



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Can school diversity policies reduce belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority youth? Multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism assessed

Celeste, L., Baysu, G., Phalet, K., Meeussen, L., & Kende, J. (2019). Can school diversity policies reduce belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority youth? Multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism assessed. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219838577>

Published in:
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2019 The Authors. This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

RUNNING HEAD: SCHOOL DIVERSITY POLICIES

Title: Can school diversity policies reduce belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority youth? Multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism assessed

Laura Celeste¹, Gülseli Baysu², Karen Phalet¹, Loes Meeussen^{1,3}, Judit Kende^{1,4}

1 University of Leuven, Belgium

2 School of Psychology, Queen's University of Belfast, UK

3 Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation–Flanders

4 University of Amsterdam

Corresponding Authors: Dr. Laura Celeste University of Leuven, Belgium, Center for Social and Cultural Psychology, Tiensestraat 102 box 3727, 3000 LEUVEN tel. +32 16 37 32 74,
laura.e.celeste@gmail.com

Word Count: 10,754 (abstract, text, references, footnotes)

**Can School Diversity Policies Reduce Belonging and Achievement Gaps between
Minority and Majority Youth?**

Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Assimilationism Assessed

Abstract

European societies and schools face the challenge of accommodating immigrant minorities from increasingly diverse cultural backgrounds. In view of significant belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority groups in school, we examine which diversity approaches are communicated by actual school policies; and which approaches predict smaller ethnic gaps in student outcomes over time. To derive diversity approaches, we content-analyzed diversity policies from ($n=66$) randomly sampled Belgian middle schools. Cluster analysis yielded different approaches valuing, ignoring, or rejecting cultural diversity in line with multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism, respectively. We estimated multilevel path models which longitudinally related diversity approaches to ($N=1747$) minority and ($N=1384$) majority students' school belonging and achievement (self-reported grades) one year later. Multiculturalism predicted smaller belonging and achievement gaps over time; colorblindness and assimilationism were related to wider achievement and belonging gaps, respectively. Longitudinal effects of colorblindness on achievement were mediated by (less) prior school belonging.

Key Words:

Diversity Policies, Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, Assimilationism, Achievement

Can School Diversity Policies Reduce Belonging and Achievement Gaps between Minority and Majority Youth?

Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Assimilationism Assessed

In North America and Europe, immigrant minorities often lag behind their majority peers in school (OECD, 2015) with far-reaching consequences for their psychological development and future life chances (Motti-Stefanidi & Masten, 2013). The overlap of migration-related diversity with persistent and often dramatic educational inequalities poses a major challenge to schools and societies at large. Compared to their majority peers, disadvantaged minority students show lower academic achievement (Dimitrova, Chasiotis, & Van de Vijver, 2016). Moreover, their school belonging is less stable and more contingent on a supportive environment (Cook, Purdie-Vaughns, Garcia, & Cohen, 2012). Lack of belonging is not only a critical developmental risk factor in minority youth (Eccles, Wong, & Peck, 2006), school belonging is also a key process connecting the school environment to individual achievement outcomes (Roeser, Midgley, & Urdan, 1996). The present study examines belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority adolescents in the same schools – with an explanatory focus on the school environment.

As migration-related diversity is on the rise in schools and workplaces, organizations can dampen or perpetuate related inequalities, depending on how they handle diversity (Banks, 2015; Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008). In educational contexts, school policies specifically dealing with cultural differences communicate different diversity approaches, which either value, ignore, or reject cultural differences (Guimond, De la Sablonnière, & Nugier 2014). Against this background, the present study investigates (a) which diversity approaches are communicated by actual school policies in a European educational context; and (b) how school diversity policies relate to educational inequalities, and to minority belonging and achievement in particular. To this end, we draw on large-scale

longitudinal surveys following over 3000 minority and majority adolescents in 66 secondary schools in Flanders-Belgium (CILS_Belgium, 2014).

There is some empirical evidence associating specific diversity approaches with school adjustment in minority youth (e.g., Hoti, Heinzmann, Muller, & Buholzer, 2017; Schachner, Noack, Van de Vijver, & Eckstein, 2016). One limitation of previous studies is their reliance on student or teacher perceptions of the prevailing diversity climate. Congruence between perceived school diversity norms by majority and especially minority students (Civitillo, Schachner, Juang, Van de Vijver et al, 2017) and teachers (Fine-Davies & Faas, 2014) is generally low. Therefore, rather than diversity perceptions of students or teachers, we analyzed the actual contents of school policy documents (rules and mission statements) to assess how schools deal with diversity. To test the outcomes related to different diversity policies across schools, we applied multilevel modeling of school climate effects (Marsh et al., 2012).

Another limitation of most previous studies is their main focus on the school adjustment of minority youth (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). In the absence of direct achievement measures and without majority comparison samples, we cannot know whether and how school diversity approaches predict educational inequalities between minority and majority groups; nor do we know how they affect majority students as distinct from their minority peers. It has been suggested that valuing cultural diversity can be costly on majorities who may feel excluded or alienated (Stevens et al., 2008). Furthermore, value in diversity might boost minorities' belonging in school, yet fail to reduce real ethnic inequality in their school achievement. To assess educational inequality we estimated the gap between minority and majority students' academic outcomes. As a measure of academic achievement, we made use of their self-reported Dutch language grades. Dutch language grades are very important in the school careers of Flemish-Belgian students, because educational policies

have a strong focus on Dutch proficiency as essential for academic success (Pulinx, Van Avermaet, & Agirdag, 2015). Next, we tested whether school diversity policies at the beginning of middle school predicted the achievement gap up to one year later. In order to elucidate the processes connecting unequal achievements to the school environment, we also tested related gaps in the school belonging of minority and majority youth.

Finally, most research on organizational diversity approaches is informed by North American contexts of migration and race relations (Plaut, Thomas, Kyneshawau, & Romano, 2018). In European societies, however, different vocabularies reflect distinct histories and understandings of migration-related diversity (Guimond et al., 2014). Given such differences, the prevalence and the specific contents of diversity approaches vary across societal contexts. Moreover, schools are local institutional contexts with distinct diversity patterns and norms (Celeste, Meeussen, Verschueren, & Phalet, 2016). We do not know to what extent school contexts reflect societal diversity approaches or what specifically constitutes diversity policies in schools. Rather than imposing general diversity approaches on these school policies, therefore, we used a mixed methods design: thematic content-coding of actual diversity policies was combined with subsequent cluster analysis to optimally capture the meaning of different diversity approaches (Namey, Guest, Thairu, & Johnson, 2008).

Diversity Approaches: Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Assimilationism

North American research has contrasted two main approaches: multiculturalism and colorblindness. While both approaches seek to include minorities, multiculturalism embraces cultural diversity as added value and colorblindness ignores diversity emphasizing instead individual merits or equal treatment (Plaut et al., 2018). Assimilationism represents a third distinct approach that prioritizes majority culture adoption (Guimond et al., 2014). Below, we discuss multiculturalism, colorblindness and assimilationism as three commonly distinguished diversity approaches.

Multiculturalism policies acknowledge and value cultural diversity (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). From a social identity perspective, a multicultural approach seeks to include minorities through affirming their distinct cultural identities (Derks, Van Laar, & Ellemers, 2007; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2007). In practice, multiculturalism includes school policies such as designated ‘diversity days’ to learn about each other’s cultural heritage and educational practices aimed to improve intercultural understanding (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013). Although multicultural education may contain other elements such as combatting racism and developing caring relations between teachers and students (Zirkel, 2008), the main focus of a multiculturalist approach is on value in diversity (Apfelbaum, Stephens, & Reagans, 2016; Civitillo et al., 2017; Schachner et al., 2016).

In contrast, colorblindness tends to ignore cultural diversity. It draws on Enlightenment individualism, valuing uniqueness along with meritocratic ideals and equal treatment regardless of one’s cultural background (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010; Stevens et al., 2008). In line with value in individuality, colorblindness seeks to neutralize prejudice and discrimination by de-emphasizing group categories and ignoring group differences (Park & Judd, 2005). Recent comparative research highlights different meanings of colorblindness across intergroup contexts, however, depending on which component of the approach is foregrounded in the context (Guimond et al., 2014). Thus, stressing individual uniqueness vs. ensuring equal treatment may represent conflicting ideas depending on the context (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). Along those lines, a distinct egalitarian approach of diversity in German schools combined equal treatment with protection from discrimination (Civitillo et al., 2017; Schachner et al., 2016). Similarly in France, an egalitarian approach labeled ‘colorblind equality’ related to decreased anti-immigrant prejudice in secondary schools (Roebroek & Guimond, 2015). It is a matter of ongoing debate when an egalitarian approach may or may not overlap with colorblindness (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Schachner et al., 2016).

Assimilationism has been put forward as a distinct approach which rejects cultural diversity in Europe (Civitillo et al., 2017; Fine-Davies & Faas, 2014; Guimond et al., 2014) as well as in the US (Levin et al., 2012). The approach is akin to (American-style) colorblindness to the extent that both approaches de-emphasize cultural diversity (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Under assimilationism, minorities are expected to adopt the majority culture, and to relinquish their distinct minority cultures or any markers of it (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). The aim is to foster a common identity for both majority and minorities, like the melting-pot idea of a mainstream culture in the US. Conceptually, assimilationism has been associated with the Common In-group Identity Model, which represents a majority group perspective on prejudice reduction (Dovidio et al., 2007). However, contrary to expectations from Common In-group Identity, assimilationism was revealed as a hierarchy-enhancing ideology. Thus, assimilationist majority attitudes were related to a stronger social dominance orientation and predicted more prejudice against immigrants in the US (Levin et al., 2012). For minorities, assimilationism entails conformity pressure to adopt majority cultural customs, norms, and values while relinquishing the heritage culture (Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2012).

Looking beyond core conceptual distinctions between general diversity approaches that value, ignore, or reject cultural differences, there is also contextual variation in the way these approaches are construed in specific societies and organizational settings. Rather than imposing the prevalent societal diversity approaches on the school context, we take a bottom-up approach. To clarify how schools approach diversity in a European educational context, and to balance generic and context-specific meanings of each diversity approach, our study starts from a qualitative analysis of school diversity policies.

Relationship of Diversity Approaches to School Belonging and Achievement

Existing research on diversity approaches has mostly assessed individual diversity attitudes of majority group members in relation to aspects of intergroup relations such as bias, prejudice, and stereotyping (Guimond et al., 2014; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). There is less research on actual diversity policies in organizational contexts and in relation to academic outcomes. We take a social identity perspective to explain why and how diversity approaches may affect academic gaps between minority and majority students. From a social identity perspective, culturally diverse schools as intergroup contexts make minority identities salient. When minority identities are valued in the context, minority students will feel more included and perform better (Derks et al., 2007). Conversely, when the context is identity-threatening, experiences of exclusion, discrimination, or negative stereotyping signal to minority students that their identities are devalued. In such contexts they will feel less belonging (Walton & Cohen, 2007) and may underperform (Baysu, Celeste, Brown, Verschueren, & Phalet, 2016).

Along those lines, a multiculturalist diversity approach is expected to be related to smaller majority-minority gaps (Hypothesis 1) because it values cultural differences and thus affirms minority identities (Derks et al., 2007; Verkuyten, 2005). In support of this expectation, there is evidence of the benefits of a multiculturalist approach for minorities' sense of belonging (Meeussen, Otten, & Phalet, 2014) and achievement (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). Likewise, diversity education interventions in schools increased minority motivation and performance (Celeste, Baysu, Brown, & Phalet, 2017; Hoti et al., 2017).

