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This thesis is an investigation of factors preventing individuals from perceiving privity. Privity refers to the direct link between a group’s current disadvantage and past mistreatment. The current study draws on theories and previous literatures, such as social mobility, belief in meritocracy, temporal distance, and cognitive dissonance, to explore why individuals are unable to perceive the link between a group’s current disadvantage and past mistreatment. Cumulative advantage/disadvantage provides a framework to explore how advantages and disadvantages are perpetuated across generations. 263 participants aged 18 – 25 were randomly assigned to read one of three informational passages, and to complete a self-affirmation task, before indicating their support for a variety of redistributive policies. The interaction between information and self-affirmation on support for redistributive policies was assessed as moderated by political ideology and system justification beliefs. The implications for research and practice around the recognition of privity are discussed.
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Acknowledging Intergenerational Injustice: Implications for Redistributive Social and Organizational Policy Attitudes

A majority of individuals today support the notions that equality now exists across ethnic and gender groups (Norton & Sommers, 2011), that discrimination is no longer an issue, and that the playing field is leveled (Offermann, Basford, Graebner, Jaffer, De Graaf, & Kaminsky, 2014). This perception of a level playing field perpetuates wide-scale class differences between subordinate groups (e.g., African Americans, women, and Aboriginals) and dominant groups (e.g., White males). This difference is perpetuated by the overestimation of the ability of subordinate groups to move up the social ladder (Chambers, Swan, & Heesacker, 2015; Kraus & Tan, 2015). Despite the belief that subordinate individuals can move up the social ladder and close the gap between the haves and the have nots, there is a large overlap between subordinate group status and socioeconomic status. Because socioeconomic status is maintained across generations, the group differences between dominant and subordinate groups are also maintained across generations (Corak, 2006). Although individuals quickly acknowledge past injustices perpetrated against subordinate groups that caused these group members to fall into lower social ranks, they are often unable to perceive how these injustices are maintained across generations, and still exist today (Norton and Sommers, 2011; Unzueta, Everly, and Gutierrez, 2014).

There are a number of reasons why people are unable to perceive the discrimination maintained across generations. It may be that people are ignorant: there exists legislation (e.g., Human Rights Code) to prevent discrimination in the workplace, so why would discrimination still exist? Because these policies address injustices that
seem distant and irrelevant, it may be that these policies are deemed unnecessary, and thus it may be that dominant groups cognitively distance themselves from the historical injustices their groups have committed against subordinate groups (Peetz, Gunn, & Wilson, 2010; Wilson, Gunn, & Ross, 2009). On the other hand, it may be that subordinate groups deny their experience of discrimination in order to rationalize they are not taking action to improve their situation (Wicklund & Brehm, 1976). Each of these factors may contribute to the process through which individuals remain blind to the casual links between past and present inequality. Thus, the current study seeks to explore what factors might prevent people from seeing how past discrimination affect subordinate groups’ current life chances. As such, I will first discuss how intergenerational injustice operates, including how individuals react to injustices both behaviourally and cognitively.

**Intergenerational Discrimination**

*Historical negation* is an ideology held by majority-group members that historical injustices are irrelevant to contemporary society (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Individuals may engage in historical negation as a defense mechanism because they fear their status was not actually achieved, but was instead based on the privilege gained through majority-group membership. This status was awarded to the dominant group through historically oppressive actions leading one’s group to reap undeserved benefits from the social order (Knowles et al., 2014). Thus, individuals may believe in historical negation out of a threat to one’s self: acknowledgement that one reaped undeserved benefits threatens one’s sense of self. Recognition that benefits are undeserved and due to group membership causes the experience of collective guilt, which is the feeling of responsibility for other people’s actions by tolerating or ignoring these actions without
actively having participated in them (Branscombe, Slugoski, & Kappen, 2004; Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). Collective guilt stems from a negative evaluation of one’s in-group (Branscombe & Miron, 2004; Miron, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2006). At an individual level guilt is experienced when that individual violates a group norm or standard. At the group level, guilt threatens one’s sense of belonging in the group. As individuals strive to view their in-group in a positive light, when the in-group has acted in a morally unacceptable way, people seek to reduce the resulting guilt in order to feel comfortable with remaining a member of a group of harm-doers (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Wohl et al., 2006). There are multiple strategies available to reduce collective guilt, including prosocial attempts to make amends (Brown, González, Zagefka, Manzi, & Čehajić, 2008; Harvey & Oswald, 2000; Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003) or defensive strategies such as distorting or denying past injustices, or even shifting blame (Dresler-Hawke, 2005; Pennebaker, Paez, & Rime, 1997; Sahdra & Ross, 2007). Interestingly, these strategies are not just employed by dominant groups; subordinate groups are known to employ similar strategies to deny discrimination (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O’Brien, 2005).

For members of subordinate groups, acknowledging past discrimination against one’s group leads to maintenance of higher levels of both performance and overall self-esteem, as well as lower levels of depressed affect (Crocker & Major, 1989; Crocker, Voelkl, Testa & Major, 1991). Given these benefits, individuals should acknowledge discrimination against their group. However, it is well documented in social psychology research that subordinate groups go to great lengths to avoid acknowledgement of
discrimination that is perpetuated against their group, as well as themselves (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O’Brien, 2005). Despite the fact that individuals may advocate on behalf of their groups, or fight discrimination, for the most part group members avoid acknowledging discrimination in order to protect self-esteem and reduce tension. While counterintuitive, this denial of discrimination has been demonstrated across both ethnic and gender subordinate groups. For example, women presented with information that they were being paid significantly less than their male counterparts for the same work maintained that they were not being discriminated against based on their gender (Crosby, 1984). African Americans explicitly told an evaluator who was prejudiced against Blacks and was evaluating their performance attributed their low performance ratings to their own performance, not to discrimination (Taylor, Ruggiero, & Louis, 1996).

