Online Supplement

Table of Contents

Supplemental Pre-Registration Information

Supplemental Tables

Supplemental Analyses

Pilot Study 1 18

Study 1 24

- Data Exclusions 24
- Organizational Safety Concerns (Results for each concern separately) 24
- Additional Analyses (Outcomes not in main text) 25

Study 2 28

- Data Exclusions 28
- Organizational Safety Concerns (Results for each concern separately) 28
- Additional Analyses (Outcomes not in main text) 29

Pilot Study 2 (Testing shared discrimination manipulation) 31

Study 3 36

- Data Exclusions 36
- Organizational Safety Concerns (Results for each concern separately) 36
- Additional Analyses (Outcomes not in main text) 37

Study 4 39

- Data Exclusions 39
- Organizational Safety Concerns (Results for each concern separately) 39

Studies 5a & 5b 41

- Data Exclusions 41
- Supplemental Replication of Studies 5a & Studies 5b 41

Study 6 45

- Data Exclusions 45
- Organizational Safety Concerns (Results for each concern separately) 45
- Additional Analyses (Outcomes not in main text) 46

Supplemental References

Table of Contents

Supplemental Pre-registration Information

Below we provide additional information regarding our pre-registration plan for each study presented in the main text. The corresponding pre-registration link is provided for each study, and we note any deviations from our pre-registration plan as well as provide additional details for any missing information. To avoid redundancy with information provided in the pre-registration plan, we only provide additional details for answers that were missing a response (e.g., stopping rule, sample size rationale).

Study 1

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/8xfrv/?view_only=cf654b2188ec44aeb2407b01559d6095

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

In our pre-registration we indicated we would recruit participants from CloudResearch; however, as noted in the main text, we recruited participants across all studies from Prolific.

As noted in the main text, we also deviated from our pre-registration plan and did not include measures assessing job uncertainty for employed or unemployed participants. A separate line of work included similar measures and we found no moderation. Thus, in Study 1, we opted to not collect these measures.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Hypotheses

In our pre-registration plan, we only specified our hypothesis for our primary outcome – organizational safety (i.e., referred to as identity safety). We also hypothesized that the presence of gender pronouns would result in greater procedural fairness for LGBT+ employees relative to when pronouns were absent.

Is there any additional blinding in this study? Outside of participants not knowing which condition of the study they were assigned, there was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to one level of each independent variable (i.e., simple random assignment to one of four conditions).

Sample size

As detailed in the main text, to account for potential exclusions due to failed attention and manipulation checks and because effect sizes based on past work tend to be overestimated (Anderson et al., 2017), we increased the number of participants recruited to retain our minimum needed sample size (i.e., 304 participants). In Study 1, we recruited a total of 426 participants and retained 373 participants.

Sample size rationale

As detailed in our pre-registration plan (see answer to "Sample Size" question), to determine sample size, we looked at effects of gender pronouns being present from a previous related study (i.e., Johnson et al., 2021 examined the effects of gender pronouns being present vs. absent among members of the LGB community). In this study, the difference between the gender pronoun present and gender pronoun absent condition yielded an effect size of $d = 0.54$ for trust, $d = 0.74$ for organizational commitment, and $d = 0.42$ for organizational attractiveness. We selected the smallest effect size of the three and based on an a priori analysis using G*Power with this effect size, we would need at least 76 participants per condition.

Table of Contents

Stopping rule

We made an a priori decision to recruit 426 participants and stopped data collection once we reached 426.

Indices

As noted in the main text, we made a post hoc decision to combine our measures of organizational attraction, commitment, and trust into a single index of identity-safety.

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Inference criteria

As noted in the main text, our inference criteria was a *p*-value of .05, such that *p*-values equal to or greater than .05 are considered statistically non-significant and *p*-values less than .05 are considered a statistically significant result.

Data exclusion

We excluded participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks, as well as participants that did not identify as Black women.

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Study 2

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/njdvt/?view_only=e74d9d0156d0492b8ca935a048016603

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

In our pre-registration we indicated we would recruit participants from MTurk or Prolific; however, as noted in the main text, we recruited participants across all studies from Prolific.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Hypotheses

In our pre-registration plan, we only specified our hypothesis for our primary outcome – organizational safety (i.e., referred to as identity safety). We also hypothesized that the presence of the Rainbow Pride Flag would result in greater procedural fairness for LGBT+ employees relative to when absent. We also anticipated that the presence of the BLM Flag would result in greater procedural fairness for Black employees relative to when absent. We did not have a priori hypotheses regarding whether the Pride Flag would affect Black procedural fairness, or if the BLM flag would effect LGBT procedural fairness.

Is there any additional blinding in this study? Outside of participants not knowing which condition of the study they were assigned, there was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to one level of each independent variable (i.e., simple random assignment to one of four conditions).

Sample size

Table of Contents

As detailed in the main text, to account for potential exclusions due to failed attention and manipulation checks and because effect sizes based on past work tend to be overestimated (Anderson et al., 2017), we increased the number of participants recruited to retain our minimum needed sample size (i.e., 304 participants). In Study 2, we recruited a total of 426 participants, 427 accessed the online study and we retained 390 participants. All participants were cisgender, heterosexual, Black women.

Sample size rationale

As noted in the main text and in our pre-registration plan, we determined sample size for Study 2 consistent with that for Study 1.

Stopping rule

We made an a priori decision to recruit 426 participants and stopped data collection once we reached 426.

Indices

As noted in the main text, we combined our measures of organizational attraction, commitment, and trust into a single index of identity-safety, consistent with Study 1.

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Inference criteria

As noted in the main text, our inference criteria was a *p*-value of .05, such that *p*-values equal to or greater than .05 are considered statistically non-significant and *p*-values less than .05 are considered a statistically significant result.

Data exclusion

We excluded participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks, as well as participants that did not identify as Black, cisgender, heterosexual women.

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Study 3

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/v59um/?view_only=5f0c55602f3f42bb9aca15cbdeeaf4cf

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

Because we did not find a significant effect of shared history on organizational safety, we did not conduct the mediational analysis identified in our pre-registration plan.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Hypotheses

In our pre-registration plan, we only specified our hypotheses for organizational safety (i.e., referred to as identity safety) and shared discrimination (i.e., referred to as shared adversity). We also hypothesized that the presence of the Pride Flag would result in greater procedural fairness for LGBT+ employees relative

to when pronouns were absent. Likewise, we anticipated that the presence of the Pride Flag would result in greater Black procedural fairness, but only for participants that first learned of the shared history between Black and LGBT persons (i.e., an interaction).

Is there any additional blinding in this study? Outside of participants not knowing which condition of the study they were assigned, there was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to one level of each independent variable (i.e., simple random assignment to one of four conditions).

Sample size

As detailed in the main text, to account for potential exclusions due to failed attention and manipulation checks and because effect sizes based on past work tend to be overestimated (Anderson et al., 2017), we increased the number of participants recruited to retain our minimum needed sample size based on our a priori power analyses (i.e., 210 participants). Also, given that we were predicting an interaction, we also increased our minimum needed sample size to 326 participants. In Study 3, we recruited a total of 426 participants and retained 364 participants. All participants were cisgender, heterosexual, Black women.

Sample size rationale

As detailed in our pre-registration plan (see answer to "Sample Size" question), to determine sample size, we conducted a pilot test on our news article (i.e., our manipulation of shared discrimination) to ensure they were well-matched, and that they encouraged perceptions of shared bias. Our pilot test ($N = 80$) revealed an effect size of $d = 0.56$ among Black women participants for the difference between the Shared history with LGBT versus the Shared history with Labor conditions. Based on an a priori power analyses using G*Power with this effect size for a between-subjects 2 × 2 ANOVA, we would need a total sample of 210 participants. To account for potential exclusions due to failed manipulation checks, and to ensure our sample size is consistent with other studies in this line of research, we aimed to retain a minimum sample of 326 cisgender, heterosexual Black women.

Stopping rule

We made an a priori decision to recruit 426 participants and stopped data collection once we reached 426.

Indices

As noted in the main text, we combined our measures of organizational attraction, commitment, and trust into a single index of identity-safety, consistent with Study 1.

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Inference criteria

As noted in the main text, our inference criteria was a *p*-value of .05, such that *p*-values equal to or greater than .05 are considered statistically non-significant and *p*-values less than .05 are considered a statistically significant result.

Data exclusion

We excluded participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks, as well as participants that did not identify as Black, cisgender, heterosexual women.

Table of Contents

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Study 4

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/vht9m/?view_only=324737256a1d44779ca99b068038e27f

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

We did not deviate from our pre-registered plan for Study 4. However, we clarify and expand on information that was unclear in our pre-registration below.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Hypotheses

In our pre-registration plan, we only specified our hypothesis for our primary outcome – organizational safety (i.e., referred to as identity safety). We also hypothesized that the LGBT+ awards would result in greater procedural fairness for LGBT employees relative to the control awards condition. Likewise, we anticipated that the Black employee awards condition would result in greater procedural fairness for Black employees relative to the control awards condition, and that the Latino employees award condition would result in greater procedural for Latino employees relative to the control awards condition.

Is there any additional blinding in this study? Outside of participants not knowing which condition of the study they were assigned, there was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions (i.e., simple random assignment).