On the contrary, a colorblind approach is expected to predict a persistent majority-minority gap, to the extent that it ignores cultural difference and related disadvantage (Hypothesis 2). From a social identity perspective, colorblindness disregards a distinct cultural identity of minority students, making them feel like they do not belong (Meeussen et al., 2014). It can undermine their performance by turning a blind eye on minority

disadvantage (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). When equality is part of the definition of colorblindness, however, positive effects were also found (Apfelbaum et al., 2016). Thus, student perceptions of equal treatment in school buffered identity threat and protected school achievement for minority students (Baysu et al., 2016). The latter findings are in line with evidence of minority inclusion through positive intergroup contact and cooperation (Schachner et al., 2016). Since distinct individualism-focused versus equality-focused variants of colorblindness predict opposite outcomes, our bottom-up analysis of school policies explores the specific meanings of colorblindness in a European educational context.

Finally, an assimilationist approach is expected to predict a larger majority-minority gap because it rejects cultural differences and thus threatens minority identities (Hypothesis 3). Accordingly, assimilationism was related to majority prejudice (Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2012) and minority students experienced more peer rejection when classroom norms stressed assimilationism (Celeste et al., 2016). Likewise, when schools enforced assimilation by keeping minority students from speaking their native language, they left them feeling alienated (Pulinx et al., 2015).

As schools and organizations are not made up of only minorities, a distinctive contribution of this study is the comparison across minority and majority outcomes. Multiculturalism can be beneficial for majority outcomes to the extent that they feel included as in all-inclusive multiculturalism (Meeussen et al., 2014; Stevens et al., 2008). It may also backfire, however, when majorities feel excluded from this approach (Jansen, Otten, & Van der Zee, 2015; Plaut et al., 2018). We would not expect colorblind or assimilationist approaches to affect majority academic outcomes since majority identities are not threatened. Yet, these approaches might also benefit majority outcomes through affirming their majority identities. Hence, we have no specific hypotheses for majority outcomes.

Additionally, we examined whether ethnic school composition moderated the consequences of diversity policies for majority-minority gaps. In today's highly culturally diverse and segregated schools, immigrant minority students often make up a numerical majority in their classrooms (Baysu & De Valk, 2012; Schachner et al., 2016). Possibly, policies valuing cultural diversity are more relevant and effective in highly diverse schools, where students from many different cultural backgrounds interact on a daily basis, as compared to less diverse schools.

Finally, school belonging has been revealed as a psychological process which connects diversity approaches to school achievement (Cook et al., 2012; Inzlicht & Good, 2006). Belonging is longitudinally associated with sustained school achievement across majority and minority adolescents (Gillen-O'Neel & Fuligni, 2013). Moreover, a lack of belonging was shown to impair minority achievement (Walton & Cohen, 2007) while interventions supporting minority belonging improved their achievement (Shnabel, Purdie-Vaughns, Cook, Garcia, & Cohen, 2013). Furthermore, school belonging mediated between minority experiences of cultural diversity and school outcomes (Schachner, He, Heizmann, & Van de Vijver, 2017). Similarly, work-place belonging mediated between diversity approaches of multiculturalism (for minorities) or colorblindness (for majorities) and work-place outcomes (Jansen, Vos, Otten, Podsiadlowski, & Van der Zee, 2016). Together, these findings consistently and causally relate diversity approaches to achievement through belonging. Our study replicates the mediating role of belonging in earlier studies longitudinally, with both minority and majority samples and with actual diversity policies. Specifically, we expect the longitudinal effect of school diversity approaches on achievement to be mediated by prior school belonging (Hypothesis 4).

Method

Participants and Procedure

We surveyed 5336 students at time 1 and 4152 students one year later at time 2; 3446 participated in both waves (64% of the initial sample). Of those who participated in both waves, 103 changed schools and another 212 were missing essential data and were not included in our sample. Our final sample thus consisted of $N = 3131$ students (52% female) who stayed on in the same 66 Flemish secondary schools in both waves (see attrition analysis under Results). Using self-reported own country of birth and parentage (i.e., one or both foreign-born parents and/or grandparents) we categorized first-, second- and third-generation immigrant-origin adolescents as having an ethnic-minority status ($N = 1747$); the rest were categorized as majority youth ($N = 1384$). Minority youth were mostly second-generation (1st $N = 614$; 2nd $N = 986$; 3rd $N = 133$) from Moroccan ($N = 544$), Turkish ($N = 423$) and European backgrounds (mainly southern EU $N = 365$; western EU $N = 75$, other regions $Ns < 30$; unspecified $N = 259$). At time 1, participants were in either year 1 (32%), year 2 (26%) or year 3 (42%) of secondary school with an average age of 14.74 ($SD = 1.18$) and attending either academic (41%), vocational (29%), or technical (30%) training.

The timeline of data collection is provided as Supplemental Material. Data was collected as part of a large-scale longitudinal study in randomly-sampled secondary schools (CILS_Belgium, 2014). Classes were randomly sampled within schools with varying ethnic composition, using the percentage of students speaking a foreign language at home ($n = 902$ in schools with >10% minorities; $n = 841$ in schools with 10-30% minorities; $n = 681$ in schools with 30-60% minorities; $n = 707$ in schools with >60% minorities). We obtained initial informed consent from school principals and teachers and informed participants and their parents of their right to opt out. Participants filled out Dutch-language questionnaires during class time under the supervision of trained research assistants and a teacher. Teachers and research assistants had a majority-Belgian background (96% of teachers were of Belgian origin). School policy documents consisted of the mission statements and the rules and

regulations of the 66 schools, which were downloaded from school websites or obtained from administrative staff. Research was conducted in line with APA ethical guidelines.

Measures

School belonging was measured with four items (Wang, Willet, & Eccless, 2011) rated from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items are “I am proud to be a student of this school; I feel at home at this school.” The measure had high reliabilities in both waves (time 1 $\alpha = .85$, time 2 $\alpha = .85$). For the main analysis, we focus on school belonging at time 2 to estimate longitudinal effects of diversity policies. In addition, prior belonging was also measured at time 1 to test possible mediation from time 1 belonging to time 2 achievement. Note that students had already been exposed to the school policies when reporting their belonging at time 1, as there is no baseline measure of school belonging preceding school entry.

School achievement. As a measure of school achievement, we asked participants to report their Dutch grades.¹ For our analysis, we focus on time 2 language grades as a key outcome measure. Language achievement is at the same time most unequal between minority and majority students (Heath & Brinbaum, 2014) and most predictive of minority future success (Bleakley & Chin, 2004; Dustmann, & Fabbri, 2003). Students indicated retrospectively their school-report grade for Dutch language at the end of the Fall term (recoded from 0 to 100 across schools with different grading systems). As schools were surveyed during the Spring term, time 2 grades precede our time 2 belonging measure by at least one month.

Control variables. At the school level, we controlled for ethnic school composition as indicated by administrative data on students speaking a foreign language at home (three dummies: 10-30%, 30-60%, and > 60% minority students with < 10% as a reference category). At the individual level, we controlled for the school track of each student. The

Belgian educational tracking system sets students up for different career paths: vocational tracks prepare students directly for the labor market, while technical and academic tracks prepare for higher professional and academic education respectively (Baysu & De Valk, 2012). School track was recoded as two dummy variables: vocational and technical with academic track as a reference category. As a proxy for students' socioeconomic status we accounted for parental education (based on the parent with the highest qualification: 1 = *primary school*, 2 = *secondary school*, 3 = *university or higher*). Given the wide age-range, we controlled for age. While there was a significant gender difference in Dutch grades ($t(2852) = -2.74, p = .006$; girls reported higher grades, $M_{diff} = 2.10$), when adding all other control variables to our model gender did not show any significant effects. At the individual level, neither gender nor year in school had any significant effects and were hence dropped from the analysis.

Results

Results are presented in two main sections in line with our double research aim. To explore school diversity approaches, we report the content analysis of school policy documents and the cluster analysis of the frequency scores from the coding. To investigate the effects of school policies on belonging and achievement gaps, we present (1) attrition analysis, (2) multilevel path models testing Hypotheses 1-3 including additional analyses of interactions with ethnic school composition and associations between diversity approaches, and (3) mediation analysis testing Hypothesis 4.

Diversity Approaches

Content analysis and cluster analysis of school policy documents. In a first step, we conducted qualitative coding of each school's rules (stating explicit regulations), mission and vision statements (stating values/principles) for all 66 schools that participated in both waves. Conceptually, the coding of subthemes was organized around three general diversity

approaches: multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism. We developed a thematic coding scheme drawing on US and European examples of cultural diversity vocabularies (Stevens et al., 2008; Verkuyten, 2005) and using conceptual distinctions between approaches that value, ignore, or reject diversity as an organizing framework (Guimond et al., 2014). To ensure that our codes fully covered and accurately rendered context-specific meanings, we inductively fine-tuned our thematic coding scheme on the basis of initial reads of the school policy texts.

Technically, coding units were sentences, and each document was coded by two separate coders. Initially, coders independently coded the first few documents. Together, we discussed any discrepancies, amended the coding scheme, and recoded if necessary (Guest & McLellan, 2003), then coders continued coding the remaining documents using Nvivo 11 (Nvivo 11, 2015). Documents containing either school mission statements, school rules, or both were analyzed together. Interrater reliability was high (Kappa $\kappa = .95$; Kappa squared = .90). More information about the coding scheme development and coding procedure can be found in the Supplemental Material.

In a next step, we removed subthemes occurring in less than 15% of the documents in the frequency report so that all selected subthemes covered a broad sample of schools (Guest & McLellan, 2003). The frequencies for the final 15 coding subthemes (e.g. *must speak only Dutch*, occurrences $N = 92$) are indicated in Table 1. We then conducted cluster analyses on the frequency data in order to validate our thematic coding of the school documents. To select the best cluster solution, we used Ward's Linkage method for hierarchical cluster analysis (Field, 2000). We tested two- to five-cluster solutions and decided that a four-cluster solution fit our data best (see Supplemental Material) (Field, 2000; Norušis, 2011). The four-cluster solution distinguished three general diversity approaches (Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, Assimilationism) and one separate approach focusing on Equality. Table 1 shows the specific

subthemes included in the final four clusters, which define different diversity approaches in the Belgian school context. We provide a table with specific examples of diversity language for each subtheme as Supplemental Material.

‘Multiculturalism’ consisted of two subthemes valuing cultural diversity, focusing on the value of learning about different cultures and how diversity is included in the curriculum. ‘Colorblindness’ was a broad cluster coupling principled religious neutrality with individualistic values. In the Belgian school context, ignoring diversity refers narrowly to religious difference. Secularist policies are common in non-denominational schools and ensure religious neutrality. Specifically, Belgian state schools offer religious (including Islamic) classes in line with a European understanding of freedom of religion, restricting religious expression to these designated classes and imposing strict neutrality outside of those classes. In addition, colorblind policies value individual merits and rights; they see disadvantage as individual challenge or deficit, and they protect individual students from discrimination. ‘Assimilationism’ was a more narrow cluster rejecting cultural diversity. In the Belgian school context, it refers specifically to restrictive policies targeting linguistic and religious differences. Finally, a separate cluster ‘Equality’ was induced from our data. This egalitarian approach valued social equality while recognizing difference. As distinct from multiculturalism, its focus was on valuing equality rather than diversity. This approach also differed from colorblindness in that differences were acknowledged rather than ignored.

In a final step, we standardized frequency scores to create four z-scores on multiculturalism, colorblindness, assimilationism, and equality for each school so that the same school could endorse different approaches to varying degrees. Across all documents, instances of colorblindness covered most subthemes (9) and were most frequent (273 times); assimilationism, multiculturalism, and equality clusters were more narrowly defined (2 subthemes each); and assimilationism was more frequent (143 times) than multiculturalism

(85 times) and equality (67 times) (see Table 1). Additional analyses regressing the clusters on school-level student perceptions of the school diversity climate provided some support for the psychological validity of the different diversity approaches (see Supplemental Material).