**Cognitive dissonance.** Theorists purport cognitive dissonance as the mechanism through which subordinate individuals deny their disadvantage. Cognitive dissonance theory states that individuals experience tension as a result of inconsistencies among their thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, and take steps to justify or rationalize these inconsistencies in order to reduce this tension (Festinger, 1957). As a result of cognitive dissonance, individuals become more committed to their own state of subordination, rather than taking action to resolve the suffering (Wicklund & Brehm, 1976). A dissonance perspective would suggest that subordinate group members’ experience of discrimination implies that they are complicit with perpetuating the status quo. On one hand, subordinate group members are upset about their subordinate place in the world, but on the other hand, subordinate group members are not taking any action to reduce
their experience of discrimination. As a result of these two competing ideas, tension arises from the inconsistency that the system is putting one’s group at a disadvantage, and that through lack of action one’s group is contributing to the stability of the system. In order to reduce this tension, individuals choose not to acknowledge their subordinate place in the world, despite evidence to the contrary. Akin to their dominant counterparts, subordinate groups avoid acknowledgement of discrimination against their group in order to protect self-esteem (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1990; Tice, 1991); bolster group identity (Crosby, 1984); and avoid the negative psychological consequences associated with discrimination (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002).

**Environmental influence.** Beyond cognitive mechanisms, there exist systemic mechanisms that perpetuate discrimination as well as prevent individuals from perceiving discrimination. One systemic mechanism perpetuating the divide between the have and the have nots is socioeconomic status. Various studies have demonstrated that people often overestimate the extent to which people can move up or down the social hierarchy (Durkheim, 1933; Fiske & Markus, 2012; Kraus & Tan, 2015). A comprehensive study of Canadian social mobility by the Fraser Institute (2016) found that intergenerational mobility rates have actually remained stable and that Canadians experience the ability to move in and out of the lowest and highest income quintiles. There exist high degrees of upward social mobility for all Canadians: between 1990 and 2009 only 21% of Canadians in the second lowest income quintile still remained in the same quintile; and only 13% of Canadians in the lowest income quintile still remained in the lowest quintile (Grubel, 2016). However, these intergenerational social mobility rates have remained relatively
stable across a 20-year period: upward social mobility rates for those in the lowest quintile were 42.3% from 1999 – 2004, and 43.5% from 2005 – 2010. Similarly, downward social mobility rates from the highest quintile were 43.0% and 43.4% across the same periods. The fact that both upwards and downward social mobility rates were nearly identical across these two periods is shocking, due to the economic boom during the first period and severe recession during the second. Though individuals support the notion that people across generations are able to move up the social ladder, and that one’s chances of moving up the social ladders are increasing with time, these statistics demonstrate how social mobility rates are low. Despite ample opportunities for an increase in SES due to the recent economic boom, individuals are not moving up the social ladder. One contributing factor to the identical mobility rates over the 20-year period is income inequality. Income inequality remained stable across the same 20-year period, while real income increases substantially. This indicates that though the poor are getting richer, so too are the rich.

Economists have explored the effect of income inequality on social mobility, and while theory and evidence are mixed, both researchers (Andrews & Leigh, 2009; Björklund & Jäntti, 1997; Corak, 2006; d’Addio, 2007; Solon, 2004) and The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2011) have made statements crediting rising income inequality as a source for stifling, and even lowering, social mobility rates. In comparisons between countries with high inequality, such as Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States, intergenerational mobility is much lower than the Nordic countries where income is distributed more evenly.
Income inequality is not the only form of inequality stifling social mobility: inequality of opportunity has been cited as the missing link between income inequality and social mobility (Brunori, Ferreira, & Peragine, 2013). Higher income inequality makes it difficult for children to achieve a higher income than their parents due to the unequal distribution of opportunities for advancement. Thus, there exists a growing recognition that providing greater investment in human capital (e.g., sending children to university or private schools), beginning with early childhood education and care, particularly in low-income groups, can level the playing field later in life. Evidence shows that some of the initial gaps of children born in adverse environments can be reduced when children participate in early childhood programs (Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Carneiro & Heckman, 2003; Currie & Blau, 2005; d’Addio, 2007; Machin, 2006; Sylva et al., 2004). Investment in children’s human capital requires removing the financial constraints placed on disadvantaged families. Policies such as redistributive taxes can reduce income inequality, allowing the incomes of future generations to regress more quickly to the mean (Corak, 2006), as well as to encourage children to participate in the labour market. These policies not only target current inequalities, but also future inequalities through increasing social mobility.

Inequality of opportunity is linked to the inheritance of socioeconomic status. Children of wealthy parents earn higher incomes; marry other children of wealthy parents (Black & Devereux, 2010); and are provided occupational opportunities (e.g., opportunity to work in the same organization as one’s father) (Corak, 2013). Similarly, children born into families with low-income parents who receive welfare are more likely to grow up to receive welfare themselves (Black & Devereux, 2010). Economic researchers posit that
those who are better off financially possess the resources to invest in their children, and these children will group up to possess similar resources, thus in turn continuing to invest in their children. This investment maintains a similar production of family income across several generations. Intergenerational correlations between parent and child income range from $r = 0.40 – 0.75$ for father-child pairs, and $r = 0.30 – 0.50$ for mother-child pairs (Ermish & Francesconi, 2002). This idea of investment in human capital is purported to be an explanation for the direct link between a group’s current disadvantage and past mistreatment, referred to as privity (Banfield, Ross, & Blatz, 2014). Parents maximize utility by choosing optimal investments in human rather than nonhuman capital for their children, thus perpetuating dominance of race, culture, caste, and religion (Becker & Tomes, 1979; Solon, 2004). Thus, one’s life chances are often dictated by those of their parents.