Sample size

As detailed in the main text, to account for potential exclusions due to failed attention and manipulation checks and because effect sizes based on past work tend to be overestimated (Anderson et al., 2017), we increased the number of participants recruited to retain our minimum needed sample size (i.e., 400 participants). In Study 4, we recruited a total of 426 participants and retained 369 participants. All participants were cisgender, heterosexual, Black women.

Sample size rationale

As detailed in our pre-registration plan (see answer to "Sample Size" question), sample size was informed based on a previous study examining identity-safety cues for Black women. In this study, the difference between the identity-congruent safety cue condition and the identity-incongruent safety cue condition yielded an effect size of $d = 0.28$ for organizational identity-safety. Using G*Power with this effect size indicated we would need approximately 100 participants per condition. To account for potential exclusions due to failed manipulation checks, we recruited a minimum sample of 426 cisgender, heterosexual Black women.

Stopping rule

We made an a priori decision to recruit 426 participants and stopped data collection once we reached 426.

Indices

Table of Contents

As noted in the main text, we combined our measures of organizational attraction, commitment, and trust into a single index of identity-safety, consistent with Study 1.

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Inference criteria

As noted in the main text, our inference criteria was a *p*-value of .05, such that *p*-values equal to or greater than .05 are considered statistically non-significant and *p*-values less than .05 are considered a statistically significant result.

Data exclusion

We excluded participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks, as well as participants that did not identify as Black women.

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Exploratory analysis

As noted in our pre-registration plan (see "Measured variables" answer), for exploratory purposes, participants also completed items assessing the extent to which Black individuals and LGBT+ persons have faced similar bias (4 items), and the extent to which Black individuals and Latino persons have faced similar bias (4 items). To analyze these measures, we made an a priori decision to conduct a mixed model ANOVA with condition as a between-subjects variable and the two measures of shared discrimination as a within-subjects variable. We did not anticipate any condition effects on shared discrimination.

Studies 5a & 5b

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/qnkd4?view_only=1612c5b56ac640678ec3d19b896357a4

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

In our pre-registration plan, we describe Studies 5a & 5b as descriptive studies and indicate "there is no blinding involved in this study". This is because we made an a priori decision to treat Studies 5a and 5b as separate studies. However, participants were randomly assigned to complete either the intergroup prejudice (i.e., Study 5a) or the intergroup equality measures (Study 5b). Given the use of randomization to have participants complete intergroup prejudice ***or*** intergroup equality measures, a more precise description would have been an experiment.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Is there any additional blinding in this study? There was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to complete either intergroup prejudice (i.e., Study 5a) or intergroup equality (i.e., Study 5b) measures.

Indices

Table of Contents

As noted in our pre-registration plan (see "Measured Variables" answer), for multi-item measures, we will average the items, with higher scores indicating more of the measured constructs.

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Exploratory analysis

We had no exploratory analysis planned.

Study 6

Pre-registration link: https://osf.io/b7qyd/?view_only=8987c0d4e07c4286a909e38c04ce4368

Deviations from Pre-registration Plan

We did not deviate from our pre-registered plan for Study 6.

Additional Details and/or Missing Information

Is there any additional blinding in this study? Outside of participants not knowing which condition of the study they were assigned, there was no additional blinding.

Randomization Participants were randomly assigned to one level of each independent variable (i.e., simple random assignment to one of four conditions).

Transformations

No data transformations were conducted.

Inference criteria

As noted in the main text, our inference criteria was a *p*-value of .05, such that *p*-values equal to or greater than .05 are considered statistically non-significant and *p*-values less than .05 are considered a statistically significant result.

Data exclusion

We excluded participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks, as well as participants that did not identify as Black, cisgender, heterosexual women.

Missing data

We only included participants that provided complete data in our data analyses.

Exploratory analysis

As noted in our pre-registration plan (see "Measured variables" answer), for exploratory purposes we included measures assessing participants estimate of Black employees working at the company (1 item), women employees working at the company (1 item), Black women employees working at the company (1 item), perceptions of invisibility within the organization (6 items), and gender-race stigma consciousness

Table of Contents

(9 items). Except for gender-race stigma consciousness (SC), we conducted a 2 (Race-relevant cue: Present versus absent) × (Gender-relevant cue: Present versus absent) between-subjects ANOVA for each exploratory measure. We examined SC as a moderator and report all exploratory analyses in the online supplement.

Supplemental Tables

Table S1

Correlations among Variables for Studies 1 & 2

	Study 1	Study 2		
Variable	1	1	2	3
1. Organizational safety	-	-		
2. LGBT procedural fairness	.59*	.53*	-	
3. Black procedural fairness	-	.64*	.56*	-
4. GEC managers' SDO	-	-.49*	-.42*	-.50*

Note. * = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, † = $p < .05$

Table S2

Correlations among Variables for Studies 3 & 4

	Study 3				Study 4					
Variable	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Organizational safety	-				-					
2. LGBT procedural fairness	.55*	-			.51*	-				
3. Black procedural fairness	.54*	.62*	-		.63*	.48*	-			
4. Shared discrimination with LGBT+	.33*	.22*	.26*	-	.25*	.21*	.21*	-		
5. Intraminority solidarity	.31*	.26*	.35*	.41*	-	-	-	-	-	
6. Latino procedural fairness	-	-	-	-	.26*	.33*	.35*	.19	-	-
7. Shared discrimination with Latinos	-	-	-	-	.20*	.17*	.19*	.58*	-	.10

Note. * = $p < .001$; Intraminority solidarity was not measured in Study 4

Table of Contents

Table S3

Correlations among Variables for Study 6

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Organizational safety	-			
2. Black procedural fairness	.64*	-		
3. Women procedural fairness	.59*	.72*	-	
4. Black women procedural fairness	.63*	.85*	.78*	-
5. Organizational invisibility	-.34*	-.34*	-.27*	-.35*

Note. * = $p < .001$

Table of Contents

Table S4

Study 1 ANOVA and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for each separate outcome and outcomes not in main text

	Pronoun			Race			Pronoun × Race		
Measures	*F* (1,369)	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Attraction	0.03	.866	.001	2.12	.147	.006	0.21	.644	.001
Commitment	0.56	.457	.002	3.65	.057	.010	1.04	.309	.003
Trust	0.58	.446	.002	6.70	.010	.018	0.23	.630	.001
Inclusivity	1.19	.277	.003	15.97	<.001	.041	0.11	.744	.001

Mean (Standard Deviations) across Conditions

	Pronoun present		Pronoun absent					
	Black woman	White woman	Black woman	White woman	Black woman	White woman	Pronoun present	Pronoun absent
Measures	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Attraction	3.69 (1.15)	3.48 (0.97)	3.66 (1.00)	3.55 (1.05)	3.68_a (1.09)	3.51_a (1.01)	3.58_a (1.06)	3.60_a (1.03)
Commitment	3.87 (0.77)	3.64 (0.74)	3.85 (0.68)	3.78 (0.87)	3.86_a (0.73)	3.70_a (0.80)	3.75_a (0.76)	3.81_a (0.78)
Trust	3.91 (0.69)	3.67 (0.71)	3.93 (0.68)	3.77 (0.87)	3.92_a (0.68)	3.72_b (0.79)	3.85_b (0.79)	3.79_b (0.71)
Inclusivity	4.27 (0.68)	3.99 (0.69)	4.21 (0.7)	3.89 (0.74)	4.24_a (0.72)	3.96_b (0.71)	4.12_b (0.70)	4.04_b (0.77)

Note. Within each row, means with shared subscripts are not significantly different.

Table S5

Regression analyses predicting organizational safety from Pronoun condition, Employee race condition, mean-centered stigma consciousness, and the interactions of all three predictors

Regression Model	*b*	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Constant	5.13	0.38	13.50	<.001
Pronoun	-1.30	0.54	-2.41	.016
Employee race	-0.61	0.57	-1.08	.281
Stigma consciousness	-0.40	0.10	-3.86	<.001
Pronoun × Employee race	0.85	0.79	1.07	.284
Pronoun × Stigma consciousness	0.33	0.15	2.21	.028
Employee race × Stigma consciousness	0.20	0.15	1.31	.192
Pronoun × Employee race × Stigma consciousness	-0.20	0.22	-0.93	.353

Note. Gender-race stigma consciousness was mean centered, and Gender pronoun and Employee race were each dummy coded, with the Pronoun absent condition and the white woman employee, as the reference group, respectively.

