	Race-Related Event	Race-Unrelated Event
Race-Related Negative, Race-Unrelated Positive	In 1970, police opened fire on a group of students at Jackson State College, a historically Black college. Police Officers shot and killed two black students and injured twelve. Prior to the shooting, students were rioting in response to a rumor that civil rights activist Charles Evers had	In 1970, US Senator Nelson organized the first Earth Day, a day to honor Earth and the concept of peace. More than 200 million Americans entered the streets, making the first Earth Day the largest single-day protest in history. Nelson was later awarded the Presidential

	been assassinated. After an investigation on the shooting, the police were criticized, but no arrests were made.	Medal of Freedom for his work.
Race-Related Positive, Race-Unrelated Positive	In August 1983, Guion "Guy" Bluford became the first African American to travel into space when he served as a mission specialist aboard the Space Shuttle Challenger.	In June 1983, Sally Ride, Ph.D., became the first woman from the United States to travel to space and make it into orbit aboard the Space Shuttle Challenger.
Race-Related Negative, Race-Unrelated Negative	In late 1963, white supremacists bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services; four young Black girls were killed in the explosion. The church bombing was the third in 11 days, after the federal government had ordered the integration of Alabama schools.	In late 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated as he rode in a motorcade in Dallas, Texas. Kennedy's assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was later arrested and killed before standing trial. Kennedy was the fourth president to have died as a result of an assassination attempt.
Race-Related Positive, Race-Unrelated Negative	Jackie Robinson, previously famous for being the first Black player on a minor league baseball team to play on a major league team, became more well known when he debuted in the National League in 1947. He became the first player of color in major league baseball history. His legacy grew even more as he went on to win the rookie of the year award, most valuable player award, and was elected into the national baseball hall of fame.	Elizabeth Short, who was already famous as an actress, gained more public attention after being murdered in 1947. The images of the murder were gruesome as the young actress had been split in half at the waist. The FBI joined the investigation to support the L.A. police. To this day, the murderer has never been found. Her legacy is highlighted by a famous cold case that still garners attention today.

Measures

After reading about a historical event, participants were first asked "*How far away does this event feel to you?*" and responded on a 1 to 7 scale with 1 being "*feels like yesterday*" and 7 being "*feels like ages ago.*" This measure of temporal distance was the same as in Pilot Study 1.

Participants were then asked “*did you know about this historical event before?*” and answered yes or no. On average, participants broadly knew about the same number of race-unrelated events ($M= 1.71$) as they did race-related events ($M= 1.95$). Participants were then asked “*How important was this event to US history*” and answered on a scale of one (“*not at all important*”) to seven (“*very important*”). Participants were then asked “*To what extent do you believe this event should be taught in K-12 schools?*” and answered on a scale of one (“*Definitely should not be taught*”) to seven (“*Definitely should be taught*”). Participants were then asked about how impactful they believed the event was in the past and currently is. Specifically, they were asked “*How impactful was this event? Specifically, back then, how many people were impacted by this event?*” and “*How impactful is this event? Specifically, to what extent is this event relevant for the way things are today?*” and responded on a scale of one (“*not at all impactful*”) to seven (“*very impactful*”).

Next, participants were told that some events are positive and elicit pride while others are negative and elicit shame. They were then asked “*how negative or positive do you think this event is*” on a one (“*really negative*”) to seven (“*really positive*”) scale. Lastly, participants were asked “*how much shame or pride does this event bring?*” on a scale of one (“*great shame*”) to seven (“*great pride*”). These eight questions were asked following each historical event participants read about. As in Pilot Study 1, I calculated a difference score for each year pairing for each question asked.

Results

Here, I tested Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2A, and Hypothesis 2B, and thus focused on participants’ perceptions of how distant or close to the present historical events felt. For analyses

of the other variables (e.g., perceptions of how important an event is, and whether it ought to be taught in school), please see the detailed Appendix.

Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2A: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events and, in Particular, Negative Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past?

To test this, I first conducted a repeated measures ANOVA on distance ratings with event type (race-related vs. race-unrelated) and time point (1919 to 1983) as within-participant variables, and condition as a between-participant variable. I found main effects of condition, $F(3, 590) = 5.47, p = .001$, event type, $F(1, 590) = 12.33, p = .0005$, and time point, $F(3, 1770) = 76.54, p < .0001$. These were qualified by two-way interactions with condition and event type, $F(9, 1770) = 73.74, p < .0001$, as well as condition and time point, $F(3, 1770) = 76.54, p < .0001$. These, in turn, were qualified by the three-way interaction, $F(9, 1770) = 6.90, p < .0001$.

To deconstruct this three-way interaction, as before, I computed difference scores between race-related and race-unrelated items for each time point pair, and then tested whether each difference score was different from zero, for each condition. Means, standard deviations, and test of statistics can be found in Table 5. As can be seen, participants placed race-related historical events closer to the present in every condition.

Table 5

Means and statistics for condition and event for Pilot Study 2

Condition	Event 1	Event 2	Event 3	Event 4	Mean across events
Negative race-related, Negative race-unrelated	-.59 (1.60) $t = -4.52,$ $p < .0001$	-.01 (1.34) $t = -.12,$ $p = .90$	-.07 (.10) $t = -.67, p = .51$.40 (1.19) $t = 4.08,$ $p < .001$	-.07 (.70) $t = -1.19,$ $p = .237$
Negative race-related,	-.01 (1.72) $t = -.77, p = .44$	-.27 (1.73) $t = -1.93,$ $p = .06$	-.20 (1.51) $t = -1.59,$ $p = .11$	-.15 (1.01) $t = -1.80,$ $p = .07$	-.18 (1.00) $t = -2.21,$ $p = .03$

Positive race-unrelated					
Positive race-related,	.03 (1.08) $t = .38, p = .71$	-.11 (1.12) $t = 1.25, p = .22$	-.13 (.95) $t = -1.73, p = .086$	-.36 (1.44) $t = -3.07, p = .003$	-.14 (.63) $t = -2.80, p = .006$
Positive race-unrelated					
Positive race-related,	.01 (1.23) $t = .13, p = .89$.01 (.84) $t = 1.47, p = .14$	-.29 (1.17) $t = -2.96, p = .004$.01 (1.14) $t = .15, p = .88$	-.04 (.62) $t = -.76, p = .45$
Negative race-unrelated					

Altogether, then, these data were contrary to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2A as White participants placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated events, regardless of valence. However, these results were consistent with Pilot Study 1 findings. Next, I then looked at ideology, to test Hypothesis 2B. Recall that in the Pilot Study 1, this is where I found consistent results; conservatives placed race-related events further in the past than liberals.

Hypothesis 2B: Does Ideology Play a Role in the Placement of Race-related Historical Events?

To test this, I conducted a repeated measures ANOVA on placement of events and event type (race-related vs. race-unrelated) and time point (1919 to 1983) as within-participant variables, and ideology as a between-participant variable. I found main effects of event type, $F(1, 508) = 4.36, p = .04$, time point, $F(3, 1524) = 37.15, p < .001$, and ideology, $F(1, 508) = 16.76, p < .001$. These were qualified by two-way interactions with ideology and event type, $F(1, 508) = 14.83, p < .001$, but not for ideology and time point, $F(3, 1524) = 2.01, p = .11$. These, in turn, were qualified by the three-way interaction, $F(3, 1524) = 4.71, p = .003$.

To deconstruct this three-way interaction, as before, I computed difference scores between race-related and race-unrelated items for each time point pair, and then tested whether

each difference score was different from zero, for each ideological group (conservative and liberal). Means, standard deviations, and test of statistics can be found in Table 6. As can be seen, liberal participants placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated events while conservative participants did not show a difference in placement between race-related and race-unrelated events. Altogether, then, these data were inconsistent with Hypothesis 2B.

Table 6

Means and statistics for ideology and event for Pilot Study 2

Ideology	Event 1	Event 2	Event 3	Event 4	Mean across events
Liberals	-.34 (1.54) $t = -4.13$, $p < .001$	-.24 (1.33) $t = -3.27$, $p = .001$	-.26 (1.23) $t = -3.95$, $p < .001$	0 (1.26) $t = .04$, $p = .97$	-.22 (.80) $t = -5.19$, $p < .001$
Conservatives	.15 (1.14) $t = 1.63$, $p = .10$.20 (1.12) $t = 2.29$, $p = .02$	-.04 (1.16) $t = -.40$, $p = .69$	-.06 (1.14) $t = -.69$, $p = .49$.09 (.70) $t = 1.49$, $p = .14$

Discussion

Surprisingly, while temporal placement means were significantly different from zero, there was no significant effect of valence condition on temporal placement, contrary to Hypothesis 2A. So while there was a difference in temporal placement between race-related and race-unrelated events, valence seemed not to be of importance. However, by looking at political ideology, it became apparent that liberals and conservatives diverged in their reported temporal distancing of race-related and race-unrelated events. Liberals placed race-related events closer to the present than race-unrelated events. In contrast, conservatives placed race-related events further in the past than liberals, consistent with Hypothesis 2B. However, while conservatives placed race related events further in the past than liberals, conservative's placement of race-related events compared to race-unrelated events was not significantly different from zero.

Conservatives placed race-related events further in the past than liberals but they did not place these events significantly further in the past than race-unrelated events. While it was hypothesized that conservatives would be especially likely to place race-related events further in the past than liberals, I did not hypothesize that liberals would place race-related events closer to the present. However, this finding replicated Pilot Study 1¹.

Pilot Study 3

In Pilot Study 1 and Pilot Study 2, I did not find evidence that White participants placed race-related historical events further into the past. However, two features of the measure used in these studies are worth mentioning. First, each item specified the year in which a historical event occurred. For example, one item read, "In 1970..." It could be participants' responses were constrained because I provided the year. It could having provided the exact year created a contrast effect, whereby some events would have felt like "ages ago" were it not for the year being presented, but the year--and how close the year was to present day—may have surprised participants. It could be that learning about racist history and realizing that it was not so long ago led some participants (e.g. liberal participants) to place these events closer to the present (see Appendix for a study where the task from Pilot Studies 1 and 2 is the same but year is removed).

Second, participants were asked to rate the extent to which various events felt "like yesterday" to "ages ago." This method, which I borrowed from Ji and colleagues (2009), while clever, did not get at historical distortion but, rather, subjective sense of time. More specifically, it did not require participants to contend with historical truth and accuracy. Participants could

¹See Appendix for a version of Pilot Studies 1 and 2 where I removed year from the historical events. Across Pilots 1 and 2 as well as the aforementioned Appendix study, I did not find evidence that White participants placed race-related events further in the past.

have simply reported that all historical events felt like a long time ago but not ages ago and not like yesterday; and indeed, that is essentially what they did.

In Pilot Study 3, then, I created a measure that took on these potential issues (and here, I am thankful to my dissertation committee for suggesting this). I created a measure in which participants ranked historical events in the order in which they believed the events occurred. Essentially, participants placed events on a timeline. When I created this task, I chose five events from Pilot Study 2 that participants indicated they most recognized. I supplemented those events with three new events to provide a greater spread in years as many of the events from Pilot Study 2 happened within a couple of decades.

I launched the study and collected data from 200 participants (Wave 1). Three days after the launch, I noticed that the scale did not have clear anchors and thus re-launched the study and collected 201 more participants, this time with more clear anchors (Wave 2). Specifically, in Wave 1 they were told: “Please rank the following historical events in the order in which you believe the events occurred. Click and drag to change the order of events.” In Wave 2 they were told: “Please rank the following historical events in the order in which you believe the events occurred. Click and drag to change the order of events. The top (number 1) means the event is furthest away in the past and the bottom (number 8) means the event is closest to the present.” The only difference between these two waves of data collection was the inclusion of the scale anchors. Here, I reported analyses across these two waves of data collection, but results looked the same when I looked just at Wave 1 data or just Wave 2 data.

Method

Participants

Across Wave 1 and Wave 2, 401 participants completed the study. Eighty-four participants did not identify as White and were removed. One participant indicated that they did not think their data should be used in analyses so was removed. One participant was excluded for providing an impossible age (over 1000). The final dataset consisted of 315 participants. In the final dataset, 137 identified as women, 172 as men, five identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, and one identified as transgender. The average age was 41.09 ($SD= 13.33$) and the modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure

After consenting to participate, participants were told that they would read about historical events and rank these events in the order they thought the events happened. All participants then saw the same eight events in randomized order. Four of the events were race-related events and four were race-unrelated events. After ranking the events in the order participants believed the events happened, participants responded to various demographic items and were debriefed.

Historical Events

Four race-related events and four race-unrelated events were shown to participants, the events ranged from 1848 to 1992. Some events were taken from Pilot Study 1 and Pilot Study 2, other events were added to create a greater spread in years (see Table 7 for events). To prepare to analyze the data, I first calculated an accuracy score for each historical event. To do this, I took the position participants placed the event at and subtracted by the correct position number. For example, if a participant placed the start of the Civil War as the first event but the Civil War is actually the second event, the participants accuracy score for this item was -1. Negative numbers indicated that the event was being placed further in the past than it actually was, positive

numbers indicated that the event was placed closer to the present than it actually was. I then created a composite of race-related events and a composite of race-unrelated events. As with single events, positive composite scores indicated that the participant placed events closer to the present than they should have and negative scores indicated that the events were placed further in the past than they actually were.