Sociology and psychology researchers posit a systematic tendency for an individual to experience a cumulative advantage/disadvantage in money, health, or status over time (Merton, 1988). For instance, an individual who is afforded opportunities at birth due to parental income will continue to see these advantages grow throughout his or her life span. Of greater relevance here is how cumulative advantage/disadvantage can play out intergenerationally. These literatures provide evidence for privity using theories of cumulative advantage/disadvantage. Initial comparative advantages of trained capacity, structural location, and available resources add up to make for successive increments of advantage, eventually creating large gaps between the haves and the have-nots. Perhaps the most prevalent example is racial cumulative disadvantage. African Americans face persistent disadvantage as a result of stratification of exposure to
stressors, and access to health care and protective resources (Shuey & Wilson, 2008), whereas Whites are provided a life of privilege, often due to investment in human capital. These racial disparities exist primarily in the distribution of socioeconomic resources, rather than in an inability to transform these resources into health (e.g., access to healthy eating options or prenatal care) (Hayward, Crimmins, Miles, & Yu, 2000). Individuals born into African American families have lower socioeconomic status (SES), and little access to health care and protective resources. Because of the inability for the parents to invest in their children’s human capital, the children grow up at the same level of SES, eventually having children of their own at this low status level. The cumulative advantage/disadvantage perpetuates the divide between the haves and the have nots.

Of all the mediating factors of cumulative advantage/disadvantage and investment in human capital, socioeconomic status (SES) plays perhaps the largest and most impactful role. Work by Knudsen, Heckman, Cameron, and Shonkoff (2006) summarizes how SES begins by influencing child development, followed by both adult social and labour market outcomes, and how this recursive process perpetuates intergenerational SES. Socioeconomic status influences a child beginning in utero, through the availability and affordability of prenatal care to parents, as well as a child’s health and aptitudes in their early life. A child’s early health in turn influences early cognitive and social development through childcare and educational opportunities provided by both parental incomes, as well as by the quality of the neighbourhoods in which the child grows up. The family circumstances of the child paired with the quality of neighbourhoods and schools influences the child’s primary school success, which feeds into success in secondary and post-secondary education. Family resources and networks provide or limit
access to good schools and well-paying jobs. The degree the child has access to well-paying jobs determines his or her own SES, and ultimately, the SES of future offspring. Patterns of how parental SES affects Canadian children have been well examined by economists, and demonstrate how being raised by a high SES parent confers a two-to-three times greater income-earning advantage than children raised by low or middle SES parents (Corak & Heisz, 1999; Corak & Piraino, 2010, 2011). Thus, the ability to take advantage of investment in human capital is limited to offspring of advantaged parents because disadvantaged parents cannot afford to buy their children the same advantages as advantaged parents (Burtless & Jencks, 2003; Corak, 2006; Solon, 2004; d’Addio, 2007).

Epigenetics researchers have also demonstrated how environmental factors play a role in one’s future circumstances. These researchers posit that environmental factors early in life can override genetic predispositions. Past prevailing theories purported that precursors to behavior were solely determined by one’s genetics, regardless of the environment in which one is raised (Godfrey, Gluckman & Hanson, 2010). However, recent research has demonstrated that behavior is influenced by prenatal and early childhood experience (Deneberg and Rosenberg, 1967; Harper, 2005). These theories of soft inheritance posit that phenotypic displays of disease or malnutrition still persist despite superior genetics perhaps better explain the impact of one’s history on the present. For example, where precursors of cancer can grow into cancer regardless of one’s early childhood environment, exposure to poor diet in early childhood, despite no family history or genetic markers of diabetes, can cause children to develop diabetes later in life. Harper (2005) found these effects persist for subsequent generations not exposed to these same events. Denenberg and Rosenberg (1967) and Weaver and colleagues
(2004) used rats to demonstrate how early environments influence not only current, but also future generations. Difference in emotionality and stress response are later observed in the offspring of rats exposed to licking, grooming, and nursing by mother, including an increased expression of hippocampal glucocorticoid receptor and enhanced glucocorticoid feedback sensitivity. Thus parental responses to environmental challenges have a lasting effect on their future offspring. Taken together this research demonstrates how things we understand to be biologically based (e.g., the onset of disease), as well as things considered to be inherently set (e.g., temperament) are in fact shaped through epigenetic processes. Gene expression, as well as behavioural expression, is carried down as a product of one’s social environment, not only in rats, but also in humans.

Given the influence of one’s environment on gene expression, it is important to note that one’s socioeconomic status can play a role in one’s genetic expression. Lower SES is disproportionality associated with more chronic and acute stressors (Turner & Lloyd, 1999; Turner, Wheaton, & Lloyd, 1995); however, it is the additive effects of daily life stressors that maintain and exacerbate the social inequalities in health (Grzywacz, Almeida, Neupert & Ettner, 2004; Wheaton, 1994). Because lower SES individuals often belong to other subordinate groups (e.g., ethnic and gender minorities) the experience of discrimination is often a daily stressor. For example, the experience of racism has been explicitly linked to the experience of daily social stress, as well as chronic stress, leading to negative health outcomes (Anderson, 2012). Consistent exposure to daily stressors in early has been cited as a predisposing factor for the development of behavioural and emotional disorders in later adulthood, as well as the transfer of this predisposition to future children (Franklin et al., 2010). Offspring of
subordinate group members, as well as future generations of the offspring, are similarly predisposed to experience disorders despite having not experienced the same trauma (Bifulco et al., 2002; Harper, 2005; Kim, Capaldi, Pears, Kerr, & Owen, 2009; Sterba, Prinstein, & Cox, 2007). Thus, subordinate group members can experience the epigenetic effects of stress stemming from both experience of discrimination as a stressor, as well as the stress associated with their lower socioeconomic status.