Table of Contents

Table S6

Study 2 ANOVA and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for each separate outcome and additional outcomes not reported in main text

	Rainbow Pride flag			BLM flag			Rainbow Pride × BLM		
Measures	*F* (1,386)	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Attraction	0.51	.475	.001	0.49	.485	.001	1.34	.248	.003
Commitment	4.11	.043	.011	13.76	<.001	.034	1.01	.316	.003
Trust	1.38	.240	.004	9.10	.003	.023	0.54	.464	.001
Black allyship	1.12	.290	.003	25.25	<.001	.061	0.45	.503	.001
LGBT+ allyship	15.95	<.001	.040	0.23	.630	.001	1.14	.287	.003

Mean (Standard Deviations) across Conditions

	Rainbow Pride present		Rainbow Pride absent					
	BLM flag present	BLM flag absent	BLM flag present	BLM flag absent	BLM flag present	BLM flag absent	Rainbow flag present	Rainbow flag absent
Measures	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Attraction	3.81 (1.04)	3.86 (0.94)	4.00 (0.94)	3.81 (1.03)	3.91_a (0.99)	3.84_a (0.98)	3.84_a (0.99)	3.91_a (0.98)
Commitment	4.04 (0.77)	3.83 (0.78)	4.27 (0.66)	3.91 (0.77)	4.16_a (0.72)	3.87_b (0.77)	3.93_a (0.78)	4.10_b (0.73)
Trust	4.00 (0.74)	3.83 (0.77)	4.13 (0.60)	3.87 (0.71)	4.07_a (0.67)	3.85_b (0.74)	3.91_b (0.76)	4.01_b (0.66)
Black allyship	6.07 (1.08)	5.29 (1.37)	6.07 (1.14)	5.51 (1.41)	6.04_a (1.11)	5.40_b (1.39)	5.63_b (1.29)	5.80_b (1.30)
LGBT+ allyship	6.02 (1.05)	6.19 (0.90)	5.70 (1.11)	5.64 (1.25)	5.85_a (1.09)	5.92_a (1.12)	6.11_b (0.97)	5.67_a (1.18)

Note. Within each row, means with shared subscripts are not significantly different.

Table of Contents

Table S7

Pilot Study 2 – S*hared History Manipulation, t-tests and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for article attributes (top) and dependent variables (bottom)*

News article attributes					
	Condition			*M* (*SD*) across Conditions	
Measures	*t* (89)	*p*	Mean difference & 95% CI	Shared LGBT history present *n* = 46	Shared LGBT history absent *n* = 45
Interesting	0.20	.840	0.03 [-.29, .36]	4.50 (0.72)$_a$	4.47 (0.84)$_a$
Easy to read	-0.15	.882	-0.02 [-0.33, 0.28]	4.50 (0.75)$_a$	4.52(0.70)$_a$
Held attention	0.85	.400	0.15 [-0.20, 0.49]	4.48 (0.66)$_a$	4.33 (0.95)$_a$
Clear	-0.07	.947	-0.01 [-0.33, 0.30]	4.48 (0.75)$_a$	4.59 (0.76)$_a$
Informative	0.38	.702	0.05 [-0.22, 0.32]	4.67 (0.60)$_a$	4.62 (0.68)$_a$

Dependent variables					
	Condition			*M* (*SD*) across Conditions	
Measures	*t* (89)	*p*	Mean difference & 95% CI	Shared LGBT history present *n* = 46	Shared LGBT history absent *n* = 45
Overlap	1.82	.073	.50 [-0.05, 1.05]	3.43 (1.22)$_a$	2.93 (1.41)$_a$
Shared discrimination	2.57	.012	.99 [0.22, 1.76]	5.27 (1.44)$_a$	4.28 (2.15)$_b$
Similarity	1.98	.050	0.84 [-0.01, 1.69]	4.11 (1.91)$_a$	3.27 (2.13)$_a$
Empathy	1.88	.063	0.63 [-0.03, 1.30]	6.10 (1.43)$_a$	5.47 (1.75)$_a$
Intraminority solidarity	1.92	.058	0.46 [-0.02, 0.93]	5.32 (1.17)$_a$	4.87 (1.10)$_a$

Note. Levene's test for equal variances was significant for shared discrimination; thus, the reported results for shared discrimination reflect a Welch's corrected t-test with 76.61 degrees of freedom; Means with differing subscripts reflect a statistically significant difference

Table of Contents

Table S8

Study 3 ANOVA and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for each separate outcome and additional outcomes not reported in main text

	Rainbow pride flag (*1, 360*)			Shared History (*1, 360*)			Rainbow Pride × Shared History (*1, 360*)		
Measures	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Attraction	0.24	.622	.001	0.05	.820	.001	0.11	.745	.001
Commitment	0.28	.598	.098	0.54	.464	.001	0.01	.945	.001
Trust	0.14	.710	.001	1.89	.170	.005	0.17	.682	.001
Similarity	0.05	.819	.001	3.28	.071	.009	0.19	.661	.001
Empathy	5.84	.016	.016	0.25	.616	.001	1.31	.253	.004

Mean (Standard Deviations) across Conditions

	Rainbow Pride present		Rainbow Pride absent					
	LGBT+ Movement	Labor Movement	LGBT+ Movement	Labor Movement	LGBT+ Movement	Labor Movement	Rainbow Pride present	Rainbow Pride absent
Measures	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Attraction	3.95 (0.94)	4.01 (1.00)	3.93 (1.07)	3.92 (0.95)	3.94_a (1.00)	3.97_a (0.98)	3.98_a (0.97)	3.93_a (1.01)
Commitment	4.12 (0.66)	4.06 (0.81)	4.07 (0.67)	4.02 (0.83)	4.10_a (0.66)	4.04_a (0.82)	4.09_a (0.74)	4.05_a (0.75)
Trust	4.07 (0.64)	4.14 (0.75)	4.01 (0.75)	4.14 (0.60)	4.04_a (0.69)	4.14_a (0.68)	4.10_a (0.70)	4.07_a (0.68)
Similarity	3.99 (1.65)	3.59 (1.62)	3.87 (1.71)	3.62 (1.86)	3.93_a (1.68)	3.60_a (1.73)	3.78_a (1.64)	3.75_a (1.79)
Empathy	6.46 (1.06)	6.54 (1.03)	6.31 (1.21)	6.11 (1.35)	6.39_a (1.13)	6.34_a (1.21)	6.50_a (1.04)	6.21_b (1.28)

Note. Within each row, means with shared subscripts are not significantly different.

Table of Contents

Table S9

Study 4 ANOVA and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for each separate outcome

Measures	Condition		
	F *(1,365)*	*p*	η_p^2
Attraction	3.90	.009	.031
Commitment	4.89	.002	.039
Trust	1.65	.179	.013

Mean (Standard Deviations) across Conditions				
	Black diversity award	Latino diversity award	LGBT diversity award	Control diversity award
Measures	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Attraction	$3.93_a(0.91)$	$3.48_b(0.86)$	$3.72_{ab}(0.88)$	$3.77_{ab}(1.03)$
Commitment	$4.14_a(0.63)$	$3.81_b(0.73)$	$4.10_a(0.66)$	$4.14_a(0.75)$
Trust	$4.12_a(0.63)$	$3.91_a(0.73)$	$4.09_a(0.71)$	$4.03_a(0.75)$

Note. Within each row, means with shared subscripts are not significantly different.

Table of Contents

Table S10

Study 6 ANOVA and Means and Standard Deviations across Conditions for each separate outcome and outcomes not in main text

Measures	Gender-relevant			Race-Relevant			Race × Gender		
	F (1, 442)	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Attraction	0.86	.355	.002	4.47	.035	.010	5.72	.017	.013
Commitment	0.01	.971	.001	4.56	.033	.010	1.69	.195	.004
Trust	0.01	.921	.001	5.64	.018	.013	1.84	.176	.004
% of Black employees	6.72	.010	.015	24.63	<.001	.053	12.04	.<.001	.027
% of women employees	5.05	.025	.011	9.55	.002	.021	0.12	.725	.001
% of Black women employees	0.69	.407	.002	12.90	<.001	.028	5.48	.020	.012

Mean (Standard Deviations) across Conditions

	Gender-relevant present		Gender-relevant absent					
	Race-relevant present	Race-relevant absent	Race-relevant present	Race-relevant absent	Race-relevant present	Race-relevant absent	Gender-relevant present	Gender-relevant absent
Measures	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Attraction	3.68 (1.25)	3.70 (1.13)	4.03 (1.01)	3.55 (1.13)	3.86_a (1.14)	3.62_b (1.13)	3.69_b (1.19)	3.79_b (1.10)
Commitment	3.88 (0.80)	3.82 (0.82)	3.98 (0.73)	3.72 (0.85)	3.94_a (0.76)	3.78_b (0.83)	3.85_b (0.81)	3.86_b (0.80)
Trust	3.95 (0.76)	3.88 (0.84)	4.06 (0.70)	3.78 (0.85)	4.01_a (0.73)	3.83_b (0.84)	3.91_b (0.80)	3.93_b (0.78)
% of Black employees	46.01 (22.20)	42.80 (21.56)	59.08 (24.56)	40.90 (22.11)	52.80_a (24.30)	41.85_b (21.81)	44.39_b (21.89)	50.35_b (25.08)
% of women employees	56.82 (19.78)	51.79 (20.20)	53.34 (18.77)	47.02 (18.60)	55.00_a (19.29)	49.43_b (19.53)	54.26_a (20.11)	50.29_b (18.91)
% of Black women employees	37.78 (24.47)	35.02 (23.10)	44.77 (23.95)	31.69 (21.32)	41.41_a (24.40)	33.37_b (22.25)	36.38_a (23.77)	38.46_a (23.60)

Note. Within each row, means with shared subscripts are not significantly different.

Table of Contents

Table S11

Regression analyses predicting organizational safety from Gender-relevant cues, Race-relevant cues, mean-centered stigma consciousness, and the interactions of all three predictors

Regression Model	*b*	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Constant	3.67	0.08	47.10	<.001
Gender-relevant cue	0.14	0.11	1.25	.212
Race-relevant cue	0.36	0.11	3.31	.001
Stigma consciousness	-0.25	0.07	-3.51	<.001
Gender-relevant cue × Race-relevant cue	-0.33	0.15	-2.11	.036
Gender-relevant cue × Stigma consciousness	0.31	0.14	2.23	.026
Race-relevant cue × Stigma consciousness	0.40	0.14	2.93	.004
Race-relevant cue × Gender-relevant cue × Stigma consciousness	-0.32	0.20	-1.63	.103

Note. Gender-race stigma consciousness was mean centered, and gender-relevant cue and race-relevant cue conditions were each dummy coded, with the gender-relevant cue absent and the race-relevant cue absent, as the reference groups, respectively.