Table 7

Race-Related and Race-Unrelated events in Pilot Study 3

Race-Related Events	Race-Unrelated Events
The Confederate states instigated the civil war.	The California Gold Rush began and it led to a booming population in California and greatly impacted the U.S. economy.
The Supreme Court reached their decision on the case <i>Brown vs. Board of Education</i> , which established racial segregation in public schools as unconstitutional.	The Battle of Midway was a turning point of the war. United States intelligence intercepted word of plans by the Japanese to attack the island of Midway.
A reporter broke the story about the Tuskegee Syphilis Study. This study, meant to record the natural history of Syphilis in Black men, was revealed for its exploitative nature.	The stock market crash in the United States started the period of the Great Depression.
Four police officers were acquitted of the gruesome beating of Rodney King. This acquittal resulted in riots in Los Angeles, CA that lasted days.	President John F. Kennedy was assassinated as he rode in a motorcade in Dallas, Texas.

Results

Here, I tested Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2A, and Hypothesis 2B, and thus focused on participants' ranking of race-related events relative to race-unrelated events and whether conservatives placed race-related events further in the past than did liberals.

Hypothesis 1: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past?

To test this question, I conducted a one sample t-test comparing the race-related events composite against zero. Zero was the test statistic because if participants were accurate in their placement of events, their composite score would be zero. The mean value of the composite of race-related events ($M = -.39$, $SD = .61$) was significantly different from zero; $t(310) = 11.42$, $p < .001$, $d = .65$. Race-related events were placed further in the past than the events actually occurred. This finding supported my hypothesis that race-related events were placed further in the past than they happened. It was then important to test whether ideology played a role as I hypothesized that the distancing of race related events would be stronger among conservative participants because of the threat these events may have elicited.

Hypothesis 2A: Do Participants Place Negative Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past than Positive Race-related Events?

I tested whether the negative race-related events and the one positive race-related event were different from zero. Negative race-related events were placed further in the past ($M = -.66$, $SD = .71$) than the events actually happened, $t(310) = -16.44$, $p < .001$. In contrast, the positive race-related event was placed closer to the present ($M = .405$, $SD = 1.36$) than the event actually happened, $t(310) = 5.24$, $p < .001$. Participants placed the positive race-related event closer to the present while they placed the negative race-related events further in the past. Altogether, then, these data were consistent with Hypothesis 2A.

Hypothesis 2B: Does Ideology Play a Role in the Placement of Race-related Historical Events?

I conducted a regression analysis to test if ideology significantly predicted participants' placement of race-related and race-unrelated historical events. The overall regression where

ideology predicted placement of race-related events did not account for a significant amount of variance ($R^2 = .006$, $F(1, 309) = 1.77$, $p = .81$). I found that ideology did not significantly predict placement of race-related events ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .184$). In summary, ideology did not significantly predict the placement of either race-related historical events. This was contrary to hypothesis 2C which predicted that distancing of race-related historical events would be strongest among conservatives. Instead, it seemed that liberals and conservatives were equally likely to place race-related events further in the past.

Discussion

In Pilot Study 3, participants ranked race-related and race-unrelated events in the order in which they believed the events happened. I found that, consistent Hypothesis 1, participants placed race-related events further in the past than the events actually happened and thus placed race-unrelated events closer to the present. It is interesting that the measure seemed to operate differently from the measure used in Pilot Study 1 and Pilot Study 2. It seemed to have captured something different. Notably, the Pilot Study 3 measure got at historical distortion directly by asking participants to place events in the order the participants thought the events happened. The measure, then, imposed some trade-offs (i.e., placing an event closer to the present meant placing another event closer to the distant past). It also made clear that there is an order -- an accurate and truthful order-- and that ideally participants would report that order. In this way, I think the measure was closer to what I originally intended; it was a measure of historical distortion, with higher (absolute) numbers denoting larger deviations from truth.

I also found, consistent with Hypothesis 2A, that while participants placed negative race-related items further in the past, they placed the race-related positive item closer to the present.

White people were willing to bring race-related events closer only when the event was positive, when the event painted their ingroup in a positive light.

Contrary to hypotheses, ideology was not a significant predictor of placement of race-related events. I hypothesized that the phenomenon of placing race-related events further in the past would be especially strong for conservatives as opposed to liberals because race-related historical events would be especially threatening to their group identity. This is because, I hypothesized, conservatives were more likely than liberals to believe in American exceptionalism. One would expect that historical events where the United States is shown in a negative light would be especially threatening to people that strongly identify with being American and believe that the United States is uniquely great. One reason I may not have seen ideology as a significant predictor in this study is because the threat of race-related historical events might be threatening on the White American dimension more so than on American exceptionalism. Essentially, that race-related historical events were highly threatening to the White American identity more broadly. Another possibility is that these events were threatening to liberals and conservatives for different reasons. For conservatives, race-related historical events could have been viewed as an attack on White identity and American exceptionalism. For liberals, these events could have been a threat to White identity and perceptions White people as allies in the fight for racial justice. If these race-related historical events occurred when they actually did as opposed to further in the past, then White liberals would have had to contend with the realities of slow moving racial progress.

Given these possibilities, a stronger test of my prediction--that group status threat leads White people to distort historical truths about racism--was to experimentally manipulate group status threat and measure historical distortions. This is what I did in my next two experiments.

Experiment 1

Pilot Study 1, Pilot Study 2, and Pilot Study 3 examined whether White people placed race-related history further in the past. In Pilot Study 3, I found that, beyond ideology, White participants placed race-related historical events further in the past than these events actually happened. In Experiments 1 and 2, I tested whether this placing of race-related events further in the past increased as a result of heightened group status threat. I manipulated group status threat with the hypothesis that White people in the threat condition would report greater distancing of race-related historical events, demonstrating that distancing of history is motivated. In Experiment 1, I manipulated threat by using a manipulation evidenced to elicit threat by highlighting diversity initiatives benefiting Black people.

I also added individual difference measures (i.e., measures that assess racial resentment and white nationalism) to assess whether there was a systematic difference in how participants responded to the timeline task. I decided to use racial resentment as a proxy for anti-Black attitudes because the scale included items related to the denial of historical racism (ANES, 2018). Further, I decided to use a white nationalism scale. White nationalism is the belief that White people are superior to other racial groups and that they deserve preferential treatment (Reyna et al, 2022). I decided to measure white nationalism as I was interested in how those who subscribed to a White identity may have held negative beliefs and engaged in distancing of history (Reyna et al, 2022). As such, I expected that those higher in racial resentment and white nationalism would have placed race-related events further in the past because these events threatened their world view.

Method

Participants were recruited from Prolific and were prescreened based on the self-reported demographic questionnaire. Anyone who indicated that they were White were eligible to participate. Three hundred and two White participants completed the study. Two participants indicated that they did not think their data should be used in analyses so were removed. The final dataset consisted of 300 participants. In the final dataset, 142 identified as women, 152 as men, four identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, and one indicated that their gender identity was not listed. The average age was 43.62 ($SD= 14.05$) and the modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure and Materials

To manipulate threat, I adapted a manipulation used by Trawalter and colleagues (2023). Participants were assigned to one of two conditions, group-status threat and no group status threat. In the group-status threat condition, participants read an article which framed organizational costs of supporting Black employees. The article highlighted organizational programs that benefitted Black employees presumably at the cost of White employees relative positioning and advancement (see Appendix for article). A version of this article was found by Trawalter and colleagues to elicit group status threat in White participants. Participants in the no group status threat condition read an article that detailed similar initiatives but the initiatives in the no group status threat condition were aimed at benefiting employees broadly, not just Black employees (see Appendix for article).

After reading the article, participants completed the timeline task developed in Pilot Study 3. Specifically, they were presented with eight historical events and ranked these events in the order in which they believe the events happened. Lastly, participants responded to demographic items and were debriefed.

Results

First, I tested Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2A, and Hypothesis 2B as a replication of Pilot Study 3.

Hypothesis 1: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past?

To test this question, I first conducted a one sample t-test comparing the race-related events composite against zero. Again, zero was the test statistic because if participants were correct in their rankings, their composite score would be zero. The mean value of the composite of race-related events ($M = -.44$, $SD = .61$) was significantly different from zero; $t(310) = -12.46$, $p < .001$, $d = .61$. White participants placed race-related events further in the past than they actually occurred.

Hypothesis 2A: Do Participants Place Negative Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past than Positive Race-related Events?

I tested whether the negative race-related events and the one positive race-related event were different from zero. Negative race-related events were placed further in the past ($M = -.73$, $SD = .65$) than the events actually happened, $t(299) = -19.54$, $p < .001$. In contrast, the positive race-related event was placed closer to the present ($M = .44$, $SD = 1.44$) than the event actually happened, $t(299) = 5.32$, $p < .001$. Participants placed the positive race-related event closer to the present while they placed the negative race-related events further in the past. Altogether, then, these data were consistent with Hypothesis 2A.

Hypothesis 2B: Do Ideology and Other Individual Differences Play a Role in the Placement of Race-related Historical Events?

I conducted a regression analysis to test if ideology significantly predicted participants' placement of race-related and race-unrelated historical events. The overall regression where

ideology predicted ranking of race-related events did not account for a significant amount of variance ($R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 297) = .09$, $p = .77$). I found that ideology did not significantly predict ranking of race-related events ($\beta = -.02$, $t(297) = -.30$, $p = .77$). In summary, as in Pilot Study 3, ideology did not significantly predict the ranking of race-related historical events. Again, this ran contrary to hypothesis 2C which predicted that distancing of race-related historical events would be strongest among conservatives.

Next, I tested whether white nationalism and racial resentment predicted placement of race-related events. I conducted a regression analysis to test if white nationalist beliefs significantly predicted participants' placement of race-related historical events. I found that the overall regression where white nationalism predicted placement of race-related events did not explain a significant portion of variance ($R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 297) = .32$, $p = .57$). White nationalism did not significantly predict placement of race-related events ($\beta = -.03$, $t(297) = -.57$, $p = .57$).

I also conducted a regression analysis to test if racial resentment was a significant predictor of participants' placement of race-related historical events. I found that the overall regression with racial resentment as a predictor of placement of race-related events did not explain a significant portion of variance ($R^2 = -.00$, $F(1, 297) = 4.36$, $p = .68$). Racial resentment did not significantly predict placement of race-related events ($\beta = .02$, $t(297) = .41$, $p = .68$).

Hypothesis 2C: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past When Group Threat is Experimentally Heightened?

To test hypothesis 2C, I conducted a one-way ANOVA on participants placement of race-related historical events with condition (e.g. group status threat or no group status threat) as the independent variable. I found no significant effect of group status threat condition on placement

of historical events, $F(1, 298) = 1.44, p = .23$. Experimentally heightened group status threat did not impact placement of race-related historical events, contrary to hypotheses.

Discussion

Experiment 1 results supported Hypothesis 1. Participants placed race-related historical events further in the past; they distanced these events. Experiment 1 results did not provide support for Hypothesis 2, however. Specifically, Experiment 1 did not provide support for hypothesis 2B as I found that ideology did not predict placement of race-related historical events. I also did not find support for Hypothesis 2B, the group status threat manipulation did not affect placement of race-related historical events.

It could be that White participants did not place racist history further in the past in the experimental condition because the threat manipulation did not identify a history of racism as part of the problem the proposed racial equity policies were trying to solve. It could be that White people are particularly adept at placing racist history further in the past when it is that specific history that is the problem, but not when that history is not clearly tied to the problem at hand.

In Experiment 2, then, I again manipulated group status threat but I explicitly mentioned how the US's racist history is the reason why the US needs racial equity policies and, specifically, reparations for slavery.

Experiment 2

In Experiment 2, I manipulated group status threat by assigning participants to read an article about reparations at the beginning or end of the study. I used reparations for slavery as a manipulation because it is a topic in which White people, as evidenced in the media by politicians, place race-related historical harms further in the past. Further, reparations

intentionally do not benefit White people and also call upon a racist history, linking that history to the present. It highlights White peoples' wrongdoings and Black peoples subsequent suffering. For these reasons, reparations might elicit group status threat.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from Prolific. As in Experiment 1, participants were prescreened so that only self-identified White people were eligible to participate. Three hundred White participants completed the study. One participant indicated that they did not think their data should be used in analyses so was removed. The final dataset consisted of 299 participants. In the final dataset, 143 identified as women, 150 as men, five identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, and one indicated that their gender identity was not listed. The average age was 43.45 ($SD= 14.39$) and the modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure and Materials

To manipulate group status threat, I wrote a news article about the national reparations committee as well as various cities across the United States that have proposed plans regarding reparations for slavery. The article suggested that reparations for slavery were planned across the US and therefore possible at the national level (See Appendix for article). I expected this manipulation to elicit group status threat because White Americans broadly do not support reparations (80% do not support; Pew, 2022). Reparations, as stated previously, may elicit group status threat by connecting the past to the present in ways that make the racist acts of White group members salient.

Participants responded to items assessing their support for reparations after reading the article and then completed the historical event placement task taken from Pilot Study 3. They

were presented with eight historical events (four racism related and four racism-unrelated) and tasked with putting the events in a timeline. Then, participants responded to an item assessing felt group status threat as a manipulation check (see Appendix for the group status threat item). After that, participants responded to measures assessing their racial resentment and white nationalist beliefs (ANES, 2011; Reyna, 2022). Last, participants responded to various demographic items and were debriefed.

Results

First, I tested whether condition had the expected effect on the manipulation check. I conducted a one-way ANOVA on the manipulation check (groups status threat item) with condition (e.g. group status threat or no group status threat) as the independent variable. This analysis revealed no effect of group status threat condition on the manipulation check, $F(1, 297) = .28, p = .60, \eta^2 = .00$. I intended for the manipulation to lead to an increase in felt group status threat. However, the results suggest that the manipulation did not change participants feelings of group status threat.