Taken together, these theories of environmental influence highlight how the environment in which one is brought up plays a pivotal role not only in their later life, but also in the life of future children. In recognizing privity, subordinate groups can preserve their positive identities by attributing current group disadvantages to past injustices against the group rather than failures of individual group members (Crocker & Major, 1989). Victimized groups can claim special compensation aimed at redressing the imbalance caused by past injustices (Banfield et al., 2014). Despite these benefits associated with preserving one’s identity, such as claiming special compensation, and reducing guilt, subordinate groups rarely recognize privity (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O’Brien, 2005).

Understanding the factors preventing people from perceiving privity has important implications for redistributive policies in contemporary society. In order for redistributive policies aimed at reducing inequalities between groups (e.g., equal pay for equal work, employment equity) to gain support, people must recognize how historical injustices are responsible for the existing inequalities. It appears that groups are unable to perceive privity due to three main factors: lack of information, self-esteem threat, and system justification beliefs. As such, the current study proposes to explore the influence
of each of these factors on perceptions of temporal distance and attitudes towards redistributive policies.

**Lack of Information**

One obstacle to acknowledging privity may be ignorance. Though people are aware of the general inequality between dominant and subordinate groups (e.g., Whites and African Americans, and low and high SES) and prefer more equality than currently exists, they still do not acknowledge privity. The most commonly cited reason for a lack of outrage or action to address this inequality is that people lack an awareness of the true extent of the current inequality (Tyler, 2011). People may be unaware of the existence of White privilege and its role in determining who gets opportunities and who is sent to prison. They may be unaware of current forms of personal and institutional discrimination, including the preferential hiring of White males. Lastly, they may be unaware of how past discrimination affects groups in the present.

People’s knowledge of past and present experiences of discrimination is heavily influenced by how and where they grew up (Fivush & Nelson, 2004; Kurtis, Adams, & Yellow Bird, 2010; Novick, 1999; Pennebaker & Banasik, 1997; Sahdra & Ross, 2007). As such, members of dominant groups are rarely taught about the privilege they may inherently hold. Additionally, lack of awareness of the statistical information relevant to social mobility trends, such as the impact of parental influence on educational attainment and occupational status (Baker, Treloar, Reynolds, Heath, & Martin, 1996; Rietveld et al., 2013; Tambs, Sundet, Magnus, & Berg, 1989), prevent individuals from understanding how subordinate groups are still oppressed in current culture. Thus, dominant groups are more ignorant to the experience of discrimination. In contrast,
subordinate group members learn about their group’s earlier mistreatment through family members, religious and group leaders, and formal education (Banfield et al. 2014), and thus are less ignorant of the existence of discrimination. However, as previously discussed, subordinate groups take great lengths to deny their disadvantage in order to preserve their self-image and to protect their self-esteem, as it is less cognitively taxing to deny the presence of discrimination than to acknowledge it.

By choosing optimal investments in their children, including education, high status parents perpetuate the dominance of their race, culture, caste, or religion (Becker & Tomes, 1979; Solon, 2004). Because education is the main avenue for social mobility, the access to education one has based on either their parents’ location, own education, or familial motivation plays a large role in one’s future education and career path (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Sewell & Hauser 1975). Because understanding and accepting privity is cognitively complex, exposure to information about systemic issues (e.g., through formal or informal education afforded by the advantage provided by one’s parents), and how the past affects the present should make a difference. However, this information should only have an effect when individuals are not threatened by the information presented to them.

In summary, individuals in both dominant and subordinate groups are ignorant to the discrimination that exists today. However, if ignorance is the only obstacle preventing individuals from perceiving intergenerational discrimination, then presenting individuals with information about the effects of intergenerational discrimination should lead these individuals to perceive, recognize, and support policies that will ameliorate it. However, the denial of discrimination literature highlights how presenting individuals with information about the existence of discrimination does not lead to acknowledgement of
this discrimination (Crosby, 1984). Thus, researchers have purported that other processes (e.g., self-esteem threat and system justification beliefs) must be at play preventing individuals from acknowledging discrimination.

**Self-esteem Threat**

Another reason why people deny discrimination may be because it threatens their self-esteem. Human beings possess esteem-needs: people are motivated to view themselves as deserving of successes and as valued by others. For dominant groups, acknowledging undeserved advantages engenders collective guilt, and threatens collective self-esteem due to the meritocratic group-image threat (Branscombe, 1998; Knowles & Lowery, 2012; Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Wohl et al., 2006). For subordinate groups, acknowledging current discrimination threatens the in-group’s value by reinforcing a subordinate position in one’s social world (Allport, 1954; Crocker & Major, 1989; Weiner, Russell & Lerman, 1979). For both groups, esteem-threats can drive collective social change (Branscombe & Wann 1994; Turner et al. 1984). For example, when Whites frame inequality in terms of in-group privilege the elevated levels of guilt stemming from group-image threat cause a reduction in out-group bias and an increased willingness to redistribute advantages (Knowles et al., 2014; Swim & Miller, 1999). Additionally, when dominant groups temporally reduce their distance from events causing collective guilt, their willingness in pro-social motivation to repair suffering in the subordinate group is increased (Peetz et al. 2010). It appears that when individuals experience a threat to their self-esteem it can lead to prosocial action, but it is less taxing on individuals to simply deny that the discrimination exists to protect their self-esteem than to take prosocial action.
If self-esteem is the root of some defensive responding about inequality, then providing another route to self-worth may alleviate the defensive responding. Self-affirmation has been shown to provide this. Self-affirmation theory posits that when self-image is threatened in one domain, affirming the self in another domain can restore self-integrity. For example, a woman whose self-image is threatened by being called overweight can restore her self-image and self-integrity by reminding herself that she is intelligent and a hard-worker. Thus, when groups experience either discrimination or collective guilt, their collective identity is threatened. As a result, individuals seek to affirm themselves in one of two ways. One can affirm the group on a domain other that the domain that is threatened by highlighting positive values the group possesses despite having perpetuated a past injustice. For example, highlighting the revenues achieved by one’s work group rather than focusing on the discriminatory hiring practices at an organization. Alternatively, one can affirm one’s self as a way to establishing self-integrity in a domain other than the threatened collective identity. In taking action to affirm their collective group identity, this identity is increased, as well as self-image (Branscombe et al. 1999; Major, Kaiser, & McCoy, 2003). Wilson and Ross (2001) found that affirming participants’ self-image caused participants to feel subjectively closer in time to negative events. When self-esteem has been bolstered through affirmation, the threat to self-image no longer exists, and one does not have to distance oneself from negative events in order to maintain self-esteem. As evidenced by the denial of discrimination literature, an individual from either a dominant or subordinate group will deny discrimination because it is a threat to self-esteem. By removing this threat, people should be more willing and able to acknowledge privity, because when the self is
affirmed, more positive attitudes towards redistribution result. Thus, affirming people
before presenting them with knowledge about injustices should reduce the esteem-threat
typically experienced, allowing individuals to demonstrate more positive attitudes
towards redistributive policies.