Table of Contents

Supplemental Analyses

Pilot Study 1

Prior to running our first study examining the efficacy of gender pronouns as an identity-safety for (predominantly) cisgender, heterosexual Black women, we ran a pilot study to ensure that Black women participants could report the purpose of gender pronouns. To achieve this goal, we ran a study identical to Study 1; however, we only utilized the white female employee conditions. Thus, our pilot study only manipulated the presence of the incongruent cue. At the end of the study, we assessed whether participants knew the purpose of gender pronouns.

Method

Power analysis. Sample size was informed based on research examining pronouns as an identity-safety cue for sexual and gender minorities, which utilized approximately 50 participants per cell for their two-condition design (see Study 1, Johnson et al., 2021). Thus, we recruited 100 Black women participants; however, 108 participants accessed the survey.

Data exclusions. Utilizing the same attention and manipulation checks described in the main text for Study 1, we excluded a total of twenty-three participants for failing attention checks and/or manipulation checks. This left a final sample of 85 participants.

Participants and sensitivity analysis. Black women participants were recruited via Cloud Research and were paid $1.50 for a 10-minute study. Participants ages were M = 34.00, SD = 15.50, range = 16 – 75. One hundred percent of participants worked at a company and 35 (41.2%) reported working in a company where the explicit identification of gender pronouns was incorporated into organizational materials. Participants had the following additional characteristics: 2 participants (2.4%) had less than a high school education, 36 (42.4%) had a

Table of Contents

high school degree or GED, 18 (21.2%) earned a 2-year college degree, 23 (27.1%) earned a 4-year college degree, 3 (3.5%) participants had a Master's degree, and 3 (3.5%) participants had a Professional degree. Majority of our sample was heterosexual (n = 74; 87.1%) and cisgender (n = 83; 97.6%). Controlling for demographic variables did not change our results; thus, we did not include these variables in the subsequent analyses.

A post hoc power sensitivity analyses using G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) indicated that with an independent groups t-test at 95% power, with a sample size of 85, we were adequately powered to find a medium-large (d = 0.81) effect size at $p < .05$.

Procedure. The study had a 2-condition design (pronouns present [n = 53] versus pronouns absent [n = 32]). Our procedure and materials were identical to that described in the main text for Study 1; however, our pilot study only included the white female employee conditions. Below, we provide a brief description of the procedure but interested readers can reference Study 1 of the main text and supplemental materials for more detail.

Participants viewed the homepage for Uptown Consulting, LLC and were next randomly assigned to view one of two employee biographies. Both biographies featured a successful current employee and we manipulated whether the biography explicitly identified the employee's gender pronouns. For participants in pronouns present condition, the biography included "Gender Pronouns: She/Her/Hers". For participants in the pronouns absent condition, this information was not included. The two conditions only differed in the explicit identification of the employee's gender pronouns; all other information was identical across conditions.

After viewing the biography, all participants viewed a brief interview with Amber, which again presented her photo, e-mail, and position, along the left-side of the screen. For participants

in the pronouns present condition, Amber's gender pronouns (i.e., Gender Pronouns: she/her/hers) were also included along the left-side.

Participants next reported organizational commitment, organizational inclusivity, and gender-race stigma consciousness. Participants then completed a manipulation check, a single item to examine their knowledge of gender pronouns, and demographics before concluding the study session.

Measures. As in the main text, we measured all continuous variables using a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Unless otherwise noted, participants responded to items "as if they were an employee at Uptown Consulting, LLC." For each measure, we averaged participants' responses to the items, with higher scores indicating more of each measured construct.

Organizational commitment. We utilized the same five items as in the main text (e.g., "I am proud to tell others I work at my organization"; Meyer & Allen, 1991; $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.84$; $\alpha = .78$).

Organizational inclusivity. Participants also responded to four items, created by the researchers, to gauge the extent to which they perceived the company as inclusive for marginalized groups, broadly. Items included: "My organization does not value hiring employees of diverse identities" (Reverse-scored); "My organization supports women in the workplace"; "My organization supports sexual minorities in the workplace"; "My organization values hiring racial and ethnic minorities in the workplace"; ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.77$; $\alpha = .64$).

Gender-race stigma consciousness. Because past work has found that Black women high in stigma consciousness are particularly sensitive to cues affirming both their racial *and* gender

identity (Pietri et al., 2018), we also included a measure of gender-race stigma consciousness. Specifically, participants were instructed they would also respond to items "assessing their general experiences about being a Black woman". These items have been utilized in past work among Black women (Johnson et al., 2019; Johnson & Pietri, 2020) and aim to assess participants' sensitivity to experiencing discrimination due to their race and gender (e.g. "When interacting with people, I feel like they interpret all of my behaviors in terms of my race and gender"; 9 items; $M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.66$; $\alpha = .69$).

Gender pronoun purpose. At the end of the study, participants responded to a single item to assess their understanding of gender pronouns: "Which of the following best describes the purpose of gender pronouns"? We provided three answer options: "Gender pronouns reflect a person's gender identity and can include she/her, he/him, or they/them" [**Correct answer**]; "Gender pronouns are always determined by a person's biological sex" [Incorrect answer]; "I am not sure" [Unsure].

Results

Gender pronoun purpose. Before examining the effect of gender pronouns on our various measures, we first examined participant's responses to our item examining the purpose of gender pronouns. Sixty-eight (80.0%) of participants responded with the correct answer, 10 (11.8%) responded with the incorrect answer, and seven (8.2%) indicated they were unsure. Thus, majority of participants correctly identified the purpose of gender pronouns.

Critically, our results do not change if we exclude participants that selected the incorrect answer or were unsure; thus, to maximize power, we included all participants.

Table of Contents

Organizational commitment. An independent samples *t* test on organizational commitment revealed non-significant results. Participants in the pronouns present condition (*M* = 3.75, *SD* = 0.79) did not differ from participants in the pronouns absent condition, (*M* = 3.74, *SD* = 0.93); *t*(83) = 0.04, *p* = .970, *d* = 0.01, Mean Difference: 0.01, 95% CI [-0.37, 0.38].

Organizational inclusivity. An independent samples *t* test on organizational inclusivity also revealed non-significant results. Participants in the pronouns present condition (*M* = 3.59, *SD* = 0.78) did not differ from participants in the pronouns absent condition, (*M* = 3.71, *SD* = 0.77); *t*(83) = -0.70, *p* = .487, *d* = 0.15, Mean Difference: -0.12, 95% CI [-0.47, 0.22][1].

Moderation by gender-race stigma consciousness on organizational commitment. To explore whether stigma consciousness (SC) was a moderator for the pronoun present vs. absent condition, we ran a moderation regression analyses with Hayes (2018) PROCESS macro, model 1 with (1) pronoun condition dummy coded (pronouns present = 1, pronouns absent = 0) and mean-centered SC and (2) the interaction between SC and pronoun condition on organizational commitment. No evidence of moderation by SC emerged. The effect of pronoun condition, *b* = -0.01, *t*(81) = -0.06, *p* = .949, SC, *b* = -0.01, *t*(81) = 0.01, *p* = .996, and the interaction of SC with pronoun condition, *b* = 0.031, *t*(81) = 1.05, *p* = .295, were all non-significant.

Moderation by gender-race stigma consciousness on organizational inclusivity. To examine whether SC moderated inclusivity, we ran a regression analysis identical to that described above, with inclusivity now as the outcome variable. This analyses revealed a non-significant effect of pronoun condition, *b* = -0.11, *t*(81) = -0.64, *p* = .522 and SC, *b* = -0.36, *t*(81) = -1.76, *p* = .083. Interestingly, the interaction of SC with pronoun condition, *b* = 0.74, *t*(81) =

[1] Given that reliability for this measure was less than 0.70, we also examined the effect of pronouns on each item in the measure individually. We found no significant effects across all items (all *p*-values ≥ .466).

Table of Contents

2.88, $p = .005$, was significant. Decomposing the interaction at both one standard deviation above and below the mean revealed a significant effect of condition at one standard deviation below the mean, $b = -0.60$, $t(81) = -2.58$, $p = .012$. Specifically, among participants lower in SC, the presence of pronouns encouraged significantly *lower* organizational inclusivity compared to when pronouns were absent. In contrast, at one standard deviation above the mean, the effect of pronoun condition was non-significant, $b = 0.38$, $t(81) = 1.54$, $p = .128$.

Discussion

Overall, our pilot study revealed that though most participants could identify the purpose of gender pronouns, the presence (versus absence) of gender pronouns did not encourage organizational commitment or perceptions of inclusivity. We did find that stigma consciousness moderated organizational inclusivity, such that lower levels of stigma consciousness was associated with reduced perceptions that the company was inclusive for marginalized persons broadly. Given that stigma consciousness was included as an exploratory variable and the emergence of a significant interaction was not predicted, we include stigma consciousness as a moderator in Study 1.