Next, I tested Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2A, and Hypothesis 2B as a replication of Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1.

Hypothesis 1: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past?

To test this question, I first conducted a one sample t-test comparing the race-related historical events and the race-unrelated historical events composites against zero. The mean value of the composite of race-related events ($M = -.42, SD = .55$) was significantly different from zero; $t(310) = -13.33, p < .001, d = .55$. There was a difference such that race-related events were placed further in the past than they actually occurred, these results replicated Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1.

Hypothesis 2A: Do Participants Place Negative Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past than Positive Race-related Events?

I tested whether the negative race-related events and the one positive race-related event were different from zero. Negative race-related events were placed further in the past ($M = -.69$, $SD = .64$) than the events actually happened, $t(297) = -18.53$, $p < .001$. In contrast, the positive race-related event was placed closer to the present ($M = .37$, $SD = 1.33$) than the event actually happened, $t(297) = 4.83$, $p < .001$. Participants placed the positive race-related event closer to the present while they placed the negative race-related events further in the past. Altogether, then, these data were consistent with Hypothesis 2A.

Hypothesis 2B: Do Ideology and Other Individual Differences Play a Role in the Placement of Race-related Historical Events?

I conducted a regression analysis to test if ideology significantly predicted participants' placement of race-related events. The overall regression where ideology predicted ranking of race-related events did explain a significant portion of variance ($R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 296) = 4.45$, $p = .04$). I found that ideology did significantly predict ranking of race-related events ($\beta = -.12$, $t(296) = -2.11$, $p = .04$). Unlike in Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1, ideology did significantly predict the placement of race-related historical events.

In addition to ideology, I also measured racial resentment and white nationalism as individual differences. I conducted a regression analysis to test if white nationalist beliefs were a significant predictor of participants' placement of race-related historical events. The overall regression where white nationalism predicted placement of race-related events was statistically significant ($R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 296) = 4.79$, $p = .03$). I found that white nationalism did significantly predict ranking of race-related events ($\beta = -.13$, $t(296) = -2.19$, $p = .03$).

I also conducted a regression analysis to test if racial resentment was a significant predictor of participants' placement of race-related historical events. The overall regression where racial resentment predicted placement of race-related events was statistically significant ($R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 296) = 4.36$, $p = .04$). I found that racial resentment did significantly predict placement of race-related events ($\beta = -.12$, $t(296) = -2.09$, $p = .04$).

Hypothesis 2C: Do Participants Place Race-related Historical Events Further in the Past When Group Threat is Experimentally Heightened?

To test Hypothesis 2C, I conducted a one-way ANOVA on participants placement of race-related historical events with condition (e.g. group status threat or no group status threat) as the independent variable. This analysis revealed no effect of group status threat condition on placement of race-related historical events, $F(1, 296) = .00$, $p = .97$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Interestingly, the single group status threat item also did not predict placement of race-related historical events. I conducted a regression analysis to test if the group status threat item significantly predicted participants' placement of race-related historical events. The overall regression where group status threat predicted placement of race-related events was not statistically significant ($R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 296) = .28$, $p = .59$). I found that group status threat did not significantly predict ranking of race-related events ($\beta = -.03$, $t(296) = -.53$, $p = .59$). This was contrary to what I hypothesized. The reparations manipulation did not impact group status threat; moreover, the single group status threat item also did not predict placement of race-related events.

Discussion

Experiment 2 replicated the findings of Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1, showing that participants placed race-related historical events further in the past than they actually happened.

However, Experiment 2 differed from Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1 in that ideology significantly predicted the placement of race-related historical events. In this study, more conservatism predicted greater distance from race-related historical events, which is consistent with Hypothesis 2B. Hypothesis 2B posited that White conservatives would be particularly inclined to place race-related historical events further in the past because of heightened perception of threat. I also found that racial resentment and white nationalism predicted the placement of race-related events, in line with Hypothesis 2B and the possibility that historical distortion is motivated by group status threat. This finding contrasts with Experiment 1, which did not find that racial resentment and white nationalism predicted the placement of race-related events.

Finally, I did not find evidence that my manipulation increased group status threat. I found no condition effects on the placement of race-related events, inconsistent with Hypothesis 2C. While this could suggest that group status threat does not impact distancing of race-related historical events, it is important to highlight that a single item measure of group status threat may not be sufficient to make such a claim. Though this item has been a useful measure of group status threat in past studies (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b), the item might not have captured participants' felt group status threat because of self-presentation concerns. Participants may not have been able or willing to report group status threat in the way it was measured.

General Discussion

In the present work, I took a quantitative approach to studying temporal distancing of race-related history. I predicted that White participants would distance race-related history (Hypothesis 1) and that this distancing would be motivated (Hypothesis 2). More specifically, I predicted that White participants would distance race-related history to the extent that this

history was negative (Hypothesis 2A), that conservatives would be most likely to do so, because such information would be most threatening to them (Hypothesis 2B), and that participants would be most likely to distance race-related history when experiencing heightened group status threat (Hypothesis 2C).

Testing Hypothesis 1 first required developing an appropriate measure of historical distancing. In this dissertation, I tried two broad approaches to measure historical distancing. First, borrowing from Ji and colleagues (2009), I asked White participants to report the extent to which various race-related and race-unrelated events felt “like yesterday” to “ages ago.” In Pilot Studies 1 and 2, I examined whether White participants placed race-related historical events further in the past compared to race-unrelated events that happened in the same year. Second, in Pilot Study 3, I created a measure in which I asked White participants to place historical race-related and race-unrelated events in the order in which they believed the events occurred. Results from the first approach consistently contradicted Hypothesis 1, as I found that participants placed race-related historical events closer to the present than race-unrelated events (Pilot Studies 1 and 2). In contrast, results from the second approach consistently supported Hypothesis 1, as participants consistently placed race-related historical events further in the past than the events *actually happened* (Pilot Studies 3 and Experiments 1 and 2).

For Experiments 1 and 2, I decided to use the second approach. There are two reasons why I believe the second approach was the best approach to use. First, the timeline approach centered historical truth in ways that the initial approach did not. Using the timeline approach, participants could—to the extent that they were able and willing—order historical events in the right order; they could, in essence, tell the truth about history. Using the initial approach, participants were asked how they *feel* about historical events (e.g. “feels like ages ago”) which

did not have a correct (i.e., true) answer. Whatever they reported, it was “their truth” independent of historical truths. Because I aimed to investigate White people’s ability and willingness to tell the truth about history, I preferred the timeline approach.

Second, the timeline approach allows for a more standardized conception of time. Using the scale from Pilot Studies 1 and 2, participants may have had different ideas of what “far” or “close” meant to them. The timeline bypasses this issue by providing a more concrete representation of time, one that is ordinal and not subject to different interpretations. For all these reasons, I decided that the timeline task was the best fit for the experiments.

In Experiments 1 and 2, I replicated the findings from Pilot Study 3 and found that White participants placed race-related historical events further in the past than race-unrelated events, consistent with Hypothesis 1. To test Hypothesis 2, I examined whether distancing of race-related history was motivated. To do this, I examined positive vs. negative race-related events, considered ideology and related individual differences (namely, white nationalism and racial resentment), and manipulated group status threat. Collectively, the data offered mixed evidence for the claim that distancing race-related history is motivated.

Results were inconsistent for Hypothesis 2A, that negative race-related events would be distanced more than positive race-related events. In Pilot Study 2, I found that participants placed race-related events closer to the present, regardless of valence. However, in Pilot Study 3 and Experiments 1 and 2, participants placed negative race-related events further in the past than positive race-related events, which supported Hypothesis 2A. Notably, in the paradigm for which I am most confident in (the timeline approach), participants placed negative events further in the past.

I found decidedly mixed evidence for Hypothesis 2B, that conservatives would be most likely to distance race-related events. I found in Pilots 1 and 2 and in Experiment 2 that conservatives placed race-related events further in the past than liberals. In Pilot Study 3 and Experiment 1, I found that conservatism did not predict placement of race-related historical events. I measured white nationalism and racial resentment in Experiments 1 and 2, here I found inconsistent results. I found that white nationalism and racial resentment did not predict distancing of race-related events in Experiment 1. However, I found that white nationalism and racial resentment did predict distancing of race-related events such that higher racial resentment and white nationalism predicted greater distancing in Experiment 2. Taken altogether then, ideology did not predict distancing of racist history in a consistent way.

In terms of Hypothesis 2C, that participants would place race-related historical events further in the past when group status threat was experimentally heightened, Experiments 1 and 2 provided a direct test. Overall, Experiments 1 and 2 did not provide strong support for this hypothesis. I did not find that heightened group status threat increased distancing of race-related historical events. Additionally, I found that the single item used to measure group status threat (manipulation check in Experiment 2) did not predict the extent to which participants distanced themselves from race-related historical events.

Altogether, I found support for distancing of race-related historical events. White participants consistently placed race-related events further in the past than they actually happened when I used the method that I am most confident in. However, I did not find evidence to support the claim that these distortions are motivated by group status threat.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

This dissertation has important implications for understanding current perceptions of racism and the ways in which White people may minimize its impact. The findings indicate that, on average, White participants distance racist history, which may shed light on why and how they minimize racism today (Adams et al., 2006; Eibach & Ehrlinger, 2006; Norton & Sommers, 2011). This work adds to the emerging work on perceptions of history; I show that White people distance the US's racist history, seemingly the same way Germans distance anti-Semitic history, for example (Peetz et al., 2010).

Moreover, this dissertation complements existing research on how White people present history, which has found that they often present history in ways that benefit their ingroup (Oeberst et al., 2020; Salter & Adams, 2016). By demonstrating that White participants distance racist history, this research adds to our understanding of how history might be passed down through generations. Accordingly, these findings have important implications for understanding how historical distortions may contribute to ongoing racial inequality. Specifically, it may contribute to our understanding of why White people are often unwilling to support efforts for reform and redress. When White people perceive racism as occurring further in the past, they may be less likely to see a connection between historical racism and present-day racism. This, in turn, can lead to less support for subsequent efforts to address racism.

Contrary to predictions and previous work and theorizing (e.g., Peetz et al., 2010), my research did not find support for the hypothesis that group status threat *causes* White people in the US to distance racist history. This leads me to consider two possibilities: either my methods were insufficient to capture the motivation for distancing that Peetz and colleagues captured, or the distancing is not motivated at the individual level as suggested by my results.

With respect to the first possibility, it could be that White people distance racist history for reasons other than group status threat. There might be motives that are more proximal than group status threat. Previous work in sociology, for instance, found that when White college students were faced with truths that, historically, their families benefited from racist policies, many students denied the truths (Mueller, 2017). It may be that thinking of group advantage (more distal) is not threatening when considering historical events but thinking about one's family (more proximal) is.

With respect to the second possibility, it could be that White people distance race-related events because of genuine ignorance rather than a motivated ignorance, borne out of systemic factors. Two examples come to mind: education and the media. Since the Civil War, powerful elites--politicians and interest groups--have worked fervently to obscure America's racist history. For example, the United Daughters of the Confederacy made efforts to rewrite Civil War history by releasing textbook guidelines which listed recommendations like "reject a book that says the South fought to hold her slaves" and "reject a book that speaks of the slaveholder of the South as cruel and unjust to his slaves" (Rutherford, 1920). These lies were propagated in textbooks for over a century after the war ended (Coleman, 2017; Dean, 2009). Today, conservative politicians are supporting "Critical Race Theory" bans which obscure the United States' racist history by suppressing the teaching of this history (AHA, 2021).

Like education, the media can also promote ignorance and historical distortion. In 1915, the film "The Birth of a Nation" was released and is a prime example. It portrays a racist retelling of Confederate history and its cause. What's more, this film motivated a series of racial violence and, specifically, lynching. (Ang, 2022). White people at that time believed the historical lies put forth by the film enough to perpetrate violence because of it. Contemporarily, the media has

distorted the telling of anti-racist struggles. For example, Squires (2014) has analyzed the media's coverage of Martin Luther King Jr. and shows that the media has focused more on Martin Luther King Jr. as an individual than the civil rights struggles that he actually fought for; more on “palatable” (to White people) quotes—such as quotes from Dr. King’s “I have a dream” speech—than critical perspectives on race and racism from Martin Luther King Jr.’s "I have a dream" speech. The media’s treatment of Martin Luther King Jr. suggest that they act in ways that distort history. The media’s coverage obscures the struggle for freedom during the Civil Rights Movement (Squires, 2014). Given these efforts in education and the media, it is perhaps unsurprising that even White people who are low in white nationalism and/or racial resentment might not know racist history and believe it happened longer ago.

Following the above theoretical implication, this dissertation emphasizes the critical need for accurate history to be taught. This dissertation found that White people distanced race-related history. This poses a significant problem, especially when considering the current events surrounding the teaching of critical history in K-12 education. Policy makers across the U.S. are currently engaged in efforts to minimize or completely eliminate the teaching of critical history. These bans borrow language from former President Donald Trump’s 2020 Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping (Executive Order, 2020). The bans, like the Texas HB 3979 bill, aim to prevent “discomfort” and “psychological distress” for White students (Texas Bill HB 3979, 2021). It is clear that these bans are not intended to improve the historical understanding and knowledge of students and could potentially worsen the distancing of race-related events (AHA, 2021). To counteract this distancing, policy makers must support education that promotes accurate history, so that all students come away with a truthful accounting of race-related history and understand its legacy.