Effects on Belonging and Achievement Gaps

Attrition Analyses. While this study reached a large and representative sample of both minority and majority students across Flemish secondary schools, panel dropout at time 2 was not entirely random. Comparison of participants who dropped out (i.e. only completed our survey at time 1) with those who stayed on (i.e. participated at time 1 and 2) revealed more attrition among ethnic minority (vs. majority) students; of those who dropped out 69% had ethnic minority status against 56% in the final sample; $t(4135.56) = -8.66, p < .001$) 95% CI [-0.145, -0.092], for older (vs. younger) age groups ($M = 15.03, SD = 1.23$ versus $M = 14.74, SD = 1.20$; $t(4967) = 8.18, p < .001$), 95% CI [0.223, 0.363], and at lower levels of time 1 school belonging ($M = 3.35, SD = 1.00$ versus $M = 3.74, SD = 0.83$; $t(3218.95) = -14.22, p < .001$), 95% CI [-0.446, -0.338]. The most commonly reported reasons for panel dropout were being absent or changing schools. Selective attrition reflects the reality that ethnic minority students are more likely to change schools or leave school (Kalmijn & Kraaykamp, 2003).

Multilevel path analyses. Contextual effects of school diversity approaches on minority and majority students' academic outcomes at time 2 were estimated by way of multilevel path analyses in Mplus 7 on the pooled minority and majority samples (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). Separate analyses for majority and minority samples largely replicated the pattern of findings in the pooled analyses (see Supplemental Material). We tested cross-level interaction effects of ethnic minority status with school policy clusters. Since the least frequent equality cluster had no significant effects on academic outcomes, it was removed from further analyses. Specifically, analyses were conducted with school belonging and

achievement at time 2 as dependent measures, with ethnic minority status (individual-level), diversity approaches (school-level) (multiculturalism, colorblindness, assimilationism), and their cross-level interaction as predictors, along with (individual and school level) control variables defined at time 1 (see Table 2 for descriptive statistics of study variables).

To conclude that there are real belonging and achievement gaps between majority and minority youth, the effect of minority status on belonging and achievement should remain significant even after controlling for individual and school characteristics; and to conclude that school diversity approaches attenuate or exacerbate the gaps, the cross-level interaction effects of ethnic minority status with diversity approaches on belonging and achievement should be significant. To interpret interaction effects, we report Wald chi-square tests to indicate significant simple slopes (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012). Estimating exact power for multilevel models using cross-level interactions is highly complex, therefore a 30/30 rule of thumb is suggested for sufficient statistical power, 30 groups with 30 individuals per group for a sample of 900 (Scherbaum & Ferrer, 2009). The present research exceeds the 30/30 rule of thumb with 3131 students across 66 schools.

The analyses were conducted in a stepwise fashion and each step significantly improved the model fit (see Table 3 for stepwise model fit statistics and explained variances). We started from a null model with a random intercept only. The residual variances of school belonging and Dutch grades were significant both at the individual level (0.72 (0.03), $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.667, 0.768]; 279.40 (36.57), $p < .001$, 95% CI [207.733, 351.067]) and at the school level (0.06 (0.01), $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.036, 0.086]; 180.64 (53.59), $p < .001$, 95% CI [75.608, 285.664]). The intraclass correlations (ICC) indicated that respectively 7.8% and 39.2% of the total variance in school belonging and Dutch grades is found between schools. In a second step, the model included only control variables, which explained significant variance at the individual level in both outcomes. In a third step, the main-effects-only model,

we added minority status and diversity approaches (multiculturalism, colorblindness, assimilationism) as predictors. Adding diversity approaches explained significant variance at the school level in both outcomes. In a final step, we added cross-level interactions between minority status and each of the diversity approaches. For parsimony, we included only significant cross-level interactions in the final model.

In line with the expected ethnic gaps, minority students reported significantly less belonging ($M = 3.52$) and lower Dutch grades ($M = 59.28$) than majority peers ($M = 3.70$, $M = 63.14$, respectively, both $ps < .001$). Significant ethnic gaps remained even in the third step when control variables and diversity policies were added to the model: minority students still evinced significantly less belonging ($M = 4.37$) and lower Dutch grades ($M = 72.86$) than majority peers ($M = 4.50$, $M = 75.70$, $p = .004$, $p = .001$ respectively). Below we report detailed results from our final model with significant cross-level interactions (see Table 4 and Figure 1). When main effects differ between the main-effects-only model and the final model, we report effects from both models.

Longitudinal effects on school belonging. We found significant effects of school diversity approaches on the belonging gap at time 2 (Hypotheses 1-3; see Table 4 and Figure 1). For **multiculturalism**, no main effect was found, but there was a significant cross-level interaction between minority status and multiculturalism (Figure 2). In low multiculturalism schools, minority students felt significantly less belonging than majority students (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 12.90$, $p < .001$). In high multiculturalism schools, on the other hand, the gap was not significant such that majority and minority students did not differ in their school belonging (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 0.54$, $p = .463$). The minority slope was not significant, $p = .228$. Moreover, majority students' belonging was not significantly related to multiculturalism. In the pooled model the majority slope neared significance, $p = .088$, but separate analyses for minority and majorities revealed no significant effect for multiculturalism on majority students' belonging.

As expected, the interaction pattern reveals that multiculturalism relates to a reduced majority-minority belonging gap without significantly relating to reduced majority belonging. For **colorblindness**, there were no significant effects on belonging. **Assimilationism** was related to lower school belonging, as evident from a significant main effect. As this main effect was not significant in the main-effects-only model, $p = .106$, the effect appears to be conditional on the significant interaction with minority status (see Figure 3). In low assimilationism schools, minority and majority students did not differ in belonging, thus there was no significant majority-minority gap. Conversely, in high assimilationism schools, the gap was significant: minority students felt significantly less belonging than majority students (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 12.18, p < .001$). The more assimilationist the school, the less belonging minority students felt (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 10.12, p = .002$). Assimilationism was not related to majority students' belonging, however: the majority slope was not significant, $p = .845$.

Longitudinal effects on achievement. We also found significant effects of diversity approaches on Dutch grades at time 2 (Hypotheses 1-3; see Table 4 and Figure 1).

Multiculturalism was related to better achievement across minority and majority students, as evident from a significant main effect. The more multiculturalist the school, the higher students' self-reported Dutch language grades. While the interaction with ethnic minority status was not significant, additional analyses in minority and majority samples separately suggest that the achievement benefits of multiculturalism in the pooled data were driven by a significant positive effect for minority students, whereas the grades of majority students were not significantly related to multiculturalism (see Supplemental Material). **Colorblindness** also had a significant main effect on grades –albeit in the opposite direction– such that the more colorblind a school was, the lower the self-reported Dutch grades were (Table 4). As this main effect was near significant in the main-effects-only model ($B = -2.75, SE = 1.51, p = .069$), the effect in the final model appears to be conditional on the trend-significant

interaction with minority status (Table 4). This interaction shows that in low colorblindness schools, minority and majority students did not differ in grades ($p = .346$), thus there was no significant majority-minority gap. In high colorblindness schools, on the other hand, the gap was significant: minority students reported significantly lower grades than majority students (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 9.48, p = .002$). The more colorblind the school, the lower minority students' self-reported grades (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 4.55, p = .033$). Moreover, the majority slope was not significant, so majority students' grades were not affected by a colorblind approach ($p = .337$) (see Figure 4). **Assimilationism** did not affect Dutch grades.

Interaction with ethnic school composition. We tested whether effects of different diversity approaches on majority-minority gaps held in schools with varying ethnic composition. Specifically, we differentiated between schools with low versus high minority presence, i.e., schools where minority students make up the local numerical minority vs. majority (> 60% minority students). We found only one significant interaction effect: ethnic school composition moderated the association of multiculturalism with Dutch grades ($B = 4.56, SE = 2.135, p = .033, 95\% CI [0.370, 8.740]$), so that multiculturalism was beneficial for students' self-reported grades in schools with larger shares of minority students (Wald $\chi^2(1) = 10.68, p = .001$) (Figure in Supplemental Material).

*Associations between diversity approaches.*² Diversity approaches were positively correlated. Colorblindness correlated similarly with multiculturalism ($r = .18, p < .001$), and assimilation ($r = .22, p < .001$), but the strongest correlation was between multiculturalism and assimilationism ($r = .50, p < .001$). These associations suggest that schools endorsed multiple diversity approaches (Civitillo et al., 2017). Additional analyses testing interaction effects between diversity approaches on grades did not reach statistical significance (for the results, see Supplemental Material).

Mediation analyses. We tested if the effects of school diversity approaches on the achievement gap at time 2 were mediated through prior school belonging (Hypothesis 4). To ensure that belonging was indeed measured before achievement, in these mediational analyses we used the measure of school belonging at time 1 (one year earlier) as a predictor of school belonging and Dutch grades at time 2. To investigate the expected mediation, we re-tested our final model adding effects of controls and school diversity approaches on time 1 belonging to the model, and testing the effects of time 1 belonging on time 2 belonging and time 2 Dutch grades. This model also included all previously tested associations of school diversity approaches, ethnic minority status, and their interaction with belonging and achievement at time 2 (see Supplemental Material for the complete mediation model). Our final model in Table 4 held up when adding time 1 belonging as a mediator, except for minor changes in line with the mediation: colorblindness predicted time 1 school belonging ($B = -0.07$, $SE = 0.03$, $p = .008$, 95% CI [-0.119, -0.018]); time 1 school belonging significantly predicted time 2 belonging and time 2 Dutch grades ($B = 0.68$, $SE = 0.19$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.297, 1.059]; $B = 30.89$, $SE = 11.44$, $p = .007$, 95% CI [8.470, 53.317], respectively); and the main effect of colorblindness on time 2 Dutch grades became non-significant. Using the Goodman test which gives an unbiased estimate of the variance of the indirect effect (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2015), the indirect effect of colorblindness (through time 1 belonging) on time 2 Dutch grades was near significant, $z = -1.84$, $p = .066$, and the indirect effect of colorblindness (through time 1 belonging) on time 2 belonging was significant $z = -2.19$, $p = .029$. Thus, for both minority and majority students, colorblindness predicted lower school belonging at time 1, which in turn predicted less belonging and (near-significantly) lower achievement one year later. The findings provide partial support for Hypothesis 4 for colorblindness only.

Discussion

Minority adolescents often lag behind their majority peers in terms of belonging and achievement in today's increasingly diverse schools. One way for schools to reduce ethnic inequalities is to develop institutional policies and practices to maximize the benefits of cultural diversity and to minimize its costs. We examined how schools approach cultural diversity in a European educational context by analyzing actual school policies. Thus, we inductively derived meaningful and distinct diversity approaches. In a next step, we could relate these approaches to the gaps between minority and majority students' school belonging and achievement one year later. Overall, approaches that value cultural diversity, predicted smaller gaps, while approaches ignoring or rejecting diversity were related to persistent gaps in student outcomes. Below we first discuss the distinct diversity approaches that emerged from our analysis of actual school policies. Next, we discuss how these contextual approaches relate to the individual school belonging and achievement of minority and majority students over time.

Diversity Approaches: Multiculturalism, Colorblindness, and Assimilationism

Our study distinguished multiculturalism, colorblindness, assimilationism, and equality as common diversity approaches in our Belgian school panel. The defining aspects of each approach mirror conceptual distinctions between alternate policies valuing, ignoring, or rejecting cultural diversity: for instance, including diversity in the curriculum for multiculturalism, emphasizing individual talent for colorblindness, and only being allowed to speak Dutch for assimilationism.