In summary, although Pilot Study 1 found no evidence of cue transfer, we did find evidence that Black women participants understood the function of gender pronouns. Consequently, in Study 1, we examined pronouns as an incongruent cue for Black women.

Table of Contents

Study 1

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (N = 373) excluding participants that failed attention and/or manipulation checks. First looking at attention checks, four participants were removed (i.e., failing to "Select this answer" when the attention check question indicated to do so). These four (5.8%) exclusions did not vary across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 426) = 5.90, p = .117.

Turning to our manipulation check, as noted in the main text, we eliminated participants who selected "NO" when the pronouns were present or "YES" when they were not, but retained those participants who expressed uncertainty (i.e., selecting "I didn't notice"; 64 in the pronoun absent conditions; 9 in the pronouns present conditions). Using these criteria resulted in the elimination of 49 participants, and exclusions were not equally distributed across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 422) = 39.09, p < .001. Specifically, 20 participants were removed in the White employee-Pronoun absent condition, 24 in the Black female-Pronoun absent condition, zero exclusions in the White female-Pronoun present condition, and five were removed in the Black female-Pronoun present condition. Of note, the results without exclusion criteria mirror those presented in the main text.

Results

Organizational safety concerns (results for each measure separately)

In the main text, we combine our measures of organizational attraction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust into a single index of organizational safety. Below we report the results for each measure separately. Of note, the results presented below are consistent with that presented in the main text.

Table of Contents

As in the main text, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with pronouns (present versus absent) by employee race (Black versus white). Full ANOVA results and means and standard deviations for outcomes across the four conditions are reported in Table S5.

Organizational attraction. As shown in Table S5, no significant effects emerged; however, the general pattern of results mirrored that for organizational safety presented in the main text. Specifically, participants tended to report greater organizational attraction when viewing the profile of a Black female employee than a white female employee, $p = .147$, *mean difference* = 0.16, *SE* = 0.11, $d = 0.16$.

Organizational commitment. Like organizational attraction, no significant effects emerged. That is, participants tended to report greater anticipated organizational commitment when viewing the profile of a Black female employee than a white female employee, $p = .057$, *mean difference* = 0.15, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.21$.

Organizational trust. As shown in Table S5, only a significant effect of employee race emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater anticipated organizational trust when viewing the profile of a Black female employee than a white female employee, $p = .010$, *mean difference* = 0.20, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.23$.

Additional Analyses

Below we report analyses for measures not included in the main text. Specifically, we also included two measures from Pilot Study 1, organizational inclusivity and a measure of gender-race stigma consciousness. Both measures were the same as that used in Pilot Study 1 and were also scored consistent to that in Pilot Study 1. For organizational inclusivity ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.73$; $\alpha = .81$), our analyses were consistent with each of our separate measures comprising

Table of Contents

organizational safety. We examined gender-race stigma consciousness (M = 3.59, SD = 0.73; α = .80) as a moderator; we describe our approach to analyses with results for this measure below.

Organizational inclusivity. As shown in Table S5, similar to organizational trust, only a significant effect of employee race emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater perceptions the organization was inclusive of minoritized persons when viewing the profile of a Black female employee than a white female employee, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 0.30, SE = 0.08, d = 0.42.

Moderation by gender-race stigma consciousness on organizational safety. As noted in the main text and above, we also included a measure of gender-race stigma consciousness in Study 1. To explore whether gender-race stigma consciousness (SC) was a moderator, we ran a moderation regression analyses with Hayes (2020) PROCESS macro, model 3 with (1) pronoun condition dummy coded (pronouns present = 1, pronouns absent = 0) and (2) employee race condition dummy coded (Black woman = 1, white woman = 0), (3) mean-centered SC and (4) all interactions between the three on organizational safety.

As shown in Table S6, only two significant effects emerged. A significant effect of SC emerged, b = -0.40, $t(365)$ = -3.89, $p < .001$, such that as SC increased, organizational safety decreased. Interestingly, similar to the pilot study, the interaction of SC with pronoun condition, b = 0.33, $t(365)$ = 2.21, p = .028, was also significant. Decomposing the interaction at both one standard deviation above and below the mean revealed a pattern similar to that in Pilot Study 1 for organizational inclusivity. We found a significant effect of condition at one standard deviation below the mean, b = -0.24, $t(369)$ = -2.18, p = .030, such that among participants low in SC, they revealed the greatest organizational safety when pronouns were absent relative to

Table of Contents

present. In contrast, at one standard deviation above the mean, the effect of pronoun condition was non-significant, $b = 0.12$, $t(369) = 1.13$, $p = .261$. Thus, among participants lower in SC, the presence of pronouns decreased organizational safety.

Table of Contents

Study 2

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (N = 390) excluding participants that failed our attention check and/or those that indicated they were a sexual minority. Four hundred and twenty-seven participants accessed the study via Qualtrics; however, nineteen were removed for failing the attention check and/or indicating they were a sexual minority. These 19 (4.4%) exclusions did not vary across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 427) = 2.51, p = .474.

Turning to our manipulation check, as noted in the main text, we eliminated participants that selected the incorrect flag accompanying the company's DEI statement. Using this criterion resulted in the elimination of 18 additional participants, and exclusions were equally distributed across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 408) = 0.452, p = .452. Specifically, five participants were removed in the control flag condition, four in the BLM flag present-Rainbow Pride flag absent condition, four exclusions in the BLM flag absent-Rainbow Pride flag present condition, and five were removed in the BLM flag present-Rainbow Pride flag present condition. Of note, the results without exclusion criteria mirror those presented in the main text.

Results

Organizational safety concerns (results for each measure separately)

In the main text, we combine our measures of organizational attraction (α = .93; M = 3.88, SD = 0.99), organizational commitment (α = .83; M = 4.02, SD = 0.76), and organizational trust (α = .87; M = 3.96, SD = 0.79) into a single index of organizational safety. Below we report the results for each measure separately. Of note, the results presented below are consistent with that presented in the main text.

Table of Contents

As in the main text, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with Rainbow Pride flag (present versus absent) by BLM flag (present versus absent). Full ANOVA results and means and standard deviations for outcomes across the four conditions are reported in Table S7.

Organizational attraction. As shown in Table S7, no significant effects emerged. Specifically, thought participants organizational attraction was generally greater when the BLM flag was present versus absent, this difference was not significant, $p = .485$, *mean difference* = 0.07, *SE* = 0.10, $d = 0.08$.

Organizational commitment. Contrary to organizational attraction, two significant effects emerged for organizational commitment. Participants reported greater anticipated organizational commitment when the BLM flag was present relative to absent, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 0.28, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.39$. Unexpectedly, participants also reported significantly *lower* organizational commitment when the Rainbow Pride flag was present relative to absent, $p = .043$, *mean difference* = 0.15, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.22$.

Organizational trust. As shown in Table S7, only a significant effect of BLM flag emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater anticipated organizational trust when the flag was present relative to absent, $p = .003$, *mean difference* = 0.22, *SE* = 0.07, $d = 0.31$.

Additional Analyses

Below we report analyses for measures not included in the main text. Like our measures in the main text, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with Rainbow Pride flag (present versus absent) by BLM flag (present versus absent). Full ANOVA results and means and standard deviations for outcomes across the four conditions are reported in Table S7.

Table of Contents

Black allyship. Participants responded to four items gauging their perceptions that managers at GEC were allies for Black employees using a (*1* = Managers at GEC would strongly oppose) to (*7* = Managers at GEC would strongly favor scale). A sample item includes "Persons in leadership at GEC act to support the success of Black employees at the company" (M = 5.72, SD = 1.30; α = .94) and the items were developed by the investigators based on previous research exploring allyship perceptions among minoritized persons (Moser & Branscombe, 2022; Pietri et al., 2018).

As shown in Table S7, only a significant effect of the BLM flag emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater perceptions managers at GEC were allies for Black employees when the BLM flag was present relative to when it was absent, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 0.64, SE = 0.13, d = 0.51.

LGBT+ allyship. Like Black allyship, participants responded to four items gauging their perceptions that managers at GEC were allies for LGBT+ employees using the same 7-point scale. A sample item includes "Persons in leadership at GEC act to support the success of LGBT+ employees at the company" (M = 5.88, SD = 1.10; α = .91; adapted from Moser & Branscombe, 2022; Pietri et al., 2018).

As shown in Table S7, only a significant effect of the Rainbow Pride flag emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater perceptions managers at GEC were allies for LGBT+ employees when the Rainbow Pride flag was present relative to when it was absent, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 0.44, SE = 0.11, d = 0.41.

Table of Contents

Pilot Study 2

Prior to running Study 3, we ran a pilot study testing our manipulation of shared discrimination. Specifically, inspired by the manipulations utilized in Cortland et al., 2017, we developed a news article aimed at sparking a sense of shared discrimination between Black individuals and LGBT+ persons, as well as a comparable control news article. We also utilized our pilot test to ensure the two news articles were matched on several ancillary attributes.

Participants were randomly assigned to read one of the same two news articles utilized in Study 3 and reported their perceptions of shared discrimination with LGBT+ persons. Participants also responded to several measures related to shared discrimination and providing their general impressions of the article to ensure the two articles were well-matched.