Limitations

This dissertation also has its own limitations. One limitation is that I only recruited White participants. I only recruited White participants because I theorized, and previous research supported, that White participants would be motivated to distance race-related history to protect their ingroup. However, by only recruiting White participants, I missed the perspectives of people of color, and specifically, Black people. The perspectives of Black people are important, especially when studying anti-Black, racist history. Future work should center their perspectives.

Next, online studies were exclusively utilized in this dissertation. There are various concerns with online samples. One concern is self-selection bias. People must decide that they want to join a particular online sampling platform. Therefore, the type of people that chose to join the platform used in the studies might not have been representative of people in the U.S. In fact, the people in my samples were consistently older than the national average and had a lower income than the national average White person's income. This affects my ability to generalize the findings. Lastly, because these studies were online, it is possible that participants were more easily distracted and it is also possible that participants looked up answers. In the instructions for the timeline task, I did ask participants not to look up answers. I also asked participants in every study what amount of attention they gave to the study (whether there were extraneous factors affecting their attention). However, there is no way to know if participants were honest. To address these potential concerns, future work will need to replicate the findings with nationally representative samples and with in-lab samples where it will be harder to cheat and easier to hold participants attention.

In all studies, especially in regards to Hypothesis 2, there were no immediate stakes for participants. Therefore, these studies do not reflect distancing of race-related events in a real-

world situation where there might be immediate stakes for acknowledging racist history. It might be that participants are more willing to place race-related events closer to the present than they would in a real-world situation because they lose nothing for doing so. In sum, this dissertation may not have captured the complexity of how White people respond to race-related history in real world situations with real consequences.

Moreover, the studies featured a limited number of historical events. In all studies, participants saw eight historical events, four race-related and four race-unrelated. I chose to use eight events being cognizant of participants attention in an online study. Eight events may not be enough to get a generalizable understanding of distancing of historical events. However, the task may have been too cognitively demanding if I asked participants to read about and place more than eight events (Miller, 1956). Further, recognizability of the events may be a limitation. There was a total of 32 possible events participants could have seen in Pilot Study 2. Many of these events may have been too obscure for participants, they may not have known about these events prior to the study. However, in Pilot Study 3 and Experiments 1 and 2, I chose events that participants indicated they most recognized from Pilot Study 2. I supplemented these with events I thought would also be recognizable. Therefore, the timeline task should only feature highly recognizable events, however I did not test whether this amalgamation of events was actually recognizable. It could be the case that participants place unfamiliar events further in the past. Future work should examine this.

Lastly, I only used two manipulations of group status threat. One manipulation, aside from one sentence, did not connect explicitly to history. This may have been an issue as the tasks were not connected, the topics were in different domains. The threat elicited by the article may not have extended to perceptions of history. The other manipulation, in contrast, did center

history by focusing on the growing possibility of reparations. This however may not have been believable to participants. The article discussed the national reparations committee as well as various cities across the U.S. that have made reparations plans. Because there were only a few cities highlighted and the national committee has made no formal recommendations yet, participants may not have believed that reparations could happen and could affect them. This assumption is supported by our finding that the manipulation failed the manipulation check. It did not elicit group status threat when using the single item measure. Further, the group status threat manipulation did not take into account individual threat which might be an important factor in distancing of racist history.

Future Directions

This dissertation and its limitation lay the groundwork for future research. First and foremost, future work will need to replicate the results of the timeline task by using other events. To do this, we should first approach choosing events in a systematic way. Specifically, race-related and race-unrelated events should be closely matched in historical weight, recognizability, and span similar historical time.

Further, as already noted previously, current findings, at face value, could suggest that historical distortions are not motivated, not at the individual level at least. They could be the result of systemic racism. Archival methods might be useful to examine this possibility; survey and experimental methods are not always well equipped to capture systemic level phenomena. It might be useful to examine K-12 history textbooks for distancing language when writing about race-related events compared to race-unrelated events. Work might also examine K-12 history content standards, comparing conservative and liberal states to assess what historical events are omitted from the standards (which I might consider a form of distancing). I might predict that

liberal states are less likely, compared to conservative states, to omit race-related historical events.

Future work should include participants from other racial and ethnic groups. One possibility is that participants of color--and Black participants in particular--will not distance racist history, because they are more familiar with this history and because they are motivated to understand it (Jones & Leitner, 2015; Nelson et al., 2013). However, it is also possible that participants of color may still distance history, albeit for different reasons. For instance, they may find this history too painful to confront or they may have been exposed to cultural narratives that distance this history due to systemic factors such as education and media. Additionally, participants of color may bring racist history closer to the present, as this history may hold particular meaning and significance for them.

In addition to studying the antecedents of temporal distancing of race-related history, future research should also investigate its consequences. Specifically, researchers could explore how perceptions of historical time affect attitudes, behaviors, and policies related to race and racism. For example, they might investigate how distancing from race-related historical events influences support for slavery reparations and opposition to teaching the United States' racist history.

Future work should also explore different ways of manipulating and measuring group status threat. To manipulate group status threat, we might try using a version of the reparations manipulation that is more locally based. For example, we could recruit only participants from San Francisco, CA and describe the reparations plan proposed for this city specifically. We might then examine whether a more locally-based group status threat might impact distancing of history. Future work might also consider manipulating individual threat rather than group status

threat. For example, we might suggest that White participants will see an increase in taxes to accommodate reparations payments to African Americans (Tax Policy Center, 2021). White participants lose something (e.g. money) so that African Americans gain something (e.g. reparations payments). This kind of threat might feel more poignant to participants and subsequently the manipulation might be more successful at shifting perceptions of historical distance.

Final Remarks

James Baldwin once wrote "History is not the past. It is the present. We carry our history with us. We are our history" (Baldwin & Peck, 2017). If we believe this to be true, then the distancing of our history is troubling. Distancing our racist history means denying what we still carry and who we still are as a nation. I hope this dissertation inspires future work to consider how we carry our history with us and help people tell the truth about where we have been and who we are as a nation. Only then will we be able to do the important work of repair.

References

- Adams, G., Tormala, T. T., & O'Brien, L. T. (2006). The effect of self-affirmation on perception of racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*(5), 616-626.
- American Historical Association (2021). Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism in American History.
- American National Election Studies (2011). Racial Resentment.
- Ang, D. (2022). The birth of a nation: Media and racial hate.
- Baldwin, J. (1962). Letter from a Region in My Mind. *The New Yorker*.
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1962/11/17/letter-from-a-region-in-my-mind>
- Baldwin, J., & Peck, R. (2017). *I am not your Negro: A companion edition to the documentary film directed by Raoul Peck*. Vintage.
- Bonam, C. M., Nair Das, V., Coleman, B. R., & Salter, P. (2019). Ignoring history, denying racism: Mounting evidence for the Marley hypothesis and epistemologies of ignorance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(2), 257-265.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014a). On the precipice of a “majority-minority” America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects White Americans’ political ideology. *Psychological science, 25*(6), 1189-1197.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014b). More diverse yet less tolerant? How the increasingly diverse racial landscape affects white Americans’ racial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(6), 750-761.
- Coleman, A.L. (2017). The Civil War Never Stopped Being Fought in America’s Classrooms. Here’s Why That Matters. *Time Magazine*. <https://time.com/5013943/john-kelly-civil-war-textbooks/>

- Dean, A. W. (2009). "Who Controls the Past Controls the Future": The Virginia History Textbook Controversy. *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 117(4), 319.
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 872–886. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.872>
- Duggan, P. (2018). The Confederacy was built on slavery. How can so many Southern whites still believe otherwise?.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/magazine/wp/2018/11/28/feature/the-confederacy-was-built-on-slavery-how-can-so-many-southern-whites-still-believe-otherwise/>
- Eason, A. E., Pope, T., Becenti, K. M., & Fryberg, S. A. (2021). Sanitizing history: National identification, negative stereotypes, and support for eliminating Columbus Day and adopting Indigenous Peoples Day. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 27(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000345>
- Eibach, R. P., & Ehrlinger, J. (2006). "Keep your eyes on the prize": Reference points and racial differences in assessing progress toward equality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(1), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205279585>
- Eibach, R. P., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and white and black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(3), 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453>
- Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping (September 22, 2020).
<https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-combating-race-sex-stereotyping/>

Freer, L. (2020). *The Lost Cause Narrative in Three Southern Novels Published between 1880 and 1936* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield).

Gallagher, G. W., & Nolan, A. T. (Eds.). (2000). *The myth of the lost cause and Civil War history*. Indiana University Press.

HB 3979-Texas (2021): Relating to the social studies curriculum in public schools. (2021, June 15). <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=HB3979>

hooks, b. (2006). *Killing rage: Ending racism*. Henry Holt and Company.

Janssen, S. M. (2017). Autobiographical memory and the subjective experience of time. *Timing & Time Perception*, 5(1), 99-122.

Ji, L. J., Guo, T., Zhang, Z., & Messervey, D. (2009). Looking into the past: cultural differences in perception and representation of past information. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(4), 761.

Jones, J. M., & Leitner, J. B. (2014). The Sankofa effect: Divergent effects of thinking about the past for Blacks and Whites. In *Time perspective theory; Review, research and application: Essays in honor of Philip G. Zimbardo* (pp. 197-211). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Kurtiş, T., Adams, G., & Yellow Bird, M. (2010). Generosity or genocide? Identity implications of silence in American Thanksgiving commemorations. *Memory*, 18(2), 208–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210903176478>

Leach, C. W., Zeineddine, F. B., & Čehajić-Clancy, S. (2013). Moral immemorial: The rarity of self-criticism for previous generations' genocide or mass violence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(1), 34-53.

- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological review*, 63(2), 81.
- Mills, C. (2007). White ignorance. *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*, 247, 26-31.
- Mueller, J. C. (2020). Racial Ideology or Racial Ignorance? An Alternative Theory of Racial Cognition. *Sociological Theory*, 38(2), 142–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275120926197>
- Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley Hypothesis: Denial of Racism Reflects Ignorance of History. *Psychological Science*, 24(2), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451466>
- Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives on Psychological science*, 6(3), 215-218.
- Oeberst, A., Beck, I., Matschke, C., Ihme, T. A., & Cress, U. (2020). Collectively biased representations of the past: Ingroup Bias in Wikipedia articles about intergroup conflicts. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59(4), 791–818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12356>
- Onyeador, I. N., Daumeyer, N. M., Rucker, J. M., Duker, A., Kraus, M. W., & Richeson, J. A. (2021). Disrupting beliefs in racial progress: Reminders of persistent racism alter perceptions of past, but not current, racial economic equality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 47(5), 753-765.
- Peetz, J., Gunn, G. R., & Wilson, A. E. (2010). Crimes of the Past: Defensive Temporal Distancing in the Face of Past In-Group Wrongdoing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(5), 598–611. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210364850>
- Pew Research Center (2014). Political Polarization and Personal Life. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/06/12/section-3-political-polarization-and-personal-life/>

Pew Research Center (2021). Beyond Red vs. Blue: The Political Typology.

<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/06/30/how-americans-see-their-country-and-their-democracy/>

Pew Research Center (2022). Black and White Americans are far apart in their views of reparations for slavery. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/11/28/black-and-white-americans-are-far-apart-in-their-views-of-reparations-for-slavery/>

Pollard, E. A. (1866). *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates : Comprising a Full and Authentic Account of the Rise and Progress of the Late Southern Confederacy*. New York: E.B. Treat & Co.

Reyna, C., Bellovary, A., & Harris, K. (2022). The psychology of White nationalism: Ambivalence towards a changing America. *Social issues and policy review*, 16(1), 79-124.

Ross, M. (1989). Relation of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories. *Psychological review*, 96(2), 341.

Ross, M., & Wilson, A. E. (2002). It feels like yesterday: self-esteem, valence of personal past experiences, and judgments of subjective distance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(5), 792.

Rotella, K. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2013). Motivated to “forget” the effects of in-group wrongdoing on memory and collective guilt. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(6), 730-737.

Rutherford, M.L. (1920). A measuring rod to test text books, and reference books in schools, colleges and libraries. <https://archive.org/details/measuringrodtot00ruth/page/n3/mode/2up>

Sahdra, B., & Ross, M. (2007). Group Identification and Historical Memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(3), 384–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206296103>

- Salter, P. S., & Adams, G. (2016). On the Intentionality of Cultural Products: Representations of Black History As Psychological Affordances. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01166>
- Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2005). Over thirty years later: A contemporary look at symbolic racism. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 37(1), 95-125.
- Stephens, A. H. (1861, March 21). *The Corner Stone Speech*. EncyclopediaVirginia.org.
<https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/cornerstone-speech-by-alexander-h-stephens-march-21-1861/>
- Squires, C. (2014). *The post-racial mystique: Media and race in the twenty-first century* (Vol. 25). NYU Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology. *British Journal of social and clinical psychology*, 18(2), 183-190.
- Tax Policy Center (2021). How Could the United States Pay for Reparations?.
TaxPolicyCenter.org. <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/how-could-united-states-pay-reparations>
- Trawalter, S., Druckman, J., Henderson, K. (Manuscript invited for submission.). Critical Race Theory and COVID-19 vaccination: An empirical test of Interest Convergence.
- Wilson, A., & Ross, M. (2003). The identity function of autobiographical memory: Time is on our side. *Memory*, 11(2), 137-149.