Appreciating cultural diversity is a defining aspect of multiculturalism (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010) which resonates with similar notions of "value in diversity/difference" or "cultural pluralism" in organizational or school contexts (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Civitillo et al., 2017; Schachner et al., 2016). However, it is more narrow than

multicultural education, which includes a range of related practices such as combatting racism, developing caring relations between teachers and students, and endorsing various pedagogical tools (Banks, 2015; Zirkel, 2008).

Unexpectedly, colorblindness was the most frequent approach in Belgian schools, rather than assimilationism which has been proposed as most common diversity approach in European diversity research (Civitillo et al., 2017; Fine-Davies & Faas, 2014). Along with individualistic aspects, a closer look at the meaning of colorblindness revealed aspects of anti-discrimination and secularism which reflect historically rooted and widely shared principles in European societies (Guimond et al., 2014). Assimilationist policies, in contrast, referred narrowly to restrictions on minority language use and religious expression as defining aspects, and were hence less broad and less common than anticipated.

In the Belgian school-context colorblindness covers three main themes: individualism, anti-discrimination, and secularism. Stressing individual talents, merits, rights or needs is a core aspect of colorblindness and reflects ideals of individualism (Guimond et al., 2014). Combatting racism and discrimination, however, is sometimes associated with multiculturalism as in multicultural education (Banks, 2015; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2013) and other times with colorblindness (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010; Schwarzenhal, Schachner, Van de Vijver, & Juang, 2017), as is the case here. The difference probably lies in the focus: the former –multicultural education– challenges discrimination to expose issues of racial or cultural difference, whereas the latter highlights equal treatment. Secularism is also part of colorblindness, and denotes the so-called neutrality principle which restricts religious expression or symbols in the public domain. Religious neutrality is the institutionalized approach of religious diversity in state schools as distinct from Catholic schools in Flanders-Belgium. It is not surprising that institutionalized secularism fits with colorblindness because of its purpose to prevent differential treatment of (non-)religious minorities. While

colorblindness is prevalent in the North American context (Stevens et al., 2008), we show that this is also the case in the European context, though what constitutes colorblindness differs on both sides of the Atlantic (Guimond et al., 2014).

The assimilationist approach is theoretically an extension of the colorblind approach (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010), yet it is also distinct. Assimilationism requires that minorities adopt the majority culture (as in German schools, Civitillo et al., 2017) by distancing themselves from their distinct minority culture or identity. Accordingly, assimilationist policies tend to restrict the maintenance of the heritage culture, for instance, banning headscarves or penalizing the use of one's mother tongue in school. These markers of minority identity—headscarf and language—are hot topics in public debates over national identity and cultural diversity targeting Muslim minorities in Western Europe (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2018).

Additionally, equality emerged as a separate diversity approach in this study. This finding resonates with the argument by Apfelbaum and colleagues (2016) that ignoring diversity and equal treatment are separate components of colorblindness. It is also in line with recent research highlighting potential benefits of a focus on equality as a value in the European context (Apfelbaum et al., 2016; Roebroek & Guimond, 2015; Schachner et al., 2016). Interestingly, egalitarian values were associated with the awareness – rather than the denial - of difference in our study. Still, this approach was less prevalent than other approaches in Belgian school policies. Thanks to our bottom-up method, we were able to separate out equality from colorblindness proper, whereas confounding these aspects could have resulted in mixed or zero effects of colorblindness.

The bottom-up definition of diversity approaches also revealed unanticipated context-relevant meanings, which enriched our initial coding scheme. For example, the phrases “can't wear religious symbols” and “can't wear headscarves” came under different approaches of

colorblindness and assimilationism respectively. This distinction reflects distinct policies in the Belgian school context: ‘can’t wear religious symbols’ is a blanket assertion of principled neutrality towards all religions (colorblindness) in Belgian state schools; whereas ‘can’t wear headscarves’ targets Muslims as a devalued religious minority group in Belgian society (assimilationism). Our bottom-up analysis of actual policies thus captured some more subtle differences between colorblind and assimilationist language.

It is noteworthy that schools typically endorsed more than one diversity approach, in line with previous research (Civitillo et al., 2017; Plaut et al., 2018), and that different approaches were positively correlated (Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010). One reason may be a distinction between diversity principles and practices. Our initial coding scheme anticipated both behaviorally oriented subthemes (about rules and regulations) and value-oriented subthemes (about principles and ideals) for each diversity approach. Yet, assimilationism relied narrowly on behavioral restrictions, regulating language use and religious dress code, while both multiculturalism and colorblindness included more value-oriented subthemes. Thus, schools may communicate principled multiculturalism, yet implement some assimilationist policies which maintain inequalities in a practical manner, in line with a possible principle-implementation gap (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2007).

Relationship of Diversity Approaches to School Belonging and Achievement

We now turn to the relationship of these diversity approaches to majority-minority gaps in academic outcomes. We focused on language grades, as opposed to other achievement outcomes, to assess how school policies related to an outcome that is the most unequal and most predictive of future success for minorities (Bleakley & Chin, 2004; Heath & Brinbaum, 2014). The three main diversity approaches each had unique effects, and multiculturalism was the most beneficial for both belonging and achievement. Multiculturalism attenuated the majority-minority gap in belonging. Specifically, while in schools scoring low on

multiculturalism, minority students felt significantly less belonging than majority students, in schools with high multiculturalism, there was no gap in belonging. The more multiculturalist the school was, the higher the reported Dutch grades were (driven by the positive effect for minority students). This is in line with the social identity argument that multiculturalism values (rather than threatens) minorities' cultural identities, and thus enables their belonging and achievement. While the benefits of multiculturalism for minority outcomes are well-documented (Plaut et al., 2018; Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Stevens et al., 2008), the absence of significant negative effects for majority students' achievement is an important non-finding. In particular highly diverse schools may thus be able to create a school climate of all-inclusive multiculturalism, affirming the distinct cultures and identities of minority students without excluding majority students (Jansen et al., 2015; Stevens et al., 2008). Potentially, in the 'super-diverse' schools of present days (Vertovec, 2007) where majorities are no longer the numerical majority, a multiculturalist diversity definition may signal the value of majorities' identities as much as minorities' identities. If so, one would expect the benefits of multiculturalism for all students to be higher in more diverse schools. Additional analyses indeed supported this latter possibility by showing that multiculturalism policy was especially beneficial for achievement in schools with larger shares of ethnic minority students (> 60% minorities).

A colorblind approach focusing on individualism and ignoring differences, was detrimental for both belonging and achievement particularly for minority students, and predicted persistent gaps in achievement. In less colorblind schools, minority and majority students did not differ in achievement. In more colorblind schools, on the other hand, the gap was significant: minorities reported significantly lower grades than majorities. The more colorblind the school, the lower minority students' grades were; yet it did not harm or benefit the majority students. This is also in line with social identity valuation perspective such that

ignoring diversity through a colorblind approach undermines minority belonging and performance (Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Meeussen et al., 2014).

An assimilationist approach rejecting cultural diversity had negative effects on minorities' sense of belonging and predicted persistent gaps in belonging. In less assimilationist schools, minority and majority students did not differ in belonging. Conversely, in more assimilationist schools, minority students felt significantly less belonging than majority students. The more assimilationist the school was, the less belonging minority students felt, whereas it did not affect majority students' belonging. In line with social identity threat, the pressure to adopt the majority culture and to leave behind the minority culture in school appears to alienate minority students from the school as a majority context. Assimilationism, at least from the perspective of minorities, is thus not necessarily about majority and minority identities becoming part of a new overarching common identity (Guimond et al., 2014). Our findings suggest that assimilationist policies rejecting cultural diversity relate to the worst outcomes for minorities' identity and belonging. An interesting non-finding is that the minority-majority gap in Dutch language grades persists in assimilationist schools, whereas assimilationist policies are commonly justified as necessary to promote Dutch language mastery (Pulinx et al., 2015).

The additional cluster of equality did not have any effects on our outcome measures, possibly because it was infrequently mentioned in the school documents and had lower variance compared to other approaches. However, previous research has shown that student perceptions of equal treatment matter and are related to higher belonging and achievement (Baysu et al., 2016) and psychological adjustment in school (Schachner et al., 2016), and lower prejudice (Roebroek & Guimond, 2015).

We also found that the relationship between school diversity policies and achievement was mediated by prior school belonging: Minorities felt weaker belonging in more colorblind

schools, and this lack of belonging in turn predicted later academic outcomes. This mediation suggests that colorblindness creates an unwelcoming environment which can harm minority achievement through undermining belonging (Cook et al., 2012). Plausibly, minority students who lack a sense of belonging in school, will sooner disengage from their schoolwork, and therefore fall behind (Baysu, Phalet, & Brown, 2011). Our findings differ from those of Jansen et al. (2016) who find that for majority employees, colorblindness positively affects workplace outcomes, mediated by enhanced belonging. Notably, their definition of colorblindness in the workplace-context focused on valuing competence (qualifications and job performance), which was less central in colorblind school policies. This further suggests that definitions and outcomes of colorblindness vary across contexts (Guimond et al., 2014).

The mediation hypothesis was not supported, however, for assimilationism and multiculturalism. As these policies were unrelated to the initial belonging of the students, they could not mediate policy effects on student outcomes over time. This non-finding also implies that the longitudinal consequences of assimilation and multiculturalism for minority outcomes one year later cannot be due to initial differences in the belonging of minority students in those schools. This strengthens the causality argument, that school policies affect school belonging and achievement, rather than the reverse.

The present research contributes to the current literature in several ways. First, the positive effect of a policy of multiculturalism in terms of reducing academic inequalities between minority and majority students extends a large amount of research associating multiculturalism with lower, and colorblindness and assimilationism with higher, levels of ethnic stereotyping and prejudice (Dovidio et al., 2007; Levin et al., 2012). Importantly, the fact that we did not find any evidence of the alleged costs of multicultural policies for majority outcomes, is inconsistent with recent studies suggesting that multiculturalism is threatening for majorities (Plaut et al., 2018). These novel findings highlight the distinctive

nature of our study. Methodologically, we combine qualitative and quantitative, multi-level and longitudinal forms of analyses to address our questions. Qualitative coding based our assessment of diversity policies in the details of actual diversity management in schools. Cluster analysis revealed how these details fit together to form distinct and coherent diversity approaches. Multi-level and longitudinal analyses related these approaches at the school-level to individual outcomes over time for large random samples of minority and majority students. We showed that different diversity approaches are consequential, even after controlling for parental education, age, school track, and ethnic school composition, all of which affected academic outcomes. Another distinctive feature of our study is the inclusion of both minority and majority groups in the same schools, which enabled us to estimate real ethnic inequalities between both groups. We showed that outcomes for minority *and* majority students were differently related to diversity policies. Future research should further examine the influence of different school policies on students' own attitudes towards diversity (Celeste et al., 2016; Schachner et al., 2016).

There are also limitations. First, the attrition of our sample was not entirely random, such that those who dropped out—around 1800 students—were older, more often had a minority status, and felt less school belonging at time 1. Although we could not assess how their belonging and achievement related to the school policies over time, it is likely that both harmful and beneficial effects would have been stronger for those who already felt marginalized in school. Another limitation is that many subthemes that we initially coded were not frequent enough to quantitatively analyze. This is partly due to the nature of a mixed-method approach, and an in-depth focus on the qualitative analysis might have uncovered more approaches. In terms of language, the questionnaire was presented in the Dutch language, which could reinforce the majority culture. However we would expect any effects of the questionnaire language would be very small within the daily monolingual

Dutch-speaking setting of the school. The self-reported nature of student grades as an achievement measure is another limitation. Although there is no obvious reason why minority and majority students would report their grades differently depending on diversity approaches, nevertheless, future studies may add actual student grades as external measures. Additionally, the indirect effect of colorblindness on Dutch grades through prior belonging was only near significant, and mediation was not supported for multiculturalism or assimilationism. Future research can investigate alternate ways in which school policies may affect grades, such as through school teachers as diversity managers (Meeussen et al., 2014): if policies affect teachers' expectations (Pulinx et al., 2015) and behaviors in class (e.g., support or grading system), this could in turn affect student outcomes (Baysu & Phalet, 2012).