**System Justification Beliefs**

People hold many system justification beliefs that motivate them not to recognize
issues of inequality. These system justification beliefs explain how individuals are
motivated to legitimate the situations they are in. System justification theory purports that
because individuals want to view the world as predictable in order to avoid a sense of loss
of control or negative emotions, they are motivated to view the world, and society, as just
and fair (Jost & Banaji, 1994). System justification theory is strongly influenced by
dissonance theory. Individuals are motivated to view the system as legitimate and fair
despite knowledge to the contrary. These system justification beliefs can cause
dissonance, leading one to defend the legitimacy of the system in order to maintain a
positive image of the system (Jost & Hunyady, 2002). As such, when the fairness of
these legitimized situations is threatened, individuals respond by clinging even more
strongly to their system. At the individual level, justification beliefs may initially improve
mood and wellbeing (Jost, Pehlam, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2003), but later lead to lower
self-esteem and symptoms of depression, especially in those lower in the hierarchy (Jost
& Thompson, 2000). At the societal level system justification beliefs lead individuals to
no longer feel the need to assist the disadvantaged, and thus to the rejection of
redistributive programs aimed at helping deprived communities.
System justifying beliefs explain why individuals respond to information about the unfair system with a defensive reaction that sits in contradiction to the idea that information about these phenomena would lead towards positive attitudes towards redistributive policies. Instead, these defensive reactions could lead to more negative attitudes towards redistributive policies in individuals with high system justification beliefs. The two system justification beliefs most relevant to the issue of intergenerational discrimination are: the belief in social mobility and the belief that society and/or workplaces are meritocratic. Social mobility is the notion that through hard work, individuals are able to achieve a higher level of education, income, and occupational prestige than their parents (Causa & Johansson, 2010). Similar to the notion of the “American Dream,” and that North America is the “land of opportunity,” social mobility posits that there is the opportunity for the average person to get ahead in life. However, previous research has demonstrated that social mobility is not achievable by all due to cumulative advantage/disadvantage.

**Social mobility.** There is a widespread public understanding of and belief in social mobility. Despite an overall desire from Canadians for a more equal distribution of wealth, as well as a growing body of evidence as to the effectiveness of redistributive policies, there still exists a lack of overall support for policies that affect this equalization (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Norton & Ariely, 2011). Researchers posit this lack of support may be due to high social mobility beliefs. Subordinate group members (e.g., ethnic minorities) fail to support redistributive policies because they believe that their children will be able to move up the social ladder. These individuals incorrectly believe that
supporting redistributive policies such as progressive taxation, they will actually harm rather than help their children (Benabou & Ok, 2001).

Of the reasons explored explaining why social mobility is often thought to be easier to achieve than it actually is, those that highlight system-justifying beliefs prevail. People are motivated to defend the status quo and to view the existing social system as fair, just, and legitimate as this reduces the tension created by cognitive dissonance. As such, individuals will engage in rationalizations to maintain this belief (Jost et al., 2004). At the core of social mobility beliefs is the rationalization that everyone has an equal opportunity to get ahead, thus one’s outcome reflects personal characteristics (e.g., work, ethic, ability) rather than system-imposed constraints (e.g., resource disparities, discrimination) (Chambers et al., 2015). Following with the idea that one possess the characteristics to get ahead, is another system justification belief: meritocracy.

**Meritocracy.** One the one hand, meritocracy is a justice principle and is the belief that only relevant inputs (e.g., ability) should be considered when distributing outcomes. It is related to the distributive justice principle of equity: an individual’s ratio of inputs to outcomes should be equivalent to relevant comparison others (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Lerner, 1977). Meritocracy allows a distribution free from bias, and creates social mobility. In sum, meritocracy is a widely held North American ideal (Durkheim, 1933; Fiske & Markus, 2012). It appears that such an idealized view of meritocracy is unrelated to system justification processes (Son Hing, Bobocel, Zanna, Garcia, Gee & Orazietti, 2011).

On the other hand, the belief that the current system is a proper meritocracy operates as a system justification belief (Son Hing et al., 2011). Despite that meritocracy
makes no references to groups, it can have a substantial influence on intergroup
discrimination by justifying why different groups have different levels of social power.
For those who believe meritocracy exists, in holding the presumption that an individual’s
outcomes are a function of personal control, prejudice against groups with more negative
or less socially desired outcomes (e.g., the poor) appears justified (Crandall, 1994; Joffe
& Staerklé, 2007). In fact, dominant group members often endorse the belief meritocracy
exists in order to view themselves as possessing the necessary merit (e.g., talent,
diligence) to maintain their social position and deny that any undeserved inequality exists
(Knowles & Lowery, 2012). These individuals want to believe that their own rewards
were a function of merit, not of privilege based on uncontrollable characteristics like skin
colour. By adopting this meritocratic worldview, dominant group members engage in
system-justification. This rationalizes the status quo and reduces and discomfort they may
experience (Foster, Sloto, & Ruby, 2006; Napier & Jost, 2008; O’Brien & Major, 2005).
Dominant members believe that their rewards were awarded to them through fair and just
means, as opposed on the basis of skin colour, which would be considered an unjust
means for award.