Appendix Table of Contents

Demographics for all Studies.....	65-72
Pilot Study 1 Qualtrics Survey Flow.....	72
Pilot Study 2 Qualtrics Survey Flow	73-75
Pilot Study 2 Historical Items.....	76-79
Pilot Study 2 Supplemental Analyses.....	80-98
Supplemental Study Qualtrics Survey Flow	99-101
Supplemental Study Removing Year from Events.....	102-106
Pilot Study 3 Qualtrics Survey Flow.....	107
Experiment 1 Qualtrics Survey Flow	108
Experiment 1 Stimuli.....	109-110
White Nationalism Scale.....	111
Racial Resentment Scale.....	112
Experiment 2 Qualtrics Survey Flow	113
Experiment 2 Stimuli	114-116
Experiment 2 Manipulation Check Item.....	117

Appendix

Demographics for all Studies

Instruc It is important for us to know a little more information about who you are. Please answer the following questions. This information will remain completely confidential.

age How old are you?

gender What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Non-binary/Gender non-conforming
- Transgender
- Gender identity not listed

race What is your race/ethnicity?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
 - Asian, East Asian, South Asian
 - Black, African, or African American
 - Latino or Hispanic
 - Middle Eastern
 - Mixed- or Multi Race/Ethnicity
-

- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - White or European-American
 - Not listed, please elaborate:
-

us Were you born in the U.S.?

- Yes
- No

lengthUS How long have you been living in the U.S.?

income What is your family household income? If you do not know, please guess:

- Under \$35,000
- \$35,000-\$64,999
- \$65,000-\$79,999
- \$80,000-\$94,999
- \$95,000-\$109,999
- \$110,000-\$124,999
- \$125,000-\$139,999
- \$140,000-\$154,999
- \$155,000-\$169,999
- \$170,000-\$184,999
- \$185,000-\$199,999
- \$200,000-\$214,999
- \$215,000-\$229,999
- \$230,000-\$249,999
- More than \$250,000

OwnEdu What is the highest level of education **you** have completed?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school diploma
- Some college or vocational training
- 2-year college degree (e.g., Associate's degree)
- 4-year college degree (e.g., B.S., B.A.)
- Post-college degree (e.g., M.A., M.S., J.D., Ph.D., M.D.)

parentEdu What is the highest level of education completed by one or both of **your parents**?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school diploma
- Some college or vocational training
- 2-year college degree (e.g., Associate's degree)
- 4-year college degree (e.g., B.S., B.A.)
- Post-college degree (e.g., M.A., M.S., J.D., Ph.D., M.D.)

poli1 What political party do you identify with?

- Democratic
 - Republican
 - Other
-

poli2 How liberal/conservative are you?

- Very liberal 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Very conservative 7

poli3 How *fiscally* liberal/conservative are you?

- Very liberal 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Very conservative 7

poli4 How *socially* liberal/conservative are you?

- Very liberal 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Very conservative 7

region In which region of the United States do you live? Please refer to the map below.

- South: East South Central
- South: West South Central
- Northeast: New England
- Northeast: Middle Atlantic
- Midwest: East North Central
- Midwest: West North Central
- South: South Atlantic
- West: Mountain
- West: Pacific
- Other: Please specify _____

timeinRegion How many years have you lived in the region you currently live in?

simstudy Have you participated in a similar study before?

- Yes
- No

simstudy2 If you participated in a similar study, what was the study about? What types of tasks were you asked to complete?

comments Do you have any comments or questions about the study?

Pilot Study 1 Qualtrics Survey Flow

Standard: Captcha (1 Question)

Block: Consent (1 Question)

Standard: Intro (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 1 - Evenly Present Elements

Standard: Experimental Condition (6 Questions)

Standard: Control condition (6 Questions)

Standard: Perceptions of Systemic Racism (10 Questions)

Standard: Historical Time Measure Intro (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: Race1955 (2 Questions)

Standard: Neutral1955 (2 Questions)

Standard: race1967 (2 Questions)

Standard: neutral1967 (2 Questions)

Standard: race1963 (2 Questions)

Standard: neutral1963 (2 Questions)

Standard: race2019 (2 Questions)

Standard: neutral2019 (2 Questions)

Standard: Symbolic and structural policy support intro (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 2 -

Standard: Structural (3 Questions)

Standard: Symbolic (3 Questions)

Standard: Most pressing and important (1 Question)

Standard: Symbolic Racism (9 Questions)

Standard: Attention checks (3 Questions)

Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)

Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)

Pilot Study 2 Qualtrics Survey Flow

Standard: CAPTCHA (3 Questions)

Block: Consent (1 Question)

Branch: New Branch

If

If Informed Consent Agreement protocol #4156 Please read this consent agreement carefully before you... No Is Selected

Standard: Prolific ID (1 Question)

Standard: Intro (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 1 - Evenly Present Elements

Group: Race- Neutral -

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1955 Race -, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1955 Neutral-, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1963 Race -, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1963 Neutral-, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1972 Race -, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1972 Neutral -, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1919 Neutral -, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1919 Race -, neutral - (11 Questions)

Group: Race- Neutral+

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1967 Race -, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1967 Neutral +, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1931 Race -, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1931 Neutral +, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1970 Race -, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1970 Neutral +, Race - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Race -, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Neutral +, Race - (11 Questions)

Group: Race+ Neutral-

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1954 Race +, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1954 Neutral -, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1942 Race +, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1942 Neutral -, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Race +, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Neutral -, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1966 Race +, neutral - (11 Questions)

Standard: 1966 Neutral -, race + (11 Questions)

Group: Race+ Neutral +

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1983 Race +, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1983 Neutral +, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1956 Race +, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1956 Neutral +, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1960 Race +, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1960 Neutral +, race + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1976 Race +, neutral + (11 Questions)

Standard: 1976 Neutral +, Race + (11 Questions)

Standard: Attention Checks (2 Questions)

Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)

Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)

Pilot Study 2 Historical Time Distortion Items

Race-Related event positive + Race-Unrelated event positive	1983 In August 1983, Guion "Guy" Bluford became the first African American to travel into space when he served as a mission specialist aboard the Space Shuttle Challenger.	In June 1983, Sally Ride, Ph.D., became the first woman from the United States to travel to space and make it into orbit aboard the Space Shuttle Challenger.
	1960 In 1960, groups of multiracial students organized sit ins at Nashville, Tennessee lunch counters to protest racial segregation. These sit ins led to the desegregation of public facilities in Nashville.	The first deep space mission to carry a digital transmitting system was classified as the US Pioneer 5. The mission began in March of 1960 and lasted three and a half months. The mission confirmed what scientists had suspected, that the interplanetary magnetic field was weak.
	1976 In 1976, Black History Month was officially recognized by the sitting president. Black history month was intended to honor the accomplishments throughout history of Black Americans across different areas of life.	In 1976, the United States celebrated its 200th year of independence from Great Britain. The celebration included a series of events intended to promote patriotism and reminisce on United States history and culture.
	1956 As part of a civil rights protest against segregated seating, African Americas stopped riding city buses in Montgomery Alabama. Then, Black people had to sit at the back of the bus while white people were allowed to sit in the front. In 1956, a federal court ruled that laws like those allowing segregation on the bus were unconstitutional. The protests lead to integration of Montgomery's buses.	The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 helped to modernize travel in the United States by continuing the construction of highways across the country. \$25 billion dollars was allotted to construct the interstate highway system spanning 41,000 miles. This was the largest public works project at the time and helped to populate suburban communities.
Race-Related Negative + Race-Unrelated positive	1967 In the summer of 1967, nearly 160 riots occurred across the United States. In what became known as the "long, hot summer" of 1967, injustice stemming from the frustrations of poverty and unemployment, the systematic denial of employment opportunities by white-owned businesses and city services by white-led municipal governments, and mistreatment by white or mostly white police forces led to explosive confrontations between black residents and the forces that oppressed them.	In the summer of 1967, the media began to recognize the hippy movement, the underground alternative youth culture that had been brewing in America for several years. While they were mostly known for their clothing and hair, Hippy culture also embraced travel as a way to find oneself and communicate with others. They hitchhiked, travelled by public transport or used revamped double-decker buses and camper vans, always living as cheaply as possible.
	1931 On March 25, 1931, nine young black men are accused of raping two women in Scottsboro, Alabama; they would later become known as	On June 1, 1931, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the Near v. Minnesota case that a state law allowing prior restraint on publication was

the "Scottsboro Boys." Police convinced these women to create false rape claims after the boys were found riding a train illegally. The boys are convicted and sentenced to death.

1970 In 1970, police opened fire on a group of students at Jackson State College, a historically Black college. Police Officers shot and killed two black students and injured twelve. Prior to the shooting, students were rioting in response to a rumor that civil rights activist Charles Evers had been assassinated. After an investigation on the shooting, the police were criticized, but no arrests were made.

1947 In 1947, Rosa Lee Ingram, a black widowed sharecropper with twelve children, was approached by a white sharecropper with a rifle who lived on the same property as the Ingram family. While trying to harass her to have sex with him, Ingram's sons came to fight the man off leaving him dead. Rosa Lee Ingram and two of her teenage sons were put in jail for 12 years.

Race-
Related
Negative +
Race-
Unrelated
Negative

1963 In late 1963, white supremacists bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services; four young Black girls were killed in the explosion. The church bombing was the third in 11 days, after the federal government had ordered the integration of Alabama schools.

1955 Emmett Till, a 14 year old Black boy in Chicago, was murdered in 1955 by two white men for allegedly harassing a white woman. His murderers were found not guilty by an all White jury. The murderers later admitted to beating and shooting Till.

1919 In 1919 in Arkansas, a group of black sharecroppers gathered at a church to discuss unfair low wages. A group of white men, some affiliated with local police, came with rifles and fired into the church. Soldiers were called to the area to help and the result was a massacre of over 200 Black Americans and 5 white men. 12 of the surviving black sharecroppers were later put on trial and sentenced to death.

unconstitutional, creating a landmark ruling for freedom of the press as expressed in the first amendment. This ruling was also applied to free speech generally from that date forward.

In 1970, US Senator Nelson organized the first Earth Day, a day to honor Earth and the concept of peace. More than 200 million Americans entered the streets, making the first Earth Day the largest single-day protest in history. Nelson was later awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his work.

In 1947, Gerty Cori became the first woman to win a Nobel Prize in medicine for her work discovering the catalytic conversion of glycogen. This achievement also made her the third woman to ever win a Nobel prize in science. In that year, she was also promoted to be a full professor of research at Washington University in St. Louis.

In late 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated as he rode in a motorcade in Dallas, Texas. Kennedy's assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was later arrested and killed before standing trial. Kennedy was the fourth president to have died as a result of an assassination attempt.

U.S. Judge Curtis Eugene Chillingworth was declared missing in 1955 and later found to have been murdered. A coworker of Chillingworth later confessed to hiring someone to murder the judge. The coworker and the hired assassin were found guilty of murder.

After the 1919 World Series between the Chicago White Sox and the Cincinnati Reds, 8 members of the White Sox were accused of throwing the game in exchange for money. The members were allegedly going to receive the money from a gambling syndicate. The 8 members were put to trial for conspiracy to defraud. They were found not guilty by jury.

Race-Related Positive + Race-Unrelated Negative	<p>1972 On July 25, 1972, a reporter broke the story about the Tuskegee Syphilis Study. This study, meant to record the natural history of Syphilis in Black men, was revealed for its exploitative nature. Although initial participation was voluntary, an advisory panel found that the practices of the researchers were extremely unethical, ranging from a lack of informed consent to withholding treatment, causing unnecessary deaths of some of the Black men who participated as well as irreversible harm to their families and communities.</p>	<p>In February of 1972, a coal mining dam collapsed in Logan County, West Virginia. 132-million gallons of black water flowed down the hollow, severely damaging 17 communities and killing 125 people. Over 80% of Buffalo Creek's residents were left homeless. Pittston Coal Company said the flood was caused by heavy rain, but state and federal investigations showed that the company was aware of intense flooding hazards, and knowingly showed an intense disregard for the safety of residents.</p>
	<p>1954 On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court reached their decision on the case <i>Brown vs. Board of Education</i>, which established racial segregation in public schools as unconstitutional. This overturned the the <i>Plessy vs. Ferguson</i> case of 1896 and the principle of "separate but equal" that <i>Plessy</i> had set forth. The Supreme Court ruling in <i>Brown vs. Board of Education</i> is seen as the start of the movement towards desegregation.</p>	<p>On April 7, 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered a historic speech explaining what he called the "falling domino" principle, stating that the loss of the Vietnam war would lead to disintegration in Southeast Asia. Eisenhower described this as a great danger. This speech laid the foundation for the United States involvement in the Vietnam War, a war that saw over 45,000 American deaths.</p>
	<p>1942 On February 7, 1942, the <i>Pittsburgh Courier</i> (a weekly Black newspaper) launched the "Double V Campaign." This campaign was instrumental to the American involvement in World War II. It called for integration in the war and freedoms in the U.S. — banding people together in a collective, national effort for liberty.</p>	<p>The Battle of Midway in 1942 was a turning point in World War II. United States intelligence intercepted word of plans by the Japanese to attack the island of midway. A battle ensued with US troops eventually forcing the Japanese to retreat. This US victory stopped Japan's spread into the Pacific.</p>
	<p>1947 Jackie Robinson, previously famous for being the first Black player on a minor league baseball team to play on a major league team, became more well known when he debuted in the National League in 1947. He became the first player of color in major league baseball history. His legacy grew even more as he went on to win the rookie of the year award, most valuable player award, and was elected into the national baseball hall of fame.</p>	<p>Elizabeth Short, who was already famous as an actress, gained more public attention after being murdered in 1947. The images of the murder were gruesome as the young actress had been split in half at the waist. The FBI joined the investigation to support the L.A. police. To this day, the murderer has never been found. Her legacy is highlighted by a famous cold case that still garners attention today.</p>
	<p>1966 At the beginning of the 1966-67 NBA season, Bill Russell was named player-coach of the Boston Celtics, making Russell the first black coach in NBA history. In response to receiving the job, Russell said, "I wasn't</p>	<p>In August of 1966, Charles Whitman opened fire from the observation deck in the Main Building tower at The University of Texas at Austin. He killed 14 people and wounded 31 in a total of 96 minutes. Prior to arriving to</p>

offered the job because I am a Negro, I was offered it because Red [Auerbach] figured I could do it." The following season, the Celtics went on to win the NBA title making Russell the first black coach to win an NBA championship as well.

campus, Whitman killed his mother and wife in order to spare them future humiliation and suffering. The shooting led to the closing of the observation deck and it would not be reopened until two years following the incident.