Lastly, given that school policies were already in place when we collected data, we could not test reverse causation: whether schools may have implemented particular diversity approaches in response to achievement gaps. Therefore, we do not know how schools have developed different diversity approaches in response to diversity issues, neither how school diversity approaches and students' diversity experiences may mutually reinforce each other over time. Future research could investigate such recursive cycles by following up the same schools over several years, or by zooming in on naturally occurring policy changes, for instance when schools transition to a new scale of diversity as a consequence of school mergers, or lastly, by implementing new diversity policies and monitoring student achievement in school intervention studies (e.g., Celeste et al., 2017).

To conclude, we examined real school policies and asked how schools approach diversity and how this relates to disparate belonging and achievement outcomes among majority and minority students. We found positive effects of an inclusive multiculturalism approach, which may attenuate the majority-minority gap in belonging and boost achievement across all students. We found these positive effects in spite of the fact that actual multicultural

policies were mainly value-oriented and that some schools combined multiculturalism with colorblind or assimilationist policies. Our main findings suggest the potential of designing multiculturalist diversity policies as an effective way to reduce the gap between minority and majority school careers. Future applied studies should investigate ways to implement such policies, for instance, by training teachers to create identity-valuing school climates for all students, and by raising awareness of the risks of often well-intentioned colorblind or assimilationist approaches to cultural diversity.

References

- Apfelbaum, E.P., Stephens, N.M., & Reagans, R.E. (2016). Beyond one-size-fits-all: Tailoring diversity approaches to the representation of social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000071>
- Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*, 237-276. doi:10.3102/0034654315582066
- Banks, J.A. (2015). *Cultural diversity in education (6th edition)*. New York: Routledge.
- Baysu, G., Celeste, L., Brown, R.J., Verschueren, K., & Phalet, K. (2016). Minority adolescents in ethnically diverse schools: Perceptions of equal treatment buffer threat effects. *Child Development*, *87*, 1352–1366. doi:10.1111/cdev.12609
- Baysu, G., & De Valk, H. (2012). Navigating the school system in Sweden, Belgium, Austria and Germany: School segregation and second generation school trajectories. *Ethnicities*, *12*, 776-799. doi:10.1177/1468796812450857
- Baysu, G., & Phalet, K. (2012). Staying on or dropping out: The role of the school environment in minority and non-minority school careers. *Teachers College Record*, *114*, 1–25.
- Baysu, G., Phalet, K., & Brown, R. (2011). Dual Identity as a two edged sword: Identity threat and minority school performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *74*, 121–143. doi:10.1177/0190272511407619
- Bleakley, H. & Chin, A. (2004). Language skills and earnings: Evidence from childhood immigrants. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *86*, 481-96. doi:10.1162/003465304323031067
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77-101. DOI: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

- Celeste, L., Baysu, G., Brown, R.J., & Phalet, K. (2017). *Self-affirmation and test performance in ethnically diverse schools: A new dual-identity affirmation intervention*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Celeste, L., Meeussen, L., & Verschueren, K., & Phalet, K. (2016). Minority acculturation and peer rejection: Costs of acculturation misfit with peer-group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 55*, 544–563. doi:10.1111/bjso.12147
- CILS_Belgium (2014). *Technical Report: Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS) Belgium*. Leuven, Belgium: CeSo/CSCP, University of Leuven.
- Civitillo, S., Schachner, M., Juang, L., Van de Vijver, F.R.J., Handrick, A., & Noack, P. (2017). Towards a better understanding of cultural diversity approaches at school: A multi-informant and mixed-methods study. *Learning Culture and Social Interaction, 12*, 1-14. doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2016.09.002
- Cook, J.E., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Garcia, J., & Cohen, G.L. (2012). Chronic threat and contingent belonging: Protective benefits of values affirmation on identity development. *Journal of Social and Personality Psychology, 102*, 479-496. doi:10.1037/a0026312.
- Derks, B., Van Laar, C., & Ellemers, N. (2007). The beneficial effects of social identity protection on the performance motivation of members of devalued groups. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 1*, 217-256. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2007.00008.x
- Dimitrova, R., Chasiotis, A., & Van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2016). Adjustment outcomes of immigrant children and youth in Europe: A meta-analysis. *European Psychologist, 21*, 150-162. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000246
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2007). Intergroup contact and attitudes toward the principle and practice of racial equality. *Psychological Science, 18*, 867-872. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01993.x

- Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another view of “we”: Minority and majority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology, 18*, 296-330. doi:10.1080/10463280701726132
- Dustmann, C., & Fabbri, F. (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *The Economic Journal, 113*, 695–717.
doi:www.jstor.org/stable/3590195
- Field, A. (2000). Postgraduate statistics: Cluster analysis. [Handout]. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticshell.com/docs/cluster.pdf>
- Fine-Davies, M. & Faas, D. (2014). Equality and diversity in the classroom: A comparison of teachers’ and students’ attitudes in six European countries. *Social Indicators Research, 119*, 1319-1334. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0547-9
- Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2018). Religion and national identification in Europe: Comparing Muslim youth in Belgium, England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 49*, 44-61.
doi:10.1177/0022022117741988
- Gillen-O’Neel, C., & Fuligni, A. (2013). A longitudinal study of school belonging and academic motivation across high school. *Child Development, 84*, 678-692.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01862.x
- Gregory, A., Cornell, D., & Fan, X. (2011). The relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for Black and White high school students. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*, 904-934. doi:10.3102/0002831211398531
- Guest, G., & McLellan, E. (2003). Distinguishing the trees from the forest: Applying cluster analysis to thematic qualitative data. *Field Methods, 15*, 186–201.
doi:10.1177/1525822X03251188
- Guimond, S., De la Sablonnière, R., & Nugier, A. (2014). Living in a multicultural world:

- Intergroup ideologies and the societal context of intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25, 142-188. doi:10.1080/10463283.2014.957578
- Heath, A.F., & Brinbaum, Y. (Eds.) (2014). *Unequal attainments: Ethnic educational inequalities in ten western countries*. Proceedings of the British Academy 196, Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.
- Hornsey, M.J., & Hogg, M.A. (2000). Assimilation and Diversity: An Integrative Model of Subgroup Relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 143-156. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_03
- Hoti, H.A., Heinzmann, S., Muller, M. & Buholzer, A. (2017). Psychological adaptation and school success of Italian, Portuguese and Albanian students in Switzerland: Disentangling migration background, acculturation and the school context. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 18, 85-106. doi:10.1007/s12134-015-0461-x
- Holoien, D.S., & Shelton, N.J. (2012). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 562-565. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.010
- Inzlicht, M., & Good, C. (2006). How environments can threaten academic performance, self-knowledge, and sense of belonging. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds), *Stigma and group inequality: Social-psychological approaches (pp. 129-150)*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jansen, W., Otten, S., & Van der Zee, K.I. (2015). Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 18, 817-832. doi: 10.1177/1368430214566892
- Jansen, W.S., Vos, M.W., Otten, S., Podsiadlowski, A. & Van der Zee, K.I. (2016). Colorblind or colorful? How diversity approaches affect cultural majority and minority employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46, 81-93. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12332

- Kalmijn, M., & Kraaykamp, G. (2003). Dropout and downward mobility in the educational careers: An event-history analysis of ethnic schooling differences in the Netherlands. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 9*, 265–287. doi:10.1076/edre.9.3.265.15572
- Levin, S., Matthews, M. Guimond, S., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Kteily, N., et al., (2012). Assimilation, multiculturalism, and colorblindness: Mediated and moderated relationships between social dominance orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 207-212. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.019
- Marsh, H.W., Ludtke, O., Nagengast, D., Trautwein, U., Morin, A.J.S., Abduljabbar, A.S., & Koller, O. (2012). Classroom climate and contextual effects: Conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of group-level effects. *Educational Psychologist, 47*, 106-124. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.670488
- Meeussen, L., Otten, S., & Phalet, K. (2014). Managing diversity: How leaders' multiculturalism and colorblindness affect work group functioning. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 17*, 629-644. doi:10.1177/1368430214525809
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., & Masten, A.S. (2013). School success and school engagement of immigrant children and adolescents: A risk and resilience developmental perspective. *European Psychologist, 18*, 126–135. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000139
- Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (1998-2012). *Mplus user's guide*. Seventh Edition. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Namey, E., Guest, G., Thairu, L., & Johnson, L. (2008). Data reduction techniques for large qualitative data sets. In Guest, G. & MacQueen, K.M. (Eds.), *Handbook for team-based qualitative research* (pp. 137-161). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Norušis, M. (2011). Chapter 17: Cluster analysis. In *IBM SPSS Statistics Guides* (pp. 375-404). Addison Wesley.

- Nvivo 11 (2015). NVivo qualitative data analysis [Computer Software]. QSR International Pty Ltd.
- OECD (2015). *Immigrant students at school: Easing the journey towards integration*. Paris: OECD Reviews of Migrant Education. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264249509-en>
- Park, B. & Judd, C.M. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within a social cognition perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 106-130. doi:10.1207/515327957pspr0902
- Plaut, V.C., Thomas, K.M., Kyneshawau, H., & Romano, C.A. (2018). Do Color Blindness and Multiculturalism Remedy or Foster Discrimination and Racism? *Psych Science*, 27, 200-206. doi: 10.1177/0963721418766068
- Preacher, K.J., & Leonardelli, G.J. (2015). Calculation for the Sobel test: An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests. Retrieved 25 July, 2016, from <http://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm>
- Pulinx, R., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2015) Silencing linguistic diversity: The extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15. doi:10.1080/13670050.2015.1102860
- Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 12–21. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1892
- Roebroeck, E., & Guimond, S. (2015). Schooling, citizen-making, and anti-immigrant prejudice in France. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3, 20-42. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.391
- Roeser, R.W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. (1996). Perceptions of the school psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning: The

- mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 408-422.
doi:10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.408
- Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S.R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 4, 215–246. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2010.01022.x
- Ryan, C.S., Casas, J.F., & Thompson, B.K. (2010). Interethnic ideology, intergroup perceptions, and cultural orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 29-44.
doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01631.x
- Schachner, M.K., He, J., Heizmann, B., & Van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2017). Acculturation and school adjustment of immigrant youth in 6 European countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8: 649, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00649.
- Schachner, M., Noack, P., Van de Vijver, F.J.R., & Eckstein, K. (2016). Cultural diversity climate and psychological adjustment at school: Equality and inclusion versus cultural pluralism. *Child Development*, 87, 1175-1191. doi:10.1111/cdev.12536
- Scherbaum, C.A., & Ferrerter, J.M. (2009). Estimating statistical power and required sample sizes for organizational research using multilevel modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12, 347-367. doi: 10.1177/1094428107308906
- Schwarzental, M., Schachner, M.K., Van de Vijver, F.J.R., & Juang, L. (2017). Equal but different: Effects of equality/ inclusion and cultural pluralism on intergroup outcomes in multiethnic classrooms. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*,
doi:10.1037/cdp0000173.
- Shnabel, N., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Cook, J.E., Garcia, J., & Cohen, G.L. (2013). Demystifying values-affirmation interventions: Writing about social belonging is a key to buffering against identity threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 663–676.
doi:10.1177/0146167213480816

- Stevens, F.G., Plaut, V.C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44*, 116-133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460
- Van Acker, K., & Vanbeselaere, N. (2012). Heritage culture maintenance precludes host culture adoption and vice versa: Flemings' perceptions of Turks' acculturation behavior. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 15*, 133-145. doi:10.1177/1368430211417263
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 121-138. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2013) Multicultural education and inter-ethnic attitudes: An intergroup perspective. *European Psychologist, 18*, 179–190. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000152
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*, 1024–1054. doi:10.1080/01419870701599465
- Walton, G.M., & Cohen, G.L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 82–96. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82
- Wang, M.-T., Willet, J.B., & Eccless, J.S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*, 465–480. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2011.04.001
- Zirkel, S. (2008). Creating more effective multiethnic schools. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 2*, 187-241. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2008.00015.x

Endnotes

1. To test the validity of our achievement outcome measure, we related self-reported time 2 language grades with (1) an objective measure of language mastery (i.e., a Dutch vocabulary test) and (2) with self-reported time 2 mathematics grades. Positive associations of self-reported language grades with test performance ($r = .26, p = .001$) and math grades ($r = .77, p = .001$) support the construct validity of our measure.
2. To further test the robustness of our findings on additional achievement outcomes, we tested all multi-level models with self-reported time 2 math grades as an additional dependent measure. Math grades replicated the same patterns of associations with ethnic minority status and school diversity policies as Dutch grades (except for one effect: the main effect for colorblindness was not significant for math grades ($p = .159$); however, over and above this main effect, the cross-level interaction of colorblindness with ethnic minority status was near significant for math grades ($p = .088$), just as for Dutch grades, ($p = .097$). The pattern of mediation was also replicated for math grades. The additional analyses for math grades are available from the first author upon request.