Method

Sample size & data exclusions. We aimed for a sample size like that of Pilot Study 1; thus, we recruited 100 Black women participants. We excluded participants that incorrectly answered our two items to test participants' memory of the news article: "The news article focused on a key civil rights leader that worked alongside Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The civil rights leader's name was": Bayard Rustin [**correct answer**]; John Lewis [incorrect answer]; Huey Newton [incorrect answer]; "The civil rights leader discussed in the news article was the chief organizer for which of the following events": Montgomery Bus Boycott [incorrect answer]; March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom [**correct answer**]; Greensboro Lunch Counter Sit-in's [incorrect answer]. The correct answers were the same in both conditions. We excluded a total of nine participants for failing attention checks and/or memory checks for the news article. This left a final sample of 91 participants.

Table of Contents

Participants and sensitivity analysis. Like Pilot Study 1, Black women participants were recruited via Cloud Research and were paid $1.50 for a 10-minute study. Participants ages were *M* = 39.42, *SD* = 13.15, range = 19 – 75. Participants had the following additional characteristics: 1 participant (1.1%) had less than a high school education, 32 (35.2%) had a high school degree or GED, 14 (15.4%) earned a 2-year college degree, 29 (31.9%) earned a 4-year college degree, 13 (14.3%) participants had a master's degree, 1 (1.1%) participant had a doctorate degree, and 1 (1.1%) participant had a Professional degree. All participants reported they were cisgender and information about employment status was not collected. Majority of our sample was heterosexual (*n* = 74; 83.5%) and excluding sexual minorities resulted in a similar pattern of results. Consequently, like Pilot Study 1, we included these participants to maximize power. Controlling for demographic variables did not change our results; thus, we did not include these variables in the subsequent analyses.

A post hoc power sensitivity analyses using G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) indicated that with an independent groups t-test at 95% power, with a sample size of 91, we were adequately powered to find a medium-large (*d* = 0.70) effect size at $p < .05$.

Procedure. The Study had a 2-condition design (Shared history LGBT+ [*n* = 46] versus Shared history labor [*n* = 45]). Our materials were identical to that described in the main text for Study 4; however, we did not include the manipulation of the incongruent cue. Rather, participants only read the news article and were informed their memory of the article would be tested. Below, we provide a brief description of the procedure but interested readers can reference Study 4 of the main text and supplemental materials for more detail.

Participants were randomly assigned to read one of two news articles. In the shared history LGBT+ condition, participants read an article that emphasized the shared history between

the early civil right movements for Black Americans and the early LGBT+ movement. In the shared history labor condition, we replaced all references to the early LGBT+ movement with that of the early labor movement. To ensure participants read the article carefully, we delayed the ability to advance for approximately 90 seconds.

After viewing their assigned news article, all participants answered two questions to check their memory of the article, before rating their general impressions of the article to ensure they were well matched. Participants next completed a measure of shared discrimination with LGBT+ persons, a Black-LGBT overlap manipulation check, similarity with sexual and gender minorities, empathy for sexual and gender minorities, and a measure of intraminority solidarity (all in random order). Participants then completed an attention check and demographics before concluding the study session.

Measures. We averaged participants' responses to the items, with higher scores indicating more of each measured construct.

News article attributes. Participants rated five statements assessing their impression of their assigned article using a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Specifically, participants responded to "The news article [was interesting] [was easy to read] [held my attention] [was clear] [was informative]"; (M = 4.50, SD = 60; α = .88).

Manipulation check. As a manipulation check, participants responded to a single item to assess the extent to which they perceived Black individuals and LGBT+ persons as overlapping in their goal of equality and social justice. The *overlap* item utilized five different answer options, each option depicting a circle that said "Black" and a circle that said "LGBT", with the

Table of Contents

two circles increasing in their degree of overlap from left to right. Participants choices were coded from 1 (*no overlap*) to 5 (*very much overlapping*); (M = 3.19, SD = 1.33).

Dependent variables. Participants responded to the same four items from the main text examining *shared discrimination with LGBT+ individuals*; (M = 4.78, SD = 1.88; α = .97). Participants also rated their agreement with two items to assess their *similarity* to sexual and gender minorities: "I feel similar to members of the LGBT+ community"; "I have a lot in common with the average gay or lesbian person"; (Cortland et al., 2017; M = 3.69, SD = 2.06; α = .96), and two items to assess their degree of *empathy* with to sexual and gender minorities: "I feel sympathy for sexual and gender minorities that encounter discrimination due to their identity"; "I feel bad for LGBT+ persons that experience challenges in society"; (Cortland et al., 2017; M = 5.79, SD = 1.62; α = .97). Shared discrimination, similarity, and empathy all utilized the same 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*a lot*) scale. Finally, participants responded to the same nine item measure utilized in the main text to assess *intraminority solidarity*; M = 5.10, SD = 1.15; α = .88.

Results

We conducted independent samples t test (see Table S9 for t test information and means and standard deviations across condition).

News article attributes. As shown in Table S9, participants' perceptions of the shared history LGBT+ news article did not differ from the control shared history labor news article for any measured attribute (all p-values $\leq$ .400). Thus, participants rated both articles as statistically equivalent on how interesting, how easy to read, ability to hold their attention, how clear, and how informative the articles were.

Table of Contents

Manipulation check. Our manipulation check item, perceptions of overlap in Black and LGBT people's commitment to social justice and equality, revealed our manipulation had the intended effect, although the effect of condition was not statistically significant (p =.073; see Table S9 for means across condition). That is, participants reading the shared LGBT history article tended to report greater perceptions of overlap than those reading the control article.

Dependent variables. Turning to our primary dependent variables, as shown in Table S9, a significant effect of condition only emerged for shared discrimination; all other effects were not statistically significant (i.e., all p-values $\leq .063$). Participants reading the shared LGBT history news article reported significantly greater perceptions of shared discrimination with LGBT+ persons than those that read the shared history labor news article. Likewise, participants reading the shared LGBT history article tended to report greater similarity and empathy with LGBT persons, and greater intraminority solidarity than those reading the control article.

Discussion

Overall, our pilot study revealed that our manipulation of shared discrimination was successful and the two news articles we developed were well-matched. Specifically, participants' ratings of the two articles did not differ on how interesting, clear, informative, easy to read, or the article's ability to capture their attention. Moreover, relative to the control article, the shared history of Black and LGBT people's article resulted in significantly greater perceptions of shared discrimination with LGBT persons. Based on the results of pilot study 2, we utilized our two articles as our manipulation of shared discrimination and included similarity and empathy with LGBT persons and intraminority solidarity as exploratory measures.

Table of Contents

Study 3

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (N = 364) excluding participants that failed our attention check and/or those that indicated they did match our selected demographic sample of interest. Specifically, 426 participants accessed the study via Qualtrics; however, 32 participants were removed for failing the attention check and/or indicating they did not identify as a cisgender, heterosexual, Black woman. These 32 (7.5%) exclusions did not vary across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 426) = 2.34, p = .506.

Turning to our manipulation check, as noted in the main text, we eliminated participants that incorrectly answered two questions about the news article (see Pilot Study 2 for more detail). This criterion resulted in the elimination of 30 additional participants; however, exclusions were not equally distributed across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 394) = 11.90, p = .008. Specifically, 10 participants were removed in the Rainbow Pride flag present-LGBT+ movement condition, and 14 were removed in the Rainbow Pride flag absent-LGBT+ movement condition. In contrast, in the Rainbow Pride flag present-Labor movement condition only two participants were excluded and only four were removed in the Rainbow Pride flag absent-Labor movement condition. Of note, the results without this exclusion criteria mirror those presented in the main text.

Results

Organizational safety concerns (results for each measure separately)

In the main text, we combine our measures of organizational attraction (M = 3.95, SD = 0.99; α = .93), organizational commitment (M = 4.07, SD = 0.75; α = .83), and organizational trust (M = 4.09, SD = 0.69; α = .85) into a single index of organizational safety. Below we report

Table of Contents

the results for each measure separately. Of note, the results presented below are consistent with that presented in the main text.

As in the main text, for each separate outcome, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with Rainbow Pride flag (present versus absent) by Shared History (LGBT+ movement versus Labor Movement). Full ANOVA information and means and standard deviations for all outcome measures across condition can be found in Table S10.

Organizational attraction. As shown in Table S10, and consistent with the main text, no significant effects emerged (all p-values $\geq .622$).

Organizational commitment. Like the pattern of findings for organizational attraction, , no significant effects emerged for organizational commitment (all p-values $\geq .464$).

Organizational trust. As shown in Table S10, no significant effects emerged for organizational trust (all p-values $\geq .170$).

Thus, as shown in the main text for the composite measure of organizational safety, no significant effects emerged for any of the separate outcome measures.

Additional Analyses

Below we report analyses for measures not included in the main text. Like our measures in the main text, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with Rainbow Pride flag (present versus absent) by Shared History (LGBT+ movement versus Labor Movement). Full ANOVA results and means and standard deviations for outcomes across the four conditions are reported in Table S10.

Table of Contents

Similarity with LGBT+ persons. Participants responded to two items gauging how similar they felt to LGBT+ persons on a (*1* = Not at all) to (*7* = A lot) scale. The two items included "I feel similar to members of the LGBT+ community" and "I have a lot in common with the average gay or lesbian person" and were presented in random order (adapted from Cortland et al., 2017; $M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.71$; $\alpha = .85$).