Pilot Study 2 Supplemental Results

A series of one sample t-tests were performed to compare each pairing difference score against zero given that the null hypothesis is that there is no difference between race related events and neutral events. The mean value of difference score for the year 1955 ($M = -.60$, $SD = 1.56$) was significantly different from zero; $t(461) = -8.30$, $p < .001$. This suggests a difference such that race-related events are placed closer to the present than are race-neutral events. The mean value of difference score for the year 1963 ($M = -.08$, $SD = 1.64$) was not significantly different from zero; $t(464) = -1.02$, $p = .308$. This suggests that for the events used in the year 1963, there was no difference in distancing between race-related and race-neutral events. The mean value of difference score for the year 1967 ($M = -.32$, $SD = 1.65$) was significantly different from zero; $t(464) = -4.18$, $p < .001$. Again, the difference was such that race-related event was placed closer to the present than the race-neutral event. Lastly, the mean value of difference score for the year 2019 ($M = -.40$, $SD = 1.33$) was significantly different from zero suggesting that there is a significant difference in distancing of race-related and race-neutral events for 2019 such that race-related events are placed closer to the present than race-neutral events; $t(463) = -6.42$, $p < .001$. Similar to the year 1955, this suggests a difference such that race-related events are placed closer to the present than are race-neutral events. Aside from the difference score for 1963, participants' difference scores significantly differed from zero. Further, means for all years are negative suggesting that participants are placing race-related events closer to the present than race-neutral events (See Figure 1). This finding runs contrary to my hypotheses and warrants further investigation. Therefore, I examined whether these unexpected results were in part due to differences in political ideology.

To assess the role of political ideology, I first created an ideology variable. To do so, I created a composite of three items: how liberal to conservative participants were, how socially liberal or conservative, and how fiscally liberal or conservative they were on a scale of 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*). Participants that scored between 1 and 3.9 were coded as liberal, participants that scored 4 were coded as moderate, and participants that scored 4.1 to 7 were coded as conservative. Then, I conducted a repeated-measures ANOVA with time points and whether events were race-related or not as within-person variables, and ideology as a between-person variable. The 3-way interaction was significant ($F(3, 1374) = 5.22, p = .001$). To decompose this interaction, I again created difference scores between race-related and race-unrelated ratings, and then ran a series of ANOVAs with ideology as the independent variable and the difference score of distance for each timepoint. I then used Tukey's HSD test to assess differences between group means.

The one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how close to the present events were perceived to be for the year 1955 ($F(2, 459) = 12.01, p < .001$). While liberals, moderates, and conservatives placed race-related event closer to the present than race-neutral events, liberals ($M = -.94, SD = 1.72$) placed race related events closer to the present than conservatives ($M = -.26, SD = 1.20$) and conservatives placed closer to the present than moderates ($M = -.13, SD = 1.74$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how close to the present events were placed was significantly different between liberals and conservatives ($p < .001, CI [-1.02, -.33]$). Liberals were also statistically different from moderates ($p = .02, CI [-1.50, -.11]$) and moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .91, CI [-.83, .58]$).

The one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how close to the present events were perceived to be for the year 1963 ($F(2, 462) = 11.76, p < .001$). While liberals ($M = -.42, SD = 1.73$) placed race related events closer to the present than neutral events, moderates ($M = .40, SD = 1.61$) and conservatives ($M = .28, SD = 1.43$) placed neutral events closer to the present than race related events. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how close to the present events were placed was significantly different between liberals and conservatives ($p < .001, CI [-1.07, -.34]$). Liberals were also statistically different from moderates ($p = .02, CI [-1.55, -.10]$) and moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .92, CI [-.86, .62]$).

The one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how close to the present events were perceived to be for the year 1967 ($F(2, 462) = 8.45, p = .05$). Liberals ($M = -.50, SD = 1.84$) placed race related events closer to the present than conservatives ($M = -.15, SD = 1.38$) and conservatives placed closer to the present than moderates ($M = .03, SD = 1.61$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how close to the present events were placed was marginally different between liberals and conservatives ($p < .075, CI [-.72, -.03]$). Liberals were not statistically different from moderates ($p = .22, CI [-1.28, .22]$) and moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .83, CI [-.95, .57]$).

The one-way ANOVA for the pairing of year 2019 revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how close to the present events were perceived to be by political ideology ($F(2, 461) = .70, p = .50$). Liberals ($M = -.46, SD = 1.34$), moderates ($M = -.20, SD = 1.27$), and conservatives ($M = -.35, SD = 1.33$) did not differ.

The effect of condition on within year difference score composites

For the two composites, I next conducted a one-way ANOVA to examine the effect of valence condition on the composites. The one-way ANOVA for how negative the event was perceived to be revealed a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how negative events were perceived to be between conditions ($F(3, 590) = 1695.75, p < .001$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how negative participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between all conditions except for the comparison between the race-related positive and race-neutral positive condition as well as the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition ($p = .716, CI [-.17, .38]$). This finding is not surprising given that conditions intentionally differ in valence, how negative or positive events are.

The one-way ANOVA for how shameful the event was perceived to be revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how negative shameful events were perceived to be between conditions ($F(3, 590) = 850.65, p < .001$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how negative participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between all conditions but the race-related positive and race-neutral positive as well as the race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($p = .165, CI [-.57, .06]$).

T-tests examining within year difference scores

I next ran t-tests for both the negative and shame composites to determine whether there is a difference observed in the difference scores generated between events that happen in the same year and whether this difference is significantly different from zero. This will test a central hypothesis, whether there is a difference between race-related and race-neutral events on the

various outcome measures, in this case on the composite of difference scores for how negative and how shameful the events were. The mean value of difference score for how negative an event was perceived as ($M = .02, SD = 2.83$) was not significantly different from zero; $t(593) = .13, p = .896$. The mean value of difference score for how shameful the event was ($M = -.24, SD = 2.44$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = -2.37, p = .018$. Participants' perceptions of the event as negative did not differ significantly from zero suggesting that there was no difference between race related and race neutral events. The results for how shameful an event was suggests that there is a significant difference between race-related and race-neutral events such that race-related events are perceived as more shameful than race-neutral events.

T-tests examining cross year race-related and race-neutral difference scores

A series of one sample t-tests were performed to compare each of the difference scores (all race related events subtracted by all neutral events) for each of the eight items against zero given the null hypothesis that there is no difference between race related events and neutral events. This is done to test whether there is a significant difference between race-related and race-neutral events on key outcomes.

First, the mean value of difference score for distance from the present ($M = -.11, SD = .75$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = -3.50, p < .001$. The mean value of difference score for how important the event is to US history ($M = .35, SD = 1.00$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = 8.54, p < .001$. The mean value of difference score for whether the event should be taught in K-12 schools ($M = .46, SD = 1.19$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = 9.47, p < .001$. The mean value of difference score for how impactful the event was ($M = .18, SD = 1.04$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = 4.30, p < .001$. The mean value of difference score for how impactful the event is ($M = .48, SD = 1.16$) was significantly different from zero;

$t(593) = 10.01, p < .001$. The mean value of difference score for how negative the event is ($M = .02, SD = 2.83$) was not significantly different from zero; $t(593) = .13, p = .896$. Lastly, the mean value of difference score for how shameful the event is ($M = -.24, SD = 2.44$) was significantly different from zero; $t(593) = -2.37, p = .018$. Essentially every variable but how negative the event was perceived to be was significantly different from zero suggesting that participants are reporting differences between race related and race neutral events. However, of importance to note is the direction of the means. In each variable, the means suggest a bias towards race related events, seeing these events as closer to the present, more impactful, and that these events should be taught in school more so than the race neutral events. To better understand these findings, we look at differences based on political ideology.

The effect of condition on cross year race-related and race-neutral difference scores

Next, I created a composite of neutral events ($\alpha = .78$) and race-related events ($\alpha = .83$) to examine differences between race-related and race-neutral events by condition. I then calculated the difference score between race-neutral and race-related events. This difference score demonstrates the difference between race-related events as a whole and race-neutral events as a whole, not the difference between each individual year pairing. First, I ran a series of one-way ANOVAs to ascertain whether valence of the event had a significant effect on perceptions of race-related and race-neutral events.

The one-way ANOVA for temporal distance revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference in temporal distance by condition ($F(3, 590) = 1.16, p = .33$). However, there was a statistically significant difference in how important the event was perceived to be by condition ($F(3, 590) = 43.03, p < .001$). Valence matters for how important an event is perceived to be. Those in the race-related negative, race-neutral positive condition ($M = -.12, SD = 1.10$) and

in the race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($M=-.02$, $SD= .77$) perceived race-related events as more important to US history than race-neutral events. Those in the race-related positive and race-neutral positive condition ($M= .70$, $SD= .89$) and the race-related positive and race-neutral negative did ($M=.85$, $SD= .85$) perceived the neutral event to be more important to US history than the race-related event. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how important participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between all conditions except for the relationship between the race-related positive and race-neutral negative with race-related positive and race-neutral positive ($p=.50$, CI $[-.12, .42]$) as well as the race-related negative and race-neutral positive with race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($p= .91$, CI $[-.37, .18]$). When the race-related event is negative, participants perceive that the race-related events are more important to US history than race-neutral events, either negative or positive. This also demonstrates that when race related events are positive, they are not seen as important to US history when compared to either positive or negative neutral events.

There was a statistically significant difference in whether the event should be taught in K-12 schools by condition ($F(3, 590)= 69.59$, $p< .001$). Those in the race-related negative, race-neutral positive condition ($M=-.26$, $SD= 1.30$) and in the race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($M=-.02$, $SD= .85$) believed that the race-related events should be taught in K-12 schools more than the neutral events. Those in the race-related positive and race-neutral positive condition ($M= .99$, $SD= .95$) and the race-related positive and race-neutral negative did ($M=1.13$, $SD= .94$) believed that the race-neutral event should be taught in K-12 schools more than the race-related event. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how important participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between

all conditions except for the relationship between the race-related positive and race-neutral negative with race-related positive and race-neutral positive ($p=.62$, CI [-.45, .16]) as well as the race-related negative and race-neutral positive with race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($p= .18$, CI [-.07, .54]). When the race-related event is negative, participants report that the race-related events should be taught in K-12 schools more than race-neutral events, either negative or positive.

There was a statistically significant difference in how impactful the event was in the past by condition ($F(3, 590)= 40.32, p< .001$). Those in the race-related negative, race-neutral positive condition ($M=-.24, SD= 1.20$) and in the race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($M=-.25, SD= .86$) believed that the race-related events were more impactful in the past than race-neutral events. Those in the race-related positive and race-neutral positive condition ($M= .63, SD= .82$) and the race-related positive and race-neutral negative did ($M=.60, SD= .89$) believed that the race-neutral event was more impactful in the past than the race-related event. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how important participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between all conditions except for the relationship between the race-related negative and race-neutral negative with race-related negative and race-neutral positive ($p=1.0$, CI [-.28, .29]) as well as the race-related positive and race-neutral negative with race-related positive and race-neutral positive ($p= .99$, CI [-.32, .25]). When the race related events are negative, participants report that the events were more impactful in the past than negative or positive race-neutral events.

There was a significant difference in how impactful the event is today by condition ($F(3, 590)= 43.00, p< .001$). Only those in the race-related negative, race-neutral positive condition ($M=-4.05, SD= 1.12$) believed that the race-related events are more impactful today than race-

neutral events. Those in the race-related negative and race-neutral negative ($M=.21$, $SD=.49$), race-related positive and race-neutral positive condition ($M=.32$, $SD=.90$), and the race-related positive and race-neutral negative did ($M=3.55$, $SD=1.04$) believed that the race-neutral event is more impactful in the past than the race-related event. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of how important participants perceived the event to be was significantly different between all conditions. The only condition in which the race-related events were seen as more impactful today was the race-related negative and race-neutral positive events. It is worth noting that when the events are both negative, the neutral event is seen as more impactful today. When asked how impactful the event *was*, participants in this condition indicated that the race-related events were more impactful than race-neutral events. There is a disconnect between past and present perceptions on the impact of race-related events.

The effect of ideology on cross year race-related and race-neutral difference scores

Next, I assess the role of political ideology on the outcome variables. This was done to determine whether political ideology is accounting for the unexpected findings regarding seeing race-related events more favorably on the outcome variables than race-neutral events. To assess the role of political ideology, I first created an ideology variable. To do so, I created a composite of three items: how liberal to conservative participants were, how socially liberal or conservative, and how fiscally liberal or conservative they were on a scale of 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*). Participants that scored between 1 and 3.9 were coded as liberal, participants that scored 4 were coded as moderate, and participants that scored 4.1 to 7 were coded as conservative. A series of ANOVAs were conducted with political ideology entered as the independent variable.