Table 1*School Diversity Approaches in Final Four-Cluster Solution: Subthemes and Frequencies*

Cluster (Frequency range per school)	Specific Subthemes	<i>N</i>	<i>Total N</i>
<i>Multiculturalism</i> (0 to 12)	• Learning about different cultures as a value	37	85
	• Inclusion of diversity in curriculum / instruction	48	
<i>Colorblindness</i> (0 to 13)	• Emphasis on individual talent	89	273
	• Emphasis on individual counseling	48	
	• Anti-discrimination bodies available	12	
	• Zero-tolerance towards racism and discrimination	24	
	• Can't wear religious symbols	27	
	• Religious symbols only in religion class	13	
	• Religion class not compulsory	27	
	• Special classes offered for newcomers	13	
• Respect individual rights and liberties	20		
<i>Assimilationism</i> (0 to 7)	• Must speak only Dutch (classroom / playground)	92	143
	• Can't wear headscarves	51	
<i>Equality</i> (0 to 5)	• Awareness of difference	49	67
	• Equality as a value	18	
<i>Total Codes</i>			568

Note: *N* indicates frequency of each code across all documents.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of Study Variables at the Individual Level and School Level (N = 3131, n=66)

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	M /%	SD	1	2	3	4	
1. Age T1	14.74	1.18					
2. Ethnic Minority Status T1	44%	0.50	-.17***				
3. Parental Education T1	2.34	0.55	-.11***	.24***			
4. School Belonging T2	3.57	0.90	-.14***	.15***	.06***		
5. Dutch Grades T2	62.56	22.77	-.11***	.16***	.12***	.10***	
SCHOOL LEVEL	M	SD	6	7	8	9	10
6. Ethnic School Composition (10-30%)	0.27	0.44					
7. Ethnic School Composition (30-60%)	0.22	0.41	-.32***				
8. Ethnic School Composition (>60%)	0.23	0.42	-.33***	-.29***			
9. Multiculturalism	-0.001	0.99	-.12***	.06***	.23***		
10. Colorblindness	-0.032	0.98	.08***	.13***	.13***	.18***	
11. Assimilation	-0.007	1.01	-.05**	.11***	.02	.50***	.22***

Notes. Percentages are presented for categorical variables instead of means. Ethnic Minority

Status is coded 0 = ethnic minority background, 1 = majority background.

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

Table 3*Model Fit Statistics and Explained Variance for Stepwise Models*

	Covariates-only Model	Main-effects-only Model	Final Model
<i>Log Likelihood</i>	28091.52	28080.01	28067.24
<i>Parameters</i>	23	27	32
<i>AIC</i>	28137.52	28134.02	28131.24
<i>BIC</i>	28272.01	28291.89	28318.36
<i>Sample Size Adjusted BIC</i>	28198.93	28206.11	28216.69
$\Delta\chi^2$, <i>p-value</i>	1440.81 $p < .001$	13.89 $p = .008$	13.07 $p = .023$
Explained Variance			
Individual Level			
<i>School Belonging</i>	$R^2 = .025$, $p = 0.022$	$R^2 = .026$, $p = .022$	
<i>Dutch Grades</i>	$R^2 = .044$, $p = .006$	$R^2 = .045$, $p = .005$	
School Level			
<i>School Belonging</i>	$R^2 = .206$, $p = .094$	$R^2 = .265$, $p = .031$	
<i>Dutch Grades</i>	$R^2 = .128$, $p = .084$	$R^2 = .204$, $p = .024$	

Note: R-squared values are not calculated for (final) model with cross-level interactions.

Table 4

Multilevel Path Analysis Relating Ethnic Minority Status and School Diversity Policies and Their Interaction to Time 2 School Belonging and Dutch Grades

Individual Level	T2 School Belonging	T2 Dutch Grades
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>
Control Variables		
Age	-0.04 (0.02)*	-0.65 (0.42)
Technical Track (vs. Academic)	-0.16 (0.06)**	-5.51 (1.39)***
Vocational Track (vs. Academic)	-0.18 (0.08)*	-3.11 (2.52)
Parental Education	NS	1.59 (0.77)*
Intercept of the Random Slope		
Ethnic Minority Status	0.13 (0.04)**	2.93 (0.81)***
Residual Variance	0.70 (0.03)***	258.35 (34.74)***
School Level		
Intercept	4.33 (0.24)***	73.37 (6.45)***
Control Variables		
Ethnic School Composition (10-30%)	-0.14 (0.08)*	-1.25 (2.74)
Ethnic School Composition (30-60%)	-0.21 (0.07)**	-7.86 (4.39)^
Ethnic School Composition (> 60%)	-0.15 (0.09)^	-11.31 (4.55)**
Predictors		
Multiculturalism (MC)	0.04 (0.03)	3.13 (1.16)**
Colorblindness (CB)	NS	-3.42 (1.60)*
Assimilationism (AS)	-0.09 (0.03)***	NS
Random Slope Cross-level interactions		
MC*Ethnic Minority Status	-0.10 (0.04)**	NS
CB*Ethnic Minority Status	NS	1.88 (1.14)^
AS*Ethnic Minority Status	0.10 (0.05)*	NS
Residual Variance	0.02 (0.01)*	119.51 (34.54)***

Note. Model presents unstandardized regression results with standard errors in parentheses.

NS indicates the ‘non-significant’ effects that were set to be zero. Ethnic Minority Status is coded 0 = Ethnic Minority, 1 = Majority. Academic Track is the reference category for Technical Track and Vocational Track dummy-coded variables.

^p < .097, ^p < .07, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001




Figure 1. Multilevel Path Model Relating Ethnic Minority Status and School Policies and their interaction to Time 2 School Belonging and Dutch Grades.

Note. The model presents unstandardized regression results. Control variables were included in the model but are not shown here for simplicity. Ethnic Minority Status is coded 0 = ethnic minority background, 1 = majority background.

$^{\wedge}p = .097$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$




Figure 2. Cross-level Interaction Effect of Ethnic Minority Status with School Diversity Policies of Multiculturalism on Time 2 School Belonging.

Note: Significant slopes are indicated by *** $p < .001$




Figure 3. Cross-level Interaction Effect of Ethnic Minority Status with School Diversity Policies of Assimilationism on Time 2 School Belonging.

Note: Significant slopes are indicated by $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$




Figure 4. Cross-level Interaction Effect of Ethnic Minority Status with School Diversity Policies of Colorblindness on Time 2 Dutch Grades ($B = 1.88$ $SE = 1.14$, $p = .097$, 95% CI [-0.344, 4.110]).

Note: Significant slopes are indicated by * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Supplemental Materials

A. Timeline of Data Collection

B. Coding Scheme Development and Coding Procedure

C. Examples of Coded Language for School Diversity Policies by Subtheme

D. Cluster Analysis of School Diversity Policies: Alternate Cluster Solutions

E. Associations of School Policies with Student Experiences of Diversity

F. Separate Multi-level Path Models for Minority and Majority Students

G. Interaction between School Diversity Policies and Ethnic Composition

H. Complete Mediation Model with Time 1 School Belonging Added

I. Interaction between Multiple School Diversity Approaches

A. Timeline of Data collection

Table A.

Data Collection Timeline “Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study – Flanders”

Year 1	September	Start of Fall Term [School policies are already in place]
	January	Start of Spring Term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - obtained informed consent from school principals and teachers - participants and parents informed of their right to opt out
	February-May	<u>Data Collection Time 1</u> First classroom visit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students are reminded of their right to opt out - Students report retrospective Fall Term grades (time 1) - Students report current school belonging (time 1) - Students give demographic information as part of larger survey
	Between data collections time 1 and time 2	School policy documents are collected from school websites, or requested from administrative staff if necessary
Year 2	January-February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participants are located in their current classrooms with help of administrative staff - participants and their parents are reminded of their right to opt out
	February-May	<u>Data Collection Time 2</u> Second classroom visit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students report retrospective Fall Term grades (time 2) - Students report current belonging (time 2) - Students update other information as part of larger survey

B. Coding Scheme Development and Coding Procedure

Below we provide further detail on the initial coding scheme and the coding procedure we developed to derive diversity approaches from school policy documents in the Belgian educational context. We hope that this information is instructive for researchers who may want to develop similar coding schemes in the future so as to assess diversity policies in other national or organizational contexts.

Coding Scheme Development

The initial coding scheme is informed by the conceptualization of three commonly studied diversity approaches in the literature, which respectively value, ignore, or reject cultural differences: multiculturalism, colorblindness and assimilationism. We also added a residual category for ‘other’ subthemes which might not fit with these overarching diversity approaches. Each overarching diversity approach included instances of value-oriented language for principles and ideals, as well as behaviorally-oriented language for rules and regulations. Several initially coded subthemes were not frequent enough to include in further analysis (occurring in < 15% of the documents; Guest & McLellan, 2003). Table B below provides the initial coding scheme. Less frequent subthemes that were later removed from the analysis are marked. Many infrequent subthemes occurred less than 10 times. This was the case for value-oriented as well as behaviorally-oriented subthemes. For example, the least frequent value-oriented subthemes (with frequencies) were: “Tradition as a value” (1), “Conformity / obedience as a value” (4), “Autonomy / independence as a value” (5), “No mention of diversity / culture” (3). Least frequent behaviorally-oriented subthemes were: “Diversity-worker / counselor available at school” (1), “Wearing religious symbols (e.g. head scarves) allowed” (1), “Other languages spoken / translators available at parent-teacher meetings” (1), “Must speak only Dutch at parent-teacher meetings” (10), “School uniform required” (5), “Emphasis on equal treatment of all students” (2). Table notes indicate which

initial subthemes were reworded to better cover relevant language on the basis of coders' initial readings of school policy documents. Thematic contents, frequencies, and wordings of the subthemes reflect the Belgian educational context of this study and will likely vary between different settings.