As shown in Table S10, although the effect of Shared History encouraged more similarity with LGBT+ persons, this effect was not statistically significant. Specifically, participants tended to report greater similarity with LGBT+ persons when they read about the shared history between the early Black Freedom movement and the LGBT+ movement compared to when they read about the shared history between the early Black Freedom movement and Labor movement, $p = .071$, *mean difference* = 0.33, $SE = 0.18$, $d = 0.19$.

Empathy with LGBT+ persons. Participants responded to two items gauging how much empathy they felt towards LGBT+ persons on a (*1* = Not at all) to (*7* = A lot) scale. The two items included "I feel sympathy for sexual and gender minorities that encounter discrimination due to their identity" and "I feel bad for LGBT+ persons that experience challenges in society" and were presented in random order (adapted from Cortland et al., 2017; $M = 6.37$, $SD = 1.17$; $\alpha = .94$).

As shown in Table S10, only a significant effect of the Rainbow Pride flag emerged. Specifically, participants reported greater empathy with LGBT+ persons when the Rainbow Pride flag was present relative to when it was absent, $p = .016$, *mean difference* = 0.30, $SE = 0.12$, $d = 0.25$.

Table of Contents

Study 4

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (N = 369) excluding participants that failed our attention check and/or those that indicated they did match our selected demographic sample of interest. Specifically, 427 participants accessed the study via Qualtrics; however, 46 participants were removed for failing the attention check and/or indicating they did not identify as a cisgender, heterosexual, Black woman. These 46 (10.8%) exclusions did not vary across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 427) = 3.74, p = .291.

Turning to our manipulation check, as noted in the main text, we eliminated participants that selected the incorrect employee awards featured alongside the company's DEI statement. Using this criterion resulted in the elimination of 12 additional participants, and exclusions were equally distributed across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 381) = 4.11, p = .250. Specifically, two participants were removed in the Black employees award condition, four in the Latino employees award condition, one in the LGBT+ employees award condition, and five were removed in the early career employees award condition. Of note, the results without exclusion criteria mirror those presented in the main text.

Results

Organizational safety concerns (results for each measure separately)

In the main text, we combine our measures of organizational attraction (M = 3.72, SD = 0.93; α = .90), organizational commitment (M = 4.04, SD = 0.70; α = .83), and organizational trust (M = 4.04, SD = 0.71; α = .86) into a single index of organizational safety. Below we report

Table of Contents

the results for each measure separately. Of note, the results presented below are consistent with that presented in the main text.

As in the main text, to examine the effect of employee award condition on organizational attraction, commitment, and trust, we utilized a between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) and used a Bonferroni correction for comparisons across condition. Full ANOVA information and means and standard deviations for all outcome measures across condition can be found in Table S9.

Organizational attraction. As shown in Table S9, participants reported the greatest organizational attraction in the Black employee award condition, followed by the control employees award condition, the LGBT+ employees award condition, and finally the Latino employees award condition. Similar to results presented in the main text, despite the Black employees award condition resulting in the highest levels of attraction, this condition not significantly differ from the control employees award condition, $p = .999$, *mean difference* = 0.16, $SE = 0.14$, $d = 0.17$. The Black employees award condition also did not significantly differ from the LGBT+ employees award condition, $p = .632$, *mean difference* = 0.22, $SE = 0.13$, $d = 0.24$. In contrast, the Black employee award condition only resulted in significantly greater organizational attraction relative to the Latino employees award condition, $p = .005$, *mean difference* = 0.45, $SE = 0.13$, $d = 0.50$.

Organizational commitment. Like the pattern of findings for organizational attraction, participants reported the greatest organizational commitment in the Black employee award condition, followed by the control employees award condition, the LGBT+ employees award condition, and finally the Latino employees award condition. However, despite the Black employees award condition resulting in the highest levels of commitment, this condition not

significantly differ from the control employees award condition, p = .999, *mean difference* = 0.01, *SE* = 0.10, d = 0.01. The Black employees award condition also did not significantly differ from the LGBT+ employees award condition, p = .999, *mean difference* = 0.05, *SE* = 0.10, d = 0.07. In contrast, the Black employee award condition only resulted in significantly greater organizational commitment relative to the Latino employees award condition, p = .007, *mean difference* = 0.33, *SE* = 0.10, d = 0.48.

Organizational trust. As shown in Table S9, a significant effect of condition did not emerge for organizational trust. Specifically, participants reported the greatest organizational trust in the Black employees award condition, followed by the LGBT+ employees award condition, the control employees award condition, and finally the Latino employees award condition. The Black employees award condition did not significantly differ from the control employees award condition, p = .999, *mean difference* = 0.09, *SE* = 0.11, d = 0.13. The Black employees award condition also did not significantly differ from the LGBT+ employees award condition, p = .999, *mean difference* = 0.03, *SE* = 0.10, d = 0.04, or even the Latino employees award condition, p = .253, *mean difference* = 0.21, *SE* = 0.10, d = 0.30.

Studies 5a & 5b

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (Study 5a, N = 109; Study 5b, N = 116) excluding participants that indicated they did not match our selected demographic sample of interest. Specifically, 236 participants accessed the study via Qualtrics; however, 11 (4.7%) participants were removed for indicating they did not identify as a cisgender, heterosexual, Black woman.

Table of Contents

Supplemental Replication of Studies 5a & Studies 5b

We also conducted two supplemental studies that replicate Studies 5a & Studies 5b presented in the main text. Supplemental Study 5A examined Black women's lay beliefs about intergroup prejudice and Supplemental Study 5B examined Black women's lay beliefs about intergroup equality. Neither of the studies were pre-registered and data were collected as part of a larger, unrelated investigation. Measures were consistent with that for Studies 5a & Studies 5b in the main text.

Method

Participants and sensitivity analyses. For both supplemental studies, Black women participants were recruited via Prolific for an ongoing, unrelated investigation. Participants were paid approximately $2.26 ($12.00/hour) for a 10-minute study. Only a subset of participants completed measures for each study. Supplemental Study 5A had a sample size of 96 and a sensitivity analysis indicated that with this sample size, for a paired samples *t* test at 95% power, we were adequately powered to find a small ($d = 0.34$) effect size at $p < .05$. Supplemental Study 5B had a sample size of 77 and a sensitivity analysis indicated that with this sample size, for a paired samples *t* test at 95% power, we were adequately powered to find a small ($d = 0.38$) effect size at $p < .05$.

Procedure and Measures. Across both studies, participants were presented with the measures of interest after completing all measures for the larger, unrelated investigation. All items were measured using a 1 = *very untrue* to 7 = *very true* scale and individual items were averaged such that higher numbers indicated greater agreement.

Supplemental Study 5A: Participants completed the same two measures as Study 5a in the main text, the lay theory of generalized prejudice (LTGP; Chaney et al., 2021) scale, which

indexes the extent to which an individual perceives prejudice towards different groups as monolithic (e.g., "When someone holds hateful beliefs against one group of people, they often hold hateful beliefs against other groups of people"; 3 items; α = .81), and the lay theory of localized prejudice (LTLP) scale, which indexes the extent to which an individual perceives prejudice towards different groups as unrelated, or localized to a specific group (e.g., "Someone can hold hateful beliefs about Black people, yet still hold very positive beliefs about other groups of people"; 6 items; α = .70). Items for the GLTP and the LLTP were presented in random order, and the two measures were not significantly correlated, r (96) =.54, p = .063.

Supplemental Study 5B: Participants completed the same two measures as Study 5b in the main text, the lay theory of generalized equality (LTGE) scale, which indexes the extent to which an individual perceives expressing support for different groups as monolithic (e.g., "When someone holds positive beliefs for one group of people, they often hold positive beliefs for other groups of people"; 3 items; α = .87), and the lay theory of localized equality (LTLE) scale, which indexes the extent to which an individual perceives support for different groups as unrelated, or localized to a specific group (e.g., "When a person treats other groups fairly, that is not a sign that Black people will be treated fairly too."; 6 items; α = .73). Items for the GLTE and the LLTE were presented in random order, and the two measures were not significantly correlated, r (77) = -.010, p = .933.

Results

For each supplemental study, we conducted a paired samples t test to examine whether agreement with the two measures completed by participants significantly differed.

Supplemental Study 5A: A significant difference for the two measures emerged, t (95) = 4.22, p < .001, *mean difference* = 0.72, *SE* = 0.17, d = 0.59, such that participants expressed

greater agreement with the LTGP (M = 5.11, SD = 1.29) than the LTLP (M = 4.39, SD = 1.14). That is, we found that Black women endorsed a monolithic perception of intergroup prejudice more so than a localized perception, consistent with previously published work on GLTP among other populations.

Supplemental Study 5B: Again, a significant difference for the two measures emerged, t (76) = -6.65, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = -1.42, SE = 0.21, d = 1.08; however, the pattern of findings was in the *opposite* direction of that for Supplemental Study 5a. We found that participants expressed more agreement with the LTLE (M = 5.26, SD = 1.09) than the LTGE (M = 3.84, SD = 1.51). Put differently, when indexing lay beliefs about intergroup equality, we found that our Black women participants endorsed a localized perception of intergroup equality more than a generalized perception.

Discussion

Consistent with our pre-registered studies in the main text, our supplemental studies revealed an asymmetry in intergroup attitudes. That is, we found that Black women generally do not perceive intergroup equality as monolithic; but we did find evidence that Black women subscribed to intergroup prejudice as monolithic. In short, our supplemental studies replicate the main text and provide additional evidence that we failed to find cue transfer effects because Black women hold localized lay beliefs regarding intergroup equality attitudes.