A series of ANOVAs were conducted to assess the role of political ideology on various outcome variables. First, I examined whether there was a significant difference between liberals, moderates, and conservatives on the difference score generated from how close to the present events were placed. The one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how close to the present events were perceived to be ($F(2, 591) = 5.647, p = .004$). While liberals ($M = -.17, SD = .77$) and moderates ($M = -.02, SD = .54$) placed race related events closer to the present than neutral events, conservatives ($M = .11, SD = .73$) placed neutral events closer to the present than race related events. Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how close to the present events were placed was significantly different between liberals and conservatives ($p = .004, CI [-.47, -.08]$). Liberals were not statistically different from moderates ($p = .367, CI [-.39, .11]$) and moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .56, CI [-.43, .17]$). While liberals and moderates placed race-related events closer to the present than race-neutral events, conservatives responded in the hypothesized direction by placing race-related events further in the past.

Next, I examined the difference score for how important participants believed the events to be between political ideologies. The one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how important the events were to US history ($F(2, 591) = 3.98, p = .019$). Every political ideology group perceived the race-related event as more important to US history than the neutral event. Liberals ($M = .42, SD = .97$) perceived race-related events as more important than neutral events more than moderates ($M = .17, SD = 1.07$) and moderates perceived this more so than conservatives ($M = .14, SD = 1.09$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how

important the event was to US history was significantly different between liberals and conservatives ($p=.038$, CI [.01, .54]). Liberals were not statistically different from moderates ($p=.20$, CI [-.09, .58]) and moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p=.98$, CI [-.36, .43]). All political ideology groups perceived the race related events as closer to the present.

I then examined whether liberals, moderates, and conservatives differed in whether they believed race-related and race-neutral events should be taught in K-12 schools. The one-way ANOVA showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the difference score for whether the event should be taught in K-12 schools ($F(2, 591)= 6.66$, $p= .001$). Liberals, moderates, and conservatives believed that the race-related event should be taught in schools more than the neutral event. Liberals ($M= .56$, $SD= 1.14$) believed this much more than moderates ($M=.19$, $SD= 1.20$) and moderates more than conservatives ($M=.14$, $SD= 1.30$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for whether the events should be taught in K-12 schools was significantly different between liberals, moderates, and conservatives. Liberals were marginally different from moderates ($p=.07$, CI [-.02, .76]) and significantly different from conservatives ($p=.004$, CI [.11, .73]). However, moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p=.97$, CI [-.42, .51]). Collectively, participants believed that race-related events should be taught in K-12 schools more than race-neutral events.

Next, I examined whether liberals, moderates, and conservatives differed in how much of an impact they perceived the race-related and race-neutral events to have had in the past. The one-way ANOVA showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how impactful the events were in the past ($F(2, 591)= .96$, $p= .383$). Tukey's

HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how impactful the event was in the past was not significantly different between liberals, moderates, and conservatives.

I next examined whether liberals, moderates, and conservatives differed in how much of an impact they perceived the race-related and race-neutral events to have today. The one-way ANOVA showed that there was a marginally statistically significant difference in the difference score for how impactful the events are today ($F(2, 591) = 2.80$ $p = .06$). While all ideology groups perceived the race related events to be more impactful today than race-neutral events, liberals ($M = .54$, $SD = 1.10$) perceived this to be so more than moderates ($M = .30$, $SD = 1.14$) and moderates more than conservatives ($M = .28$, $SD = 1.42$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how impactful the events were perceived to be today was not significantly different between liberals, moderates, and conservatives. Liberals were not different from moderates ($p = .179$, CI [-1.66, .23]) and not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .965$, CI [-.83, .67]). Further, moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p = .381$, CI [-.49, 1.75]).

Next, I examined whether liberals, moderates, and conservatives differed in how negative they perceived the race-related and race-neutral events to be. The one-way ANOVA showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how negative the event was perceived to be ($F(2, 591) = 1.57$ $p = .21$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how negative the event was perceived to be was not significantly different between liberals, moderates, and conservatives. Liberals were not different from moderates ($p = .284$, CI [-.14, .64]) and not significantly different from

conservatives ($p=.11$, CI [-.04, .57]). Further, moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p=.99$, CI [-.45, .47]).

Next, I examined whether liberals, moderates, and conservatives differed in how shameful they perceived the race-related and race-neutral events to be. The one-way ANOVA showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the difference score for how shameful the event was perceived to be ($F(2, 591)= 2.26, p= .105$). Tukey's HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of the difference score for how negative the event was perceived to be was not significantly different between liberals, moderates, and conservatives. Liberals were not different from moderates ($p=.090$, CI [-1.54, .09]) and not significantly different from conservatives ($p=.812$, CI [-.81, .48]). Further, moderates were not significantly different from conservatives ($p=.36$, CI [-1.52, .41]).

The effect of condition and ideology on cross year race-related and race-neutral difference scores

A series of ANOVAs were conducted to assess the role of political ideology and valence conditions on various outcome variables. This was done to determine how liberals, moderates, and conservatives might differ on outcome variables by condition.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score generated from temporal distancing. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a marginally significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 1.84, p= .089$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did not have a statistically significant effect on temporal distancing ($p= .613$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology did have a statistically significant effect on temporal distancing ($p= .004$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition,

liberals ($M = -.32$, $SD = .99$) reported that negative race-related events were closer to the present than positive race-neutral events, moderates ($M = .000$, $SD = .44$) were in the middle, and conservatives ($M = .42$, $SD = .98$) reported that the positive race-neutral events were closer to the present than the negative race-related event. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = -.10$, $SD = .73$) reported that the negative race-related events was closer to the present than the negative race-neutral events while moderates ($M = .04$, $SD = .51$) and conservatives ($M = .04$, $SD = .66$) saw the race-neutral events as closer to the present. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M = -.16$, $SD = .65$), moderates ($M = -.17$, $SD = .39$), and conservatives ($M = -.05$, $SD = .64$) see the positive race-related events as closer to the present than the positive race-neutral events. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = -.07$, $SD = .64$) reported that the positive race-related events were closer to the present than the negative race-neutral events while moderates ($M = .04$, $SD = .69$) and conservatives ($M = .02$, $SD = .51$) saw the negative race-neutral events as closer to the present than positive race-related event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score generated from how important the event was to US history. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was not a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 1.84$, $p = .138$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on importance ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology also had a statistically significant effect on importance ($p = .004$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M = -.02$, $SD = 1.09$), moderates ($M = -.66$, $SD = 1.18$), and conservatives ($M = -.37$, $SD = 1.07$) reported that the positive race-neutral event was more important to US history than the negative

race-related event but liberals believed this less. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .08$, $SD = .74$) reported that the negative race-related event was more important to US history than the negative race-neutral event while moderates ($M = -.34$, $SD = .97$), and conservatives ($M = -.32$, $SD = .71$) saw the race-neutral events as more important to US history. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M = .85$, $SD = .83$), moderates ($M = .30$, $SD = 1.03$), and conservatives ($M = .22$, $SD = .89$) see the positive race-related event as more important to US history than the positive race-neutral event. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .83$, $SD = .81$), moderates ($M = .80$, $SD = .70$), and conservatives ($M = .95$, $SD = 1.11$) saw the positive race-related event as more important to US history than the negative race-neutral event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score generated from the extent to which the events should be taught in K-12 schools. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 2.23$, $p = .039$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on the extent to which the event should be taught ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology also had a statistically significant effect on the extent to which the event should be taught ($p < .001$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M = -.08$, $SD = 1.25$), moderates ($M = -1.25$, $SD = 1.56$), and conservatives ($M = -.75$, $SD = 1.21$) reported that the positive race-neutral events should be taught in K-12 schools more than the negative race-related events. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .10$, $SD = .80$) reported that the negative race-related event should be taught more than the negative race-neutral event while moderates ($M = -.36$, $SD = 1.03$), and conservatives ($M = -.39$, $SD = .87$)

reported that the race-neutral events should be taught more. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M= 1.18, SD= .90$), moderates ($M= .57, SD= .81$), and conservatives ($M=.36, SD= .94$) reported that the positive race-related event should be taught more than the positive race-neutral event. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M= 1.15, SD= .95$), moderates ($M= .91, SD= .62$), and conservatives ($M= 1.25, SD= 1.09$) reported that the positive race-related event should be taught in schools more than the negative race-neutral event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score generated from how impactful participants perceived the event was in the past. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582)= 2.61, p= .017$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on how impactful the event was ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology had a marginally significant effect on how impactful the event was ($p=.087$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M= -.24, SD= 1.19$), moderates ($M= -.44, SD= 1.14$), and conservatives ($M=-.19, SD= 1.31$) reported that the positive race-neutral events were more impactful in the past than the negative race-related events. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M= -.15, SD= .86$), moderates ($M= -.50, SD=.82$), and conservatives ($M= -.57, SD= .84$) saw the negative race-neutral events as more impactful in the past than the negative race-related events but liberals believed this the least. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M=.78, SD= .77$), moderates ($M= .50, SD= .77$), and conservatives ($M=.04, SD=.83$) see the positive race-related event as more impactful in the past than the positive race-neutral event. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral

negative condition, liberals ($M = .54, SD = .76$), moderates ($M = .47, SD = .95$), and conservatives ($M = .89, SD = 1.24$) saw the positive race-related event as more impactful in the past than the negative race-neutral event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score generated from how impactful participants perceived the event to be today. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a marginally significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 1.85, p = .087$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on how impactful the event is today ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology had a significant effect on how impactful the event is today ($p < .001$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M = -.01, SD = 1.22$), moderates ($M = -.66, SD = 1.47$), and conservatives ($M = -.65, SD = 1.45$) reported that the positive race-neutral event was more impactful today than the negative race-related event but liberals believed this less. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .28, SD = .94$) reported that the negative race-related event was more impactful today than the negative race-neutral event while moderates ($M = -.16, SD = 1.11$), and conservatives ($M = -.04, SD = 1.19$) saw the race-neutral events as more impactful today. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M = .86, SD = .94$), moderates ($M = .57, SD = .95$), and conservatives ($M = .27, SD = .99$) see the positive race-related event as more impactful than the positive race-neutral event. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = 1.12, SD = .89$), moderates ($M = .82, SD = .79$), and conservatives ($M = 1.43, SD = 1.15$) saw the positive race-related event as more impactful today than the negative race-neutral event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score for how negative the events were perceived to be. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 4.52, p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on how negative the event was perceived to be ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology did not have a significant effect on how negative the event was perceived to be ($p = .62$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M = -4.17, SD = 1.11$), moderates ($M = -3.63, SD = .91$), and conservatives ($M = -3.65, SD = 1.13$) but liberals were most likely to see the negative race-related event as more negative than the positive race-neutral event. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .21, SD = .48$), moderates ($M = .27, SD = .62$), and conservatives ($M = .17, SD = .48$) saw the race-neutral events as more negative. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M = .48, SD = .80$) and moderates ($M = .13, SD = .85$) see the positive race-neutral event as more negative than the positive race-related event while conservatives ($M = -.32, SD = 1.12$) report that positive race-related events are more negative than positive race-neutral events. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.06$), moderates ($M = 3.13, SD = .89$), and conservatives ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.04$) saw the negative race-neutral event as more negative than the positive race-related event.

A two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on the difference score for how shameful the events were perceived to be. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(6, 582) = 3.04, p = .006$). Simple main effects analysis showed that

condition did have a statistically significant effect on how shameful the event was perceived to be ($p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology did not have a significant effect on how shameful the event was perceived to be ($p = .80$). In the race-related negative and race-neutral positive condition, liberals ($M = -3.67, SD = 1.28$), moderates ($M = -2.94, SD = 1.50$), and conservatives ($M = -3.08, SD = 1.36$) but liberals were most likely to see the race-related event as more shameful. In the race-related negative and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = -.22, SD = .60$), moderates ($M = -.13, SD = .35$), and conservatives ($M = -.16, SD = .58$) but, again, liberals were most likely to see the race-related event as more shameful. In the race-related positive and race-neutral positive, liberals ($M = .18, SD = 1.02$) see the race-neutral event as more shameful than the race-related event while moderates ($M = -.05, SD = .99$) and conservatives ($M = -.51, SD = .58$) report that race-related events are more shameful than race-neutral events. Lastly, in the race-related positive and race-neutral negative condition, liberals ($M = .27, SD = 1.24$), moderates ($M = 2.53, SD = .91$), and conservatives ($M = 2.84, SD = 1.11$) saw the negative race-neutral event as more shameful than the positive race-related event.

Supplemental Study Qualtrics Survey Flow

Standard: CAPTCHA (3 Questions)

Block: Consent (1 Question)

Branch: New Branch

If

If Informed Consent Agreement protocol #4156 Please read this consent agreement carefully before you... No Is Selected

Standard: Prolific ID (1 Question)

Standard: Intro (1 Question)

BlockRandomizer: 1 - Evenly Present Elements

Group: Race- Neutral -

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1955 Race -, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1955 Neutral-, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1963 Race -, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1963 Neutral-, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1972 Race -, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1972 Neutral -, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1919 Neutral -, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1919 Race -, neutral - (2 Questions)

Group: Race- Neutral+

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1967 Race -, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1967 Neutral +, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1931 Race -, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1931 Neutral +, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1970 Race -, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1970 Neutral +, Race - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Race -, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Neutral +, Race - (2 Questions)

Group: Race+ Neutral-

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1954 Race +, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1954 Neutral -, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1942 Race +, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1942 Neutral -, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Race +, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1947 Neutral -, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1966 Race +, neutral - (2 Questions)

Standard: 1966 Neutral -, race + (2 Questions)

Group: Race+ Neutral +

BlockRandomizer: 8 -

Standard: 1983 Race +, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1983 Neutral +, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1956 Race +, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1956 Neutral +, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1960 Race +, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1960 Neutral +, race + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1976 Race +, neutral + (2 Questions)

Standard: 1976 Neutral +, Race + (2 Questions)

Standard: Attention Checks (2 Questions)

Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)

Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)

Supplemental Study Removing Year from Events

One possibility for why we did not see effects of race-relatedness on temporal distancing of events is that we gave participants the year in which the events happened which might constrain participants thinking about how far away events feel. Therefore, in the present study, I remove year from the historical event items.