Meritocracy is a strongly supported North American value (Knowles & Lowery, 2012). Though merit may appear to be a fair way to allocate social value, there is strong
evidence suggesting that North America is not a meritocracy (Krauze & Slomczynski,
1985) and that social value is heavily contingent on group membership (Son Hing,
Bobocel, & Zanna, 2002; Son Hing et al., 2011; Uhlmann & Cohen, 2005). Meritocracy
is often employed to assume that people who have more earned those resources, thus
ignoring institutional factors (e.g., tax codes, market economics) that aid in dominant
groups receiving more than subordinate groups. Ironically, it appears that meritocratic ideology is one example of the system-justifying beliefs that perpetuate group-based discrimination in the form institutional processes, such as hiring practices. Both social mobility and meritocratic beliefs can be employed as protective mechanisms for protecting both subordinate and dominant individuals’ self-esteem. Thus, these protective mechanisms could lead to more negative attitudes towards redistributive policies.

**Theories of Temporal Distancing**

Temporal distancing is a mechanism through which people might be more or less receptive to redistributive messages and be willing to support policies that would help to ameliorate negative effects of intergenerational discrimination. Temporal distance is a psychological distance that describes the point in time where one perceives events to have occurred, relative to another point in time (e.g., the present) (Trope & Liberman, 2003). People perceive events to be temporally distal when they are abstract (Agerstrom & Bkorklunch, 2009; Kyung, Menon & Trope, 2010); pose a threat to the current collective self (Peetz et al. 2010); contain information about failure (Ross & Wilson, 2002); and are perceived to be more negative in valence (Gebauer, Haddock, Broemer, & von Hecker, 2013). In contrast, events are perceived to be temporally proximal when they are concrete (Agerstrom & Bkorklunch, 2009; Kyung et al., 2010); contain information about success (Ross & Wilson, 2002); and are perceived to be more positive in valence (Gebauer et al. 2015). Researchers have used perception of discriminatory events to explore the effects of temporal distance.

When exposed to information about in-group historic injustices, people perceive events to have taken place in a more distant time. Gunn and Wilson (2008) had men read
about either the injustices men perpetrated against women in the 1900s, or a neutral
description of a family in the 1900s. When men’s social identity was threatened due to
reminders of their group’s injustices against women, they cognitively distanced
themselves from the 1900s, regarding it as farther away from the present than those
exposed to the neutral condition. Peetz et al. (2010) demonstrated that when present day
Germans were reminded of Germany’s atrocities in World War II, they reported the
Holocaust to be more temporally distant than those also reminded of Germany’s
reparation efforts following the Holocaust. Individuals who perceived the Holocaust as
subjectively close reported a willingness to compensate victims. These two studies
demonstrate how people shift temporal distance when thinking about outcomes. Doing so
is believed to provide an ‘emotional anaesthetic’. Distancing past failures can allow
people to acknowledge and address their contributions to negative outcomes without a
large threat to their self. This is because people are much more critical of subjectively
distant past selves than of subjectively proximal selves (Wilson & Ross, 2001).
Additionally, transgressions perceived to be temporally recent are less easily forgiven
than those perceived to be temporally distant (Wohl & McGrath, 2007). As a result of
events being temporally recent, individuals are more willing to engage in remunerative
behaviours, such as compensating victims. However, the alleviation of self-esteem threat
can come at the expense of perceived privity: the more distant an event, the more
irrelevant it may be perceived.

Members of dominant groups find it difficult to view transgressions against
subordinate groups as occurring close to them in subjective time. Group members want to
view their in-group in a positive way, and information about their historical injustices
threatens this positive information, as well as their identity. Similarly, members of subordinate groups may subjectively distance themselves from negative information about treatment of their in-group in order to preserve the in-group’s value. There is a threat to self-esteem both groups face when identifying privity.

**The Current Study**

The current study is a 3 x 2 between-subjects design wherein the first factor of information has three levels (information about intergenerational injustice; information about past discrimination; or a no injustice information control), and the second factor of self-affirmation has two levels (affirmation of the self or no affirmation control). The dependent variable variables are awareness of present discrimination operationalized as the overlap between past and current discrimination (measured using subjective distance sliders), and attitudes towards redistributive policies.

Policies classified as redistributive follow from Lowi’s typology (1964), wherein costs and benefits are widespread, but coincide with the dominant conflict in society: that of the haves and have-nots. In following with this classification, I have adhered to the conceptualization of redistributive policies to fall into two broad categories: opportunity enhancing and outcome-based (Shelton & Wilson, 2009). **Opportunity enhancing redistributive policies** promote upward social mobility through individuals developing their own cultural capital, including the redistribution of employment prospects and socioeconomic resources. The goal of these policies is to improve core life-changing opportunities for subordinate group members (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993; Wilson, 2001). These policies include access to educational and occupational opportunities (e.g., full-day kindergarten or a mentoring program for women leaders). **Outcome-based**
**redistributive policies** seek to ensure disadvantage groups are represented in society, through representation in institutions, organizations, and corporations, and to make groups equal through the equalization of outcomes (Shelton & Wilson, 2009). These policies include employment equity initiatives and progressive taxing. It is important to note that the policies of interest are both political and organizational policies. While political policies may utilize tax payer dollars to redistribute outcomes or opportunities, organizational policies do not typically use resources provided by individuals, and come at little to no cost to the individual. Because support for redistributive policies is predicted by one’s political ideology (Jacoby, 2000; Rudolph & Evans, 2005), political ideology was also included to account for additional variance in the analysis. The aim of the current study is to understand what strategies (e.g., presentation of information, self-affirmation) can be used to encourage buy-in to or support of redistributive policies.