Table of Contents

Study 6

Data exclusions

In the main text, we present our results (N = 446) excluding participants that failed our attention check and/or those that indicated they did match our selected demographic sample of interest. Specifically, 507 participants accessed the study via Qualtrics; however, 33 participants were removed for failing the attention check and/or indicating they did not identify as a cisgender, heterosexual, Black woman. These 33 (6.5%) exclusions did not vary across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 507) = 0.68, p = .877.

Turning to our manipulation check, we eliminated participants that selected the incorrect featured hashtag. Using this criterion resulted in the elimination of 28 additional participants, and exclusions were equally distributed across condition, χ^2 (3, N = 474) = 5.65, p =.130. Specifically, 10 participants each were removed in the Climate Change hashtag condition, two in the Black Lives Matter hashtag condition, nine in the Me Too hashtag condition and seven in the Say Her Name hashtag condition. Critically, the results without exclusion criteria mirror those presented in the main text.

Results

Organizational safety concerns (results for each measure separately)

In the main text, we combine our measures of organizational attraction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust into a single index of organizational safety. Below we report the results for each measure separately. Of note, the results presented below are consistent with that presented in the main text.

Table of Contents

As in the main text, we ran between-subjects ANOVAs with Gender-relevant (present versus absent) by Race-relevant (present versus absent). Full ANOVA results and means and standard deviations for outcomes across the four conditions are reported in Table S10.

Organizational attraction. As shown in Table S10, a significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants reported greater organizational attraction when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .035$, *mean difference* = 0.23, *SE* = 0.11, $d = 0.18$. However, this main effect was qualified by a significant interaction of the race-relevant and gender relevant cues ($p = .035$). Simple effects revealed that the effect of the gender-relevant cue was significant only when the race-relevant cue was present, $F(1, 442) = 5.55$, $p = .017$, $d = 0.31$, but not when the race-relevant cue was absent, $F(1, 442) = 1.07$, $p = .302$, $d = 0.14$. Put differently, the race-relevant cue resulted in significantly greater organizational attraction when the gender-relevant cue was absent, $F(1, 442) = 10.34$, $p = .001$, $d = 0.45$, relative to when the gender-relevant cue was present, $F(1, 442) = 0.04$, $p = .845$, $d = 0.03$.

Organizational commitment. Only a significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants reported greater organizational commitment when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .033$, *mean difference* = 0.16, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.20$.

Organizational trust. Only a significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants reported greater organizational trust when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .018$, *mean difference* = 0.18, *SE* = 0.08, $d = 0.23$.

Additional Analyses

Below we report analyses for measures not included in the main text. Participants completed three, single item measures indexing the percentage of *Black employees* ($N = 443$; *M*

= 47.42, *SD* = 23.73), *women employees* (*N* = 444; *M* = 52.24, *SD* = 19.59), and *Black women employees* (*N* = 445; *M* = 37.44, *SD* = 23.68), they estimated worked at the fictitious organization[2]. Each question utilized a sliding scale from 0 – 100%, with higher numbers meaning greater percentages. We also examined gender-race stigma consciousness (*M* = 3.42, *SD* = 0.79; α = .79) as a moderator; we describe our approach to analyses with results for this measure below.

Percentage of Black employees. As shown in Table S10, a significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants estimated a higher percentage of employees at the company were Black when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 10.70, *SE* = 2.16, *d* = 0.47. A significant effect of the gender-relevant cues also emerged such that participants estimated a higher percentage of employees at the company were Black when gender-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .010$, *mean difference* = 5.59, *SE* = 2.16, *d* = 0.25. However, these main effects were qualified by a significant interaction of the race-relevant and gender relevant cues ($p < .001$). Simple effects revealed that the effect of the gender-relevant cue was significant only when the race-relevant cue was present, F (1, 439) = 18.65, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.56, but not when the race-relevant cue was absent, F (1, 439) = 0.38, $p = .538$, *d* = 0.09. Put differently, the race-relevant cue resulted in significantly higher estimates of Black employees when the gender-relevant cue was absent, F (1, 439) = 36.09, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.78, relative to when the gender-relevant cue was present, F (1, 439) = 1.10, $p = .295$, *d* = 0.15.

Percentage of women employees. A significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants estimated a higher percentage of employees at the company were women

[2] Not all participants completed these items; thus, we included the sample completing each item above. Inconsistencies in degrees of freedom are due to participants that elected to skip these items.

Table of Contents

when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .002$, *mean difference* = 5.68, *SE* = 1.84, $d = 0.29$. A significant effect of the gender-relevant cues also emerged such that participants estimated a higher percentage of employees at the company were women when gender-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p = .025$, *mean difference* = 4.13, *SE* = 1.84, $d = 0.20$.

Percentage of Black women employees. A significant effect of the race-relevant cues emerged such that participants estimated a higher percentage of employees at the company were Black women when race-relevant cues were present relative to absent, $p < .001$, *mean difference* = 7.92, *SE* = 2.21, $d = 0.34$. However, this main effect was qualified by a significant interaction of the race-relevant and gender relevant cues ($p = .020$). Simple effects revealed that the effect of the gender-relevant cue was significant only when the race-relevant cue was present, F (1, 441) = 5.08, $p = .025$, $d = 0.29$, but not when the race-relevant cue was absent, F (1, 441) = 1.13, $p = .289$, $d = 0.15$. Put differently, the race-relevant cue resulted in significantly higher estimates of Black women employees when the gender-relevant cue was absent, F (1, 441) = 17.87, $p < .001$, $d = 0.58$, relative to when the gender-relevant cue was present, F (1, 441) = 0.77, $p = .380$, $d = 0.12$.

Moderation by gender-race stigma consciousness on organizational safety. As noted in the main text and above, we also included a measure of gender-race stigma consciousness in Study 6. To explore whether gender-race stigma consciousness (SC) was a moderator, we ran a moderation regression analyses with the (1) gender-relevant cue dummy coded (gender present = 1, gender absent = 0), the (2) race-relevant cue dummy coded (race present = 1, race absent = 0), (3) mean-centered SC and (4) all interactions between the three on organizational safety.

Table of Contents

As shown in Table S11 several significant effects emerged (see Table S11 for full regression results). A significant effect of SC emerged ($p < .001$), such that as SC increased, organizational safety decreased. Consistent with the ANOVA results presented in the main text, the presence of the race-relevant cues resulted in greater organizational safety relative to when absent ($p = .001$). Interestingly, all three 2-way interactions were significant (all p-values $\leq$ .036), while the 3-way interaction was non-significant ($p = .103$). First decomposing the interaction of the gender-relevant and race-relevant cues, the effect of the race-relevant cue resulted in significantly greater organizational safety when the gender-relevant cue was absent, $b = 0.36$, $t(223) = 3.50$, $p < .001$, but not when present, $b = 0.03$, $t(215) = 0.28$, $p = .782$.

Next, decomposing the interactions with SC at both one standard deviation above (i.e., high) and below the mean (i.e., low) revealed for the interaction of SC and the gender-relevant cue, the presence of the gender-relevant cue resulted in greater organizational safety for participants high in SC, $b = 0.38$, $t(440) = 2.47$, $p = .014$, but not for participants low in SC, $b = -0.11$, $t(440) = -0.70$, $p = .485$. Similarly, for the interaction of SC and the race-relevant cue, the presence of the race-relevant cue resulted in greater organizational safety for participants high in SC, $b = 0.67$, $t(440) = 4.36$, $p < .001$, but not those low in SC, $b = 0.04$, $t(440) = 0.29$, $p = .769$. Taken together, these findings suggest that among participants high in SC, the presence of both the race-relevant and gender-relevant cues promoted organizational safety, a pattern of findings that fits with past work examining individual identity-safety cues (e.g., Pietri et al., 2018).

Table of Contents

Supplemental References

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Cortland, C. I., Craig, M. A., Shapiro, J. R., Richeson, J. A., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2017). Solidarity through shared disadvantage: Highlighting shared experiences of discrimination improves relations between stigmatized groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*(4), 547–567. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000100

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press: New York.

Johnson, I. R., & Pietri, E. S. (2020). An ally you say? Endorsing White women as allies to encourage perceptions of allyship and organizational identity-safety among Black women. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220975482

Johnson, I. R., Pietri, E. S., Buck, D. M., & Daas, R. (2021). What's in a pronoun: Exploring gender pronouns as an organizational identity-safety cue among sexual and gender minorities. *Journal of Studyal Social Psychology*, *97*, 104194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104194

Johnson, I. R., Pietri, E. S., Fullilove, F., & Mowrer, S. (2019). Exploring identity-safety cues and allyship among Black women students in STEM environments. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *43*, 131-150. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319830926

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational

Table of Contents

commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*, 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Moser, C. E., & Branscombe, N. R. (2022). Male allies at work: gender-equality supportive men reduce negative underrepresentation effects among women. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *13*(2), 372-381. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211033748

Pietri, E. S., Johnson, I. R., & Ozgumus, E. (2018). One size may not fit all: Exploring how the intersection of race and gender and stigma consciousness predict effective identity-safe cues for Black women. *Journal of Studyal Social Psychology*, *74*, 291-306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.021

Table of Contents