Table B. Initial Coding Scheme of School Diversity Policies: Complete List of Subthemes by Conceptual Approach

	X = Frequency <15% <i>(removed from analyses)</i>
Multiculturalism: Valuing Difference	
Learning about different cultures as a value	
Inclusion of diversity in curriculum / instruction	
Awareness of difference	
Other religions in curriculum / instruction	X
Diversity worker / counselor available at school	X
Emphasis on openness to difference	X
Other languages spoken/translators available at parent-teacher meetings	X
Wearing religious symbols allowed ¹	X
Other cultural holidays recognized ²	X
Reference to minority platforms / contacts outside school ³	X
Colorblindness: Ignoring Difference	
Emphasis on individual talent	
Emphasis on individual counseling	
Respect individual rights and liberties ⁴	
Anti-discrimination bodies available	
Respect / value individual personality (no groups mentioned)	X
Autonomy / independence as a value	X
Emphasis on equal treatment of all students	X
Zero-tolerance towards racism and discrimination (not just bullying)	X
Equality as a value	
Assimilationism: Rejecting Difference	
Must speak only Dutch (classroom / playground)	
Must speak only Dutch (parent-teacher meetings)	X
Can't wear religious symbols	
Can't wear headscarves	
Religious symbols only in religion class	
Conformity / obedience as a value	X
Tradition as a value	X
Other	
Special classes offered for newcomers	
Religion class not compulsory	
Religious identity of the school ⁵	
School uniform required	X
No mention of diversity / culture	X

Notes.

1. Separate subtheme “Wearing religious symbols allowed” was added as distinct from a more restrictive subtheme “Religious symbols allowed *only in religion class.*”
2. Initial wording of this subtheme “Cultural holidays allowed” was narrowed to “Other cultural holidays recognized.” The original wording covered all official school holidays listed in the school calendar, yet very few calendars included other than Belgian/Catholic holidays.
3. Separate subtheme “Reference to minority platforms / contacts outside school” was added on later as distinct from “Diversity worker / counselor available at school.”
4. Initial wording of this subtheme “Appreciate individual preferences / tastes” was changed to “Respect individual rights and liberties” to better cover the language coded under this subtheme.
5. Subtheme “Religious identity of the school” was left out of the analysis, not because it was too infrequent, but because it was most dissimilar from other subthemes. Rather than indicating a coherent diversity approach, this subtheme reflects an institutionalized distinction between (publicly funded) Belgian schools with and without a religious (most often Catholic) denomination.

Coding Procedure

School Policy documents consisted of two types of documents per school: school rules and school vision/mission. All documents were collected from the school websites, or if not available online, requested from the administrative staff. The coding scheme was originally developed and fine-tuned starting from a literature review and repeated readings of the policy documents and through discussing the meaning of the subthemes in repeated meetings with two researchers and two coders. Sentences were used as coding units but two or three very closely related subsequent sentences could be included in the same coding unit. First, coders

and researchers individually read and coded one school (rules and vision/mission documents). Next, inconsistencies between coders were discussed and in case of disagreement we came to a consensus on the best fitting subtheme, as recommended by Guest and McLellan (2003). Coders then continued to code other schools individually and consulted with researchers when they did not know how to code a unit. Coders started at opposite ends of the list of 66 schools; so as to ensure that any coding issues would be identified and discussed sooner rather than later in the process, and to reduce the possibility that the order of reading the documents would influence coder's interpretation of the subthemes while coding. Similarly, coders alternated whether they started with the vision/mission document, or the school rules document for each school (e.g., coder 1 read school 1 rules, then school 1 mission; coder 2 read school 66 vision/mission, then school 66 rules). By alternating, we aimed to reduce any influence that reading one type of document (e.g. the vision of the school) may have on the interpretation of the second document (e.g. rules, and vice versa). Coders were instructed to code a unit under more than one subtheme if more than one subtheme seemed appropriate. Researchers and coders discussed (rare) instances of dual coding (see Supplemental Material C for examples). When both coders had completed coding the same schools, researchers checked co-occurrences of codings and discussed any inconsistent codes. Given these precautions and a high interrater reliability (Kappa $\kappa = .95$), two coders and two supervising researchers were sufficient to complete the qualitative analysis of all school diversity policies. After all documents had been coded we assessed the frequency of the subthemes; and we inspected the co-occurrence matrix to determine if specific themes could be merged or separated to enhance "clear and identifiable distinctions between themes" (p.91, Braun & Clarke, 2006). We then removed most infrequent subthemes (occurring in less than 15% of the documents), as indicated in Table B. Finally, we transferred the frequencies of each

subtheme into SPSS to conduct cluster analysis (Field, 2000), see Supplemental Material D for additional details of the cluster analysis.

C. Examples of Coded Language for School Diversity Policies by Subtheme

Table C. Table of Subtheme Codes with Examples of Coded Language

Cluster	Specific Subthemes	Examples of Coded Language
Multiculturalism (range 0 to 12 per school)	Learning about different cultures as a value	<i>We respect everyone's background and characteristics. We see differences between students as an asset. Respect for ethnic origin: The multicultural character of our school forces students and educators to learn about, understand, and appreciate cultural differences. They are enriching for the school and for everyone's personal development. We support all initiatives to promote the coexistence of the different cultures. We open our school doors to other cultures because we see the confrontation of opinions, values and beliefs living in the community as an enrichment for the entire school population.</i>
	Including diversity in curriculum/instruction	<i>[Ours] is a multicultural school where all students are welcome. The school wants to contribute in a future-oriented way to tomorrow's multicultural society. Respect for each other is key. When young people from diverse cultures and social environments have to work and learn in collaboration, they are confronted with various intellectual, cultural, philosophical and social inequalities. Our policies for equal educational opportunities (GOK) focus on this interplay of difference with inequality.*</i>
		(Dually-coded: Learning about different cultures as a value)
	Including diversity in curriculum/instruction	<i>The [educational] framework of [this school] envisages to guide young people to become valuable world citizens through up-to-date general and socio-cultural education on the one hand and on the other hand through optimal vocational training (inside and outside national borders). The provincial [educational] institutions are both a learning environment and a social community. They offer young people the opportunity to develop not only their cognitive competence, but also to form their entire personality through socio-cultural activities and sports activities. That is why we emphasize the core values of respect and care for others, including those of us who face special difficulties. We offer our students celebrations, reflection days, prayer moments, and activities for the benefit of the third and fourth world.[Note from authors: Fourth world refers to poverty in Belgium/western countries.]</i>
Colorblindness (range 0 to 13 per school)	Emphasis on individual talent	<i>We focus on students with different talents, without distinction of background/origin. We foster the well-being of each individual through strengthening their inherent personal talents. Every teaching or educating moment must do justice to the individual uniqueness of each student.</i>
	Emphasis on individual counseling	<i>At our school all students are entitled to special guidance, both collectively and individually. Throughout the entire school career the school is committed to providing the most appropriate form of guidance tailored to each individual student.</i>
	Anti-discrimination bodies available	<i>We refer those who have complaints about discrimination and racism to the (national) Center for Equal Opportunities and Anti-Racism (telephone number). The (municipal) Local Education Platform strives to ensure equal opportunities to learn and develop for all students, as well as combat any form of exclusion, discrimination and social segregation.</i>
	Zero-tolerance towards racism and discrimination	<i>Bullying, use of violence, racist language, and sexual harassment are abuses of power, which we do not tolerate. Any form of racism (swear words, gestures, ...) and all outer signs of racism or other forms of intolerance are strictly forbidden and can even lead to permanent exclusion from the school.</i>
	Can't wear religious symbols	<i>Our school does not allow students to wear signs of their religion or philosophy of life. Concretely, there is a ban on all visible religious or philosophical signs. The ban applies during all educational activities, both inside and outside school walls. At school it is always and everywhere, also during internships and during all school activities, forbidden to cover one's head as an expression of a religious or philosophical conviction (e.g. Islamic headscarf, Jewish Yarmulke...), except during religion classes [note by authors: In Belgium students have a right to attend classes on their religion or philosophy of life during school hours.]. If students refuse to uncover their head, they will be denied access to class/activities. You come to school properly dressed: (be) decent, not provocative, and avoid religious, ethnic or political appearances.</i>
	Religious symbols only in religion class	<i>Only during religion classes students who attend class can wear visible signs of their religion or philosophy of life. In the interest of our pedagogical project, symbols of a religion or philosophy of life are not allowed in our school. The ban applies to all visible religious or philosophical signs. The ban applies during all educational activities, both inside and outside school walls. Only during religion classes students who attend class can wear visible signs of their religion or philosophy of life.</i>
	Religion class not compulsory	<i>If you are exempted from the obligation to take religion classes, you must devote this time to the study of your own philosophy of life; you cannot stay away from school during class hours. Exempted students in this school will spend this time to the study of their own philosophy of life in a designated study room.</i>

SCHOOL DIVERSITY POLICIES

	Special classes offered for newcomers	<i>The school also offers special classes for newly arrived immigrants who are not native speakers of Dutch ('OKAN'). These special classes aim to teach Dutch to recently arrived students who don't know the language, so as to integrate them as quickly as possible into the educational track and field that best fits their individual potential.</i> <i>[Two teachers] coordinate special classes for newly arrived immigrants who are not native speakers ('OKAN').</i>
	Value individual rights and liberties	<i>Our school values personal preferences and convictions, but this does not mean that one can intentionally provoke, violate rules of proper conduct, or interfere with others' freedom.</i> <i>We are open to alternate visions and cultural ways of life, but we also demand respect for the values and the culture that we share.</i>
Assimilationism (range 0 to 7 per school)	Speak only Dutch (classroom/playground)	<i>Our school is a Dutch speaking school. Your choice for Dutch education means that you encourage your children to learn Dutch, also outside school. When your child hears, speaks, and reads Dutch only during school hours, it is an impossible task for the school to teach adequate knowledge of Dutch.</i> <i>You must always speak Dutch!! The choice for a Dutch-language school implies a positive commitment to this language of instruction both by your parents and by yourself."</i> <i>Dutch is the official language during class hours, on the playground and on school excursions.</i> <i>Inappropriate language use and the use of a language other than Dutch to communicate will not be tolerated at school.</i>
	Can't wear headscarves	<i>Veils, caps and other head wear are not allowed.</i> <i>No head wear allowed inside the school buildings and during class activities. Wearing a headscarf is not allowed in school and in the context of school activities.</i> <i>Except for a hat against the cold in winter, all forms of headgear are forbidden for everyone at school.</i>
	Awareness of difference	<i>We are a school where students and staff members with different backgrounds, qualities and beliefs feel welcome. We see the experience of this diversity as a challenge and an added value.**</i> <i>(Dually-coded: Learning about different cultures as a value)</i>
Equality (range 0 to 5 per school)	Awareness of difference	<i>We take into account differences between students who have their own learning curve and potential, their interests, their backgrounds, and their specific study fields and skills.</i> <i>Our school recognizes and respects that some parents and students speak other languages than Dutch.</i>
	Equality as a value	<i>Equality as a value means for us that everyone is equally important.</i> <i>All people have equal value and must also be treated in this way.</i> <i>We learn that all people regardless of race, culture, gender or ideology are equal by practicing equality.</i>

Table Notes:

Ranges per school indicate the frequency of subtheme codes within each cluster per school.

Dually coded language: only 3.5% (20 out of 568) of all coded materials were multiply coded (see two examples in table above).

*This item was dually coded as “Learning about different cultures as a value” and “Inclusion of diversity in curriculum/instruction.”

**This item was dually coded as “Awareness of difference” and “Learning about different cultures as a value.”

Other instances of multiple codes: The subtheme “Equality as a value” was multiply coded with “Awareness of difference” (1) within the same Equality cluster, with “Inclusion of diversity in curriculum/instruction” (1) in the Multiculturalism cluster, and with “Emphasis on individual counseling” (1) in the Colorblindness cluster. The “No headscarf” subtheme was

multiply coded with “No religious symbols” only twice. The “Learning about other cultures as a value” subtheme was multiply coded with “Inclusion of diversity in curriculum/instruction” (4) within the same Multiculturalism cluster, and with ‘Awareness of difference’ (3) in the Equality cluster. The “Awareness of difference” subtheme was multiply coded with “Inclusion of diversity in curriculum/instruction” (8) in the Multiculturalism cluster.