**Hypotheses**

Due to both the ignorance and cognitive complexity associated with perceiving privity, I hypothesize that individuals exposed to information about injustice against subordinate groups will be able to recognize privity, but only when the threat to self-esteem has been removed. In following with past research, the effect of information should only occur in those who have experienced self-affirmation, as the situation no longer poses a threat to their identity. As such, I hypothesize:

**H1:** There will be no effect of information about past discrimination, or intergenerational injustice on attitudes towards redistributive policies.

Self-affirmed individuals who have been exposed to information about past and intergenerational injustice will show increased support for both broad categories of
redistributive policies, but with the strongest support for policies equalizing opportunity, as participants will be able to make the cognitively complex connection between past and current discrimination.

H2: There will be an information condition x affirmation condition interaction, such that when participants have been affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show more positive attitudes towards redistributive policies than those in the control condition. When participants have not been affirmed no difference between information conditions is expected. When participants have been affirmed, the effect of information condition will be stronger for policies aimed at enhancing one’s opportunities in life than for policies aim at redistributing outcomes.

Similarly, when the threat to self-esteem has been removed, both dominant and subordinate group members may be able to reduce the temporal distance between the discriminatory events described in the information condition and the present, indicating a perception of privity. As such, I hypothesize:

H3: There will be an information condition x affirmation condition interaction, such that those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will perceive discriminatory events as being closer to the present than those in the control condition, but only when participants have been affirmed. When participants have not been affirmed, no difference between conditions is expected.

Moreover, because system justification beliefs such as belief in social mobility and meritocracy support the existing social structure, I hypothesize:
H4: System justification beliefs will moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, such that among participants with strong beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when not affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show more negative attitudes towards redistributive policies than those in the control condition. In contrast, among participants with weak beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when not affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show equivalent attitudes towards redistributive policies with those in the control condition. Considering the other half of the interaction, among participants with strong beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show equivalent attitudes towards redistributive policies with those in the control condition. In contrast, among those with weak beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show more positive attitudes towards redistributive policies than those in the control condition. The effect size of information condition will be stronger for policies aimed at enhancing one’s opportunities in life than for policies aimed at redistributing outcomes.

H5: System justification beliefs will moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, such that among participants with strong beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when not affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination conditions will demonstrate
more temporal distance between the 1950s and the present than those in the control condition. In contrast, among participants with weak beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when not affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show equivalent temporal distance between the 1950s and the present with those in the control condition. Considering the other half of the interaction, among participants with strong beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and discrimination conditions will show equivalent attitudes towards redistributive policies with those in the control condition. In contrast, among those with weak beliefs in social mobility and meritocracy, when affirmed, those in the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions will show less temporal distance between the 1950s and the present than those in the control condition.

**Method**

**Design**

In order to explore the effect of information on attitudes towards redistributive policies, I manipulated information using three information scenarios. In order to explore the effect of self-esteem threat on attitudes towards redistributive policies, I influenced the response to self-esteem threat utilizing a self-affirmation task. This experiment is a 3 x 2 between-subjects design wherein the first factor of information has three levels (information about intergenerational injustice; information about past discrimination; or a no injustice information control), and the second factor of self-affirmation has two levels (affirmation of the self or no affirmation control). Information was manipulated using an
informational article. Self-affirmation was affected using Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1960) study of values, where individuals in the affirmation condition selected and wrote about a value important to them, and individuals in the no affirmation condition selected and wrote about a value important to others. The dependent variables are awareness of present discrimination operationalized as the temporal distance between past and current discrimination (measured using subjective distance sliders), and attitudes towards redistributive policies. Moderators of the relationships are: belief in social mobility (lower vs. higher); and meritocratic worldview (lower vs. higher). Political conservatism is the covariate.

Participants

Participants were between the ages of 18 – 25, and were recruited from one of three sources: using a participant pool at a mid-sized Canadian university in southern Ontario ($n = 124$); using CrowdFlower, a crowd-sourcing website located in Canada ($n = 121$); or through social media websites such as Kijiji, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn ($n = 202$). Of 447 participants, 67% were female (32% were male, and one individual identified themselves as “other”), and 57% identified themselves as White/European (6.4% as Southeast Asian, 4.6% as Latin American, 3.4% as South Asian, 3.0% as Aboriginal, and 2.3% as Other). Mean age of participants is 21.23 years of age ($SD = 4.08$).

Procedure

The study began with pre-screening questions assessing ethnicity; age; belief in social mobility and perception that meritocracy exists. As I was interested in the intergenerational effects of injustice for Canadians only participants who have identified
themselves as a Canadian citizen were eligible to participate. Additionally, because the manipulation involves information about the 1950s, only participants who are less than 25 years of age were eligible to participate. This is because their grandparents would have grown up in the 1950s and 1960s, leaving them with the ability to perceive how their grandparents’ lives can influence two generations (their parents, and their own).

Participants from the university sample who met the pre-screening criteria were invited to voluntarily participate in an in-laboratory study. Participants from the CrowdFlower and Social Media samples were invited to complete the experiment using an online survey.

In order for participants to be unaware of the manipulation, they were led to believe they were participating in a study about how information presentation affects memory. Participants were informed that they were randomly assigned to one of multiple conditions where information will be presented (e.g., narrative, audio, video, and factoid) and participants were asked to read the information carefully, as they would later be asked questions from memory about the information.

All participants provided informed consent prior to participating in the study by reading and either signing or selecting an agreement button on a consent form. After providing consent, participants were randomly assigned to one of three information conditions: (1) control condition; (2) past discrimination; or (3) intergenerational injustice, and then randomly assigned to one of two affirmation conditions: (1) self-affirmation or (2) no affirmation. After reading the information in the information condition, participants in the self-affirmation condition completed a self-affirmation task,
whereas those in the no affirmation control condition completed a similar filler task that does not affirm the self.