Method

Participants

Four White American participants were recruited from Prolific, 409 participated in the study. Three hundred and eight identified as White American and were included in analyses. The final dataset consisted of 308 participants. In the final dataset, 157 identified as women, 149 as men, one identified as non-binary/gender non-conforming, and one identified as transgender. The average age was 42.09 ($SD= 14.05$) and the modal response for income was between \$35,000 and \$64,999.

Procedure

After consenting to participate, participants were told that they would read about some historical events and answer some questions about these events. Specifically, they were told:

“In this study, we want to know about your opinions on American history. You will read about 8 historical events and answer some questions about each event.”

Participants were then randomly assigned to one of two conditions. Neither condition included year for the historical events. One condition presented events with race specified and the other condition had the same information but without race specified. In each condition, participants saw seven historical events in random order. After each event, participants responded to one item

asking how far away the event felt. Then participants responded to demographic questions and were debriefed.

Historical events

Participants saw seven historical events. The events were the same across conditions, but race was either highlighted (race-related) or not (race-unrelated). The events ranged from 1919 to 2019 (see Table 1 for items).

Table 8

Historical events for study with year removed

	Race-related Events	Race-unrelated Events
1919	In Arkansas, a group of Black sharecroppers gathered at a church to discuss unfair low wages. A group of White men, some affiliated with local police, came with rifles and fired into the church. Soldiers were called to the area to help and the result was a massacre of over 200 Black Americans and 5 White men. 12 of the surviving Black sharecroppers were later put on trial and sentenced to death.	In Arkansas, a group of sharecroppers gathered at a church to discuss unfair low wages. A group of men, some affiliated with local police, came with rifles and fired into the church. Soldiers were called to the area to help and the result was a massacre of over 200 people. 12 of the surviving sharecroppers were later put on trial and sentenced to death.
1931	Nine young black men were accused of raping two women in Scottsboro, Alabama; they would later become known as the "Scottsboro Boys." Police convinced these women to create false	Nine young men were accused of raping two women in Scottsboro, Alabama; they would later become known as the "Scottsboro Boys." Police convinced these women to create false

- | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | rape claims after the boys were found riding a train illegally. The boys were convicted and sentenced to death. | rape claims after the boys were found riding a train illegally. The boys were convicted and sentenced to death. |
| 1947 | Rosa Lee Ingram, a black widowed sharecropper with twelve children, was approached by a white sharecropper with a rifle who lived on the same property as the Ingram family. While trying to harass her to have sex with him, Ingram's sons came to fight the man off leaving him dead. Rosa Lee Ingram and two of her teenage sons were put in jail for 12 years. | Rosa Lee Ingram, a widowed sharecropper with twelve children, was approached by another sharecropper with a rifle who lived on the same property as the Ingram family. While trying to harass her to have sex with him, Ingram's sons came to fight the man off leaving him dead. Rosa Lee Ingram and two of her teenage sons were put in jail for 12 years. |
| 1955 | A 14 year old Black boy in Chicago, was murdered by two white men for allegedly harassing a white woman. His murderers were found not guilty by an all white jury. The murderers later admitted to beating and shooting the boy. | A 14 year old boy in Chicago, was murdered by two men for allegedly harassing a woman. His murderers were found not guilty by a jury. The murderers later admitted to beating and shooting the boy. |
| 1963 | White supremacists bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services; four young Black girls were killed in the explosion. The church bombing was | A group of people bombed the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama during Sunday services; four young girls were killed in the explosion. The church bombing was the third in 11 days. |

the third in 11 days, after the federal government had ordered the integration of Alabama schools.

1970	Police opened fire on a group of students at Jackson State College, a historically Black college. Police Officers shot and killed two black students and injured twelve. Prior to the shooting, students were rioting in response to a rumor that civil rights activist Charles Evers had been assassinated. After an investigation on the shooting, the police were criticized, but no arrests were made.	Police opened fire on a group of students at Jackson State College. Police Officers shot and killed two students and injured twelve. Prior to the shooting, students were rioting in response to a rumor that activist Charles Evers had been assassinated. After an investigation on the shooting, the police were criticized, but no arrests were made.
2019	23 people were killed and 23 injured by a lone gunman at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas. The white nationalist gunman intended to murder Hispanic people, he was subsequently charged with a hate crime as well as murder.	23 people were killed and 23 injured by a lone gunman at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas. The gunman intended to murder people, he was subsequently charged with murder.

Results

Did participants distance place race-related vs. race-unrelated historical events further in the past?

To test this question, I conducted a one-way ANOVA on participants' temporal distance ratings with whether events were race-related or race-unrelated as the independent variable. This analysis revealed a marginally significant effect of condition on distancing of historical events,

$F(1, 306) = 3.77, p = .053$. Participants in the race-unrelated condition placed the events marginally further in the past ($M = 4.90, SD = 1.08$) than those in the race-related condition ($M = 4.64, SD = 1.21$). Those in the race-related condition placed events marginally closer to the past than those in the unrelated condition.

Did conservatives place race-related events further in the past than liberals?

To test this question, a two-way ANOVA was performed to analyze the effect of condition and political ideology on temporal distancing of events. A two-way ANOVA revealed that there was not a significant interaction between the effects of condition and political ideology ($F(1, 304) = .68, p = .41$). Simple main effects analysis showed that condition did have a statistically significant effect on distancing of historical events ($p = .05$). Simple main effects analysis showed that political ideology also had a significant effect on distancing of historical events ($p = .62$). In the race-related condition, liberals ($M = 4.17, SD = 1.06$) placed the events closer to the present than did conservatives ($M = 4.92, SD = 1.22$). In the race-unrelated condition, liberals ($M = 4.61, SD = 1.12$) placed the events closer to the present than did conservatives ($M = 5.11, SD = 1.00$).

Pilot Study 3 Qualtrics Survey Flow

Standard: CAPTCHA (3 Questions)

Block: Consent (6 Questions)

Standard: Ranking (2 Questions)

Standard: Attention Questions (3 Questions)

Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)

Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)

Experiment 1 Qualtrics Survey Flow**Standard: CAPTCHA (3 Questions)****Block: Consent (6 Questions)****BlockRandomizer: 1 -****Standard: Threat (5 Questions)****Standard: Control (5 Questions)****Standard: Ranking (2 Questions)****Standard: Racial Resentment (5 Questions)****Standard: White Nationalism (7 Questions)****Standard: Attention Questions (3 Questions)****Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)****Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)**

Experiment 1 Articles

Black Employee Initiatives

Log In | [Get Home Delivery](#)

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

[Donate](#)

[News](#) ▾ [Sports](#) ▾ [Politics](#) ▾ [Commentary](#) ▾ [Life & Culture](#) ▾ [Obituaries](#) ▾ [Classifieds](#) ▾ [E-Paper](#) [More](#) ▾ [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [YouTube](#) [Instagram](#) [Search](#)

[COLUMNISTS](#) [NEWS](#) [CHICAGO](#)

Supporting Black employees is critical now

By Staff | Mar 2, 2023, 3:45pm EST

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [Email](#) [Share](#)

More than ever, it is important for organizations to support their employees. It is especially important for organizations to support their Black employees, who often feel isolated and unsupported in their work. Efforts to support Black employees can include the following:

- Business leaders acknowledging a company's past mistakes and shortcomings with regards to those who identify as Black.
- Offering Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion trainings.
- Evaluating managers on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion metrics so it is a day-to-day priority.
- Offering a predictable and flexible scheduling practice for Black employees.
- Targeted recruiting of Black employees to participate in management trainings.

These are just a few examples of what organizations can do to support Black employees. These initiatives often require the re-allocation of resources and the prioritizing of opportunities for Black employees. But they are necessary to ensure Black employees are taken care of.

All Employee Initiatives

Log In | [Get Home Delivery](#)

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

[Donate](#)

[News](#) ▾ [Sports](#) ▾ [Politics](#) ▾ [Commentary](#) ▾ [Life & Culture](#) ▾ [Obituaries](#) ▾ [Classifieds](#) ▾ [E-Paper](#) [More](#) ▾ [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [YouTube](#) [Instagram](#) [Search](#)

[COLUMNISTS](#) [NEWS](#) [CHICAGO](#)

Supporting employees is critical now

By Staff | Mar 2, 2023, 3:45pm EST

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [Email](#) [Share](#)

More than ever, it is important for organizations to support their employees, who often feel isolated and unsupported in their work. Efforts to support employees can include the following:

- Business leaders recognizing the importance of work-life balance for all employees.
- Offering Wellness and Health trainings.
- Rewarding managers who provide excellent mentorship.
- Offering a predictable and flexible scheduling practice for employees.
- Encouraging employees to participate in management trainings.

These are just a few examples of what organizations can do to support employees. These initiatives often require the re-allocation of resources and the prioritizing of opportunities for employees. But they are necessary to ensure employees are taken care of.

Racial Resentment Measure**ANES, 2018**

1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

-Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up.

Blacks should do the same without any special favors.

-Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.

-Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.

-It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.

White Nationalism Measure**Reyna, Harris, Bellovary, Armenta, & Zarate, 2022**

1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

- I am sympathetic to organizations/groups that bring attention to White concerns.
- White American culture is what makes this country great.
- One of the problems with America is the decline of Whiteness.
- Multiculturalism is the biggest threat to White America.
- In order to maintain White status, it is sometimes necessary to use violence towards racial/ethnic minority groups.
- Whites should band together to support policies that ensure a White majority.

Experiment 2 Qualtrics Survey Flow**Standard: CAPTCHA (3 Questions)****Block: Consent (6 Questions)****BlockRandomizer: 1 - Evenly Present Elements****Group: Threat****Standard: Threat (8 Questions)****Standard: manip check (1 Question)****Standard: Ranking (2 Questions)****Standard: Racial Resentment (5 Questions)****Standard: White Nationalism (7 Questions)****Group: Control****Standard: Ranking (2 Questions)****Standard: Racial Resentment (5 Questions)****Standard: White Nationalism (7 Questions)****Standard: Control (8 Questions)****Standard: manip check (1 Question)****Standard: Attention Questions (3 Questions)****Standard: Demographics (18 Questions)****Standard: Debrief (2 Questions)**

Experiment 2 Stimuli

Log In | [Get Home Delivery](#)

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES [Donate](#)

[News](#) ▾ [Sports](#) ▾ [Politics](#) ▾ [Commentary](#) ▾ [Life & Culture](#) ▾ [Obituaries](#) ▾ [Classifieds](#) ▾ [E-Paper](#) [More](#) ▾ [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [YouTube](#) [Instagram](#) [Search](#)

[COLUMNISTS](#) [NEWS](#) [POLITICS](#)

Reparations could happen

By Staff | Mar 26, 2023, 1:38pm EDT

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [Email](#) [SHARE](#)

Scholars and activists have argued that the United States' history of racial exploitation and violence warrants reparations. In particular, proponents state that slavery is historical justification for African Americans to receive reparations. As a result, a historic number of politicians are supporting the push for slavery reparations for African Americans to be considered.

At the federal level, in 2021, the U.S. House of Representatives approved a reparations bill which established a committee to examine the impact of slavery on living African Americans and develop a proposal for reparations to redress the impact of slavery. While the reparations committee at the federal level continues to explore options for reparations, cities across the U.S. have already begun to redress the impact of slavery by proposing reparations plans for African Americans.

Some cities have provided housing vouchers to African American residents. In Evanston, Illinois, officials approved a reparations program that would provide African American residents with \$25,000 housing grants and mortgage assistance. Asheville, NC, in what officials describe as a community reparations plan, has begun to make monetary investments into African American neighborhoods.

Many proponents of reparations for slavery have claimed that cash deposits to African Americans are needed to redress the impact of slavery. A reparations committee in San Francisco, CA has proposed a plan in line with these claims. The proposed plan would give every eligible African American resident a \$5 million cash deposit. This reparations plan is showing early signs of support from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

The proposed plan would give every eligible African American resident a \$5 million cash deposit.

Ebony Carter, an activist based in North Carolina, has been fighting for reparations for over a decade. In response to this increase in support for reparations, Carter states that “African Americans need reparations now and it seems like we’re getting it. I’m calling on politicians to continue the fight for reparations for slavery.”

“African Americans need reparations now and it seems like we’re getting it.”

While the national reparations committee continues to work towards a slavery reparations plan, cities across the U.S. have proposals that are showing early signs of success with intended benefits for African Americans.

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

[About Us](#) • [Get Home Delivery](#) • [Work With Us](#) • [Media Kit](#) • [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Notice](#) • [Cookie Policy](#) • [Terms of Sale](#)

Experiment 2 Group Status Threat Manipulation Check**Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b**

1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

Some people worry that as Black Americans gain status, White Americans' status will decrease. We would like to know what you think. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement.

Increases in racial minorities' status will reduce White Americans' status.