Note that distinct diversity approaches did co-occur within the same school documents at the level of clusters – as evident from positive associations between approaches across schools. For instance, coded materials for School 1 fall into three clusters: ‘*As a student your son or daughter is entitled to personally tailored special guidance*’ (Subtheme: “Emphasis on individual counseling”; Cluster: Colorblindness); ‘*Always speak Dutch at school, even outside class.*’ (Subtheme: “Must speak only Dutch”, Cluster: Assimilationism); ‘*The multicultural character of our school forces students and educators to learn about, understand, and appreciate cultural differences.*’ (Subtheme: “Learning about different cultures as a value”; Cluster: Multiculturalism). School 2 combines Colorblindness and Assimilationism: ‘*At our school all students are entitled to special guidance, both collectively and individually.*’ (Subtheme: “Emphasis on individual counseling”; Cluster: Colorblindness); ‘*You must always speak Dutch!! The choice for a Dutch-language school implies a positive commitment to this language of instruction both by your parents and by yourself.*’ (Subtheme: “Must speak only Dutch”; Cluster: Assimilationism). And School 18 combines Assimilationism and Equality: ‘*Except for a hat against the cold in winter, all forms of headgear are forbidden for everyone at school*’ (Subtheme: “Can’t wear headscarves”; Cluster: Assimilationism); ‘*All people have equal value and must hence be treated equally*’ (Subtheme: “Equality as a value”; Cluster: Equality). Against this background, additional analyses test interaction effects of different diversity approaches on student outcomes (see Supplemental Material I).

D. Cluster Analysis of School Diversity Policies: Alternate Cluster Solutions

This section provides further details on the cluster analysis of school diversity policies and compares alternate *two-, three-, four- and five-cluster solutions*. The *two-cluster solution* combined multiculturalism and equality as one cluster, and assimilationism and colorblindness as another cluster. This solution suggests that assimilationism and colorblindness are statistically and conceptually related. The *three-cluster solution* had a better fit. It differentiated colorblindness and assimilationism as separate clusters, while still merging multiculturalism and equality in one cluster. The *four-cluster solution* showed the best fit with the data as evident from the cluster coefficients in the agglomeration schedule and from the dendogram. This solution yielded the largest change in the cluster coefficients in the agglomeration schedule, which indicates the added value for each additional cluster (Norušis, 2011). Moreover, the four clusters represent meaningful conceptual distinctions between diversity approaches. While we had not anticipated a separate equality cluster, previous research has generally associates equal treatment with colorblindness rather than multiculturalism (Markus et al., 2000; Stevens et al., 2008). The *four-cluster solution* allows us to test the associations of distinct egalitarian, multicultural, and colorblind approaches with student outcomes separately rather than combining equality with either multiculturalism or colorblindness. Finally, the *five-cluster solution* adds a specific subtheme for ‘religious identity of the school’, which reflects an institutionalized categorical distinction between two types of state-funded Belgian schools: those with a religious (mainly Catholic) denomination and those with a pluralistic orientation. This subtheme was most dissimilar from other clusters (coefficients changed 9.36 points from 45.91 to 55.27); and unrelated to student outcomes. As the religious identity of schools was neither conceptually nor empirically related to the core constructs in this study, it was removed from the analysis (Namey et al., 2008).

E. Associations of School Diversity Policies with Student Experiences of Diversity

We checked whether school diversity policies were indeed related to students' perceptions and experiences of diversity in school. Similar to a manipulation check for experimental manipulations, we regressed effects of policies on students' experiences of diversity.

Specifically, we asked students how often they spoke with their classmates about their own or other countries, cultures, or religions (rated from 1 = *never* to 4 = *always*) ($r = .61, p < .001$).

We found that multiculturalism was significantly related to diversity engagement in peer interactions at the school-level ($B = 0.09, SE = 0.03, p = .006$); the other policy clusters were not significantly related to our aggregate measure of diversity engagement. In schools with more multiculturalist policies, students did in fact talk more often to their classmates about cultures, showing one practical way in which learning about different cultures is promoted in multiculturalist schools. We also asked students how fair their school was with two items:

“The rules are applied equally to all students” and “Some students are allowed to do more than others (*reversed*)” (rated from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) ($r = .49, p < .001$) (Gregory, Cornell, & Fan, 2011). We found that assimilationism was negatively related to perceived fairness at the school-level ($B = -0.06, SE = 0.03, p = .046$); and the equality cluster was also near significantly positively related to students' fairness perceptions ($B = 0.05, SE = 0.03, p = .076$). These findings suggest that students perceived less fairness in schools with an assimilationist approach and rather more fairness in schools with an egalitarian approach. Colorblindness showed no associations with either measure of students' diversity experiences. Together, these associations offer some support for the psychological validity of distinct diversity approaches.

F. Separate Multi-level Path Models for Minority and Majority Students

We replicated our multi-level path analysis in the pooled sample within minority and majority subsamples. Table F shows separate estimates for minority and majority students. Effects of diversity policies on school belonging replicated interaction effects in the pooled sample, so that minorities were worse off in more assimilationist schools and better off in more multiculturalist schools. For Dutch grades, a negative main effect of colorblindness and a positive main effect of multiculturalism in the pooled sample were both driven by the minority sample. Separate analyses replicated both significant effects on the grades of minority students; the effects on majority students' grades were non-significant, albeit in the same direction.

Table F. *Multilevel Path Models for Minority and Majority Students Separately: Effects of School Diversity Policies on School Belonging and Dutch Grades.*

	Minority Students (<i>N</i> = 1312)		Majority Students (<i>N</i> = 1247)	
	T2 School Belonging <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	T2 Dutch Grades <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	T2 School Belonging <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	T2 Dutch Grades <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Control Variables				
Age	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.86 (0.59)	-0.06 (0.02)**	0.04 (0.54)
Technical track (vs. Academic)	-0.17 (0.07)**	-1.24 (1.73)	-0.18 (0.09)*	-8.20 (1.78)***
Vocational track (vs. Academic)	-0.10 (0.07)	0.63 (2.57)	-0.34 (0.10)***	-7.75 (3.37)*
Parental Education		1.56 (0.90)^		1.47 (1.01)
Residual Variance	0.83 (0.03)***	302.19 (44.45)***	0.57 (0.03)***	209.67 (38.14)***
School Level				
Intercept	4.11 (0.32)***	75.75 (8.73)***	4.77 (0.31)***	66.78 (8.43)***
Control Variables				
Ethnic Composition (10-30%)	-0.22 (0.09)*	-2.43 (3.06)	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.02 (3.00)
Ethnic Composition (30-60%)	-0.26 (0.08)**	-10.63 (4.41)*	-0.23 (0.08)**	-4.91 (4.39)
Ethnic Composition (> 60%)	-0.20 (0.08)*	-14.21 (4.78)**	-0.31 (0.20)	-3.02 (7.48)
Predictors				
Multiculturalism (MC)	0.04 (0.03)	2.72 (1.20)*	-0.04 (0.04)	2.42 (1.57)
Colorblindness (CB)	NS	-2.65 (1.57)^	NS	-2.65 (2.07)
Assimilation (AS)	-0.09 (0.03)**	NS	0.00 (0.04)	NS
Residual Variance	0.011 (0.01)	136.26 (38.03)***	0.03 (0.01)*	78.93 (31.52)**

Note: ^^ $p < .09$, ^ $p < .08$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

G. Interaction between School Diversity Policies and Ethnic Composition




Figure G. Interaction Effect of Ethnic School Composition (High versus Low Diversity) with School Diversity Policies of Multiculturalism on Time 2 Dutch Grades.

Notes: Low Diversity: < 60% minority students; High Diversity: 60% minority students or more.

Significant slopes are indicated by $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

H. Complete Mediation Models with Time 1 School Belonging Added**Table H.** *Mediation Model Relating Ethnic Minority Status and School Diversity Policies to School Belonging (Time 1, 2) and Dutch Grades (Time 2).*

	T1 School Belonging	T2 School Belonging	T2 Dutch Grades
Individual Level	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>
Control Variables			
Age	-0.09 (0.02) ^{***}	0.01 (0.01)	-0.68 (0.44)
Technical Track (vs. Academic)	-0.14 (0.06) [*]	-0.01 (0.05) [*]	-5.46 (1.39) ^{***}
Vocational Track (vs. Academic)	-0.18 (0.06) ^{**}	-0.09 (0.07)	-3.03 (2.52)
Parental Education	NS	NS	1.61 (0.77) [*]
School Belonging T1		0.54 (0.03) ^{***}	
Intercept of the Random Slope			
Ethnic Minority Status	0.07 (0.03) [*]	0.09 (0.04) ^{**}	2.84 (0.85) ^{***}
Residual Variance	0.57 (0.03) ^{***}	0.54 (0.02) ^{***}	259.30 (34.50) ^{***}
School Level			
Intercept	5.28 (0.24) ^{***}	0.78 (1.07)	-89.26 (61.94)
Control Variables			
Ethnic School Composition (10-30%)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.11 (0.06) [*]	-1.04 (2.47)
Ethnic School Composition (30-60%)	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.13 (0.07) ^{^^}	-5.05 (4.92)
Ethnic School Composition (> 60%)	-0.19 (0.09) [*]	-0.01 (0.10)	-5.65 (4.51)
Predictors			
School Belonging T1		0.68 (0.19) ^{***}	30.89 (11.44) ^{**}
Multiculturalism (MC)	NS	0.04 (0.02) [^]	3.39 (1.16) ^{**}
Colorblindness (CB)	-0.07 (0.03) ^{**}	NS	NS
Assimilationism (AS)	NS	-0.08 (0.02) ^{***}	NS
Random Slope Cross-level interactions			
MC* Ethnic Minority Status	NS	-0.08 (0.04) ^{^^}	NS
CB* Ethnic Minority Status	0.06 (0.03) ^{^^}	NS	NS
AS* Ethnic Minority Status	NS	0.08 (0.04) [*]	NS
Residual Variance	0.02 (0.01) [*]	0.01 (0.004) [*]	104.108 (34.52) ^{**}

Note: ^^ $p < .08$, ^ $p < .06$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

I. Interaction between Multiple School Diversity Approaches

Schools typically endorsed multiple diversity approaches to varying degrees, so that distinct approaches tend to be positively correlated. Interestingly, we find the strongest (school-level bivariate) correlation between assimilationism and multiculturalism ($r = .50, p < .001$). To explore this phenomenon of multiple seemingly conflicting approaches within schools, we tested school-level interaction effects of the different diversity approaches on our student outcome measures. To avoid complex higher-order interactions of multiple school diversity approaches with ethnic background, we ran these models separately for minority and majority students. There were no significant interaction effects on majority outcomes. There was only one near significant interaction effect on minority outcomes for the interplay of assimilationism and multiculturalism ($B = 2.20, SE = 1.27, p = 0.084$). None of the other interactions was near significant ($ps > .10$). Wald chi-square tests revealed that this effect was driven by a near significant simple effect of multiculturalism in highly assimilationist schools ($B = 3.46, p = 0.063$, see Figure I); no other simple effects were (near) significant. In highly assimilationist schools, minority students reported slightly better Dutch grades when the school was also high on multiculturalism. This suggests a possible softening of restrictive assimilationist rules for minorities when schools also communicate strong (value-oriented) multiculturalism. As none of the (school-level) interactions reached significance, however, great caution is warranted. Future research should elucidate the reality that schools may endorse conflicting policies, and assess how specific combinations of policies may affect student outcomes.




Figure 1. Interaction Effect of School Diversity Policies of Assimilationism (High, Low AS) and Multiculturalism (High, Low MC) on Time 2 Dutch Grades.

Note: $\wedge p = .06$; all other slopes were non-significant.