Participants were exposed to one of three randomly assigned passages describing information about the 1950s in Canada. Participants were instructed to read the scenario carefully.

In the control condition participants read a passage describing the 1950s, including information about popular movies, fashion, political movements, and major events. The informational factoids such as “Watching TV was a favourite family pastime, and CBC introduced Hockey Night in Canada in 1952. On Saturday nights, families would gather to watch a broadcast of that week’s NHL game, with enjoyable segments during the intermissions. The original theme song was called “Saturday’s Game” were neutral in tone, and did not contain information about past treatment of groups.

Participants in the past discrimination condition read a passage describing the 1950s in Canada, including information about various forms of discrimination experienced by Canadian citizens. The scenario included informational factoids such as: “Until the late 1960s, women did not have any legal rights. For instance, women were unable to get a divorce if their husbands were abusive. The only reason women were allowed to get a divorce was if the husband cheated”. The goal of these scenarios was to evoke an understanding of how subordinate groups (e.g., Aboriginals, ethnic minorities, homosexuals, elderly, and women) have experienced discrimination.

Participants in the intergenerational injustice condition read both the discrimination condition passages, as well as a passage describing intergenerational discrimination. The scenario included informational factoids such as “Children whose
families were in welfare heard about 600 words an hour, whereas working-class children heard 1,200 words an hour, and children from professional families heard 2,100 words per hour. By age 3, a poor child will have heard 30 million fewer words in the home environment than a child from a professional family. Poor children reflect this gap in language in a lower IQ and poorer performance in school.” The goal of this passage was to evoke an understanding of how past treatment of subordinate groups (e.g., Aboriginals, ethnic minorities, homosexuals, elderly, women, low income households) influences current or future treatment of later generations of group members.

Participants then completed a comprehension check, where they were asked to correctly answer two to four multiple-choice questions about the content of the passage they just read.

Participants across both the affirmation and no-affirmation conditions were asked to select from one of six values. Participants in the affirmation condition selected the most important value to them, wrote about how the value selected was important to them. Participants in the no affirmation condition selected the value least important to them and wrote about how this value may be important to others.

In order to prevent participants from explicitly seeing the link between the passages they just read and the policies they will see, participants were then invited to complete measures for what they believed to be a separate study. Participants were invited to complete a study in collaboration with the Political Science department. Participants were told that due to the 2015 Federal election, researchers were interested in how young Canadians voted, and how they support or oppose the policies proposed by the Liberal, Conservative, Green, and NDP parties. Participants were exposed to 16
randomly ordered policies based off of the true platforms of these parties. Policies fell into three categories: equalization of opportunity, equalization of outcomes, or filler policies. Participants also then completed a measure of political ideology. Lastly, participants then completed a measure of temporal distance.

**Materials/Measures**

**Comprehension Check.**

In order to verify that participants understood the content presented in each of the manipulation passages, a comprehension check was used. In the control information condition, participants had to respond to two questions such as, “After WWII what happened to the Canadian population”? In the past discrimination information condition, participants had to respond to two questions such as, “In the 1950s which group was not allowed to vote in elections”? In the intergenerational injustice information condition, participants had to respond to the same two questions as participants in the past discrimination information condition, as well as two questions pertaining to the intergenerational information such as, “Poor performance in school is not linked to which of the following”? All multiple-choice questions assessing comprehension must be answered correctly in order for participant data to be included in the analyses.

**Covariate.**

**Political ideology.** Political ideology was assessed using Napier and Jost’s (2008) one-item measure of liberal-conservatism. Participants placed themselves on a scale ranging from 1 (strong liberal) to 7 (strong conservative). Previous research shows this item possess good test-retest reliability and strong predictive validity (Jost, 2006).
Moderators.

**Belief in Social Mobility.** Belief in social mobility was assessed using three items from Major et al.’s (2007) Protestant Work Ethic measure, which was originally adopted from Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, and Federico (1998). Items such as “Most people who don’t achieve more than their parents did should not blame the system; they really only have themselves to blame.” are scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Two of items were reverse coded. The mean score indicates the degree of belief in social mobility, such that a high score signals a high belief. Adequate reliability has been demonstrated ($\alpha = .74$; Major, Kaiser, Brien & McCoy, 2007); however, reliability for the current sample was notably low at .29, as well as inter-item correlations, which ranged from -.60 to .49.

**Perception that Meritocracy Exists.** Meritocratic worldview was assessed using 11-items\(^1\) from the Perception that Meritocracy exists scale (Son Hing et al., 2011). Items such as “In organizations, people who do their job well rise to the top” are scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The mean score indicates the degree of meritocratic worldview, such that a high score signals a stronger worldview. Good discriminant validity and adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.76$) have been demonstrated (Zimmerman & Reyna, 2013). Cronbach’s alpha for the current study was .89, demonstrating high reliability.

\(^1\) In following with past research (Son Hing et al., 2011), all reverse coded items from both the PWE measure and the perception that meritocracy exists were not administered due to low overall inter-item correlations.

\(^2\) The results of the main analyses did not replicate if these participants are in included in
**Self-affirmation.**

*Self-affirmation.* Participants in the self-affirmation condition were manipulated using Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1960) study of value, which has been used extensively in self-affirmation research. Participants were provided with a list of six common values, and asked to circle the value that is most important to them, as well as to write a few lines explaining the importance of this value. Having participants think about an especially important personal value produces self-affirmation without affecting state self-esteem (Steele, 1988). Whereas participants in the no affirmation control condition completed the same scale, but instead circled the value that is least important to them, and wrote a few lines explaining the importance of the value to others. By thinking about how the values relate to others, the self is not affirmed. Affirming one’s self identity as opposed to one’s group identity to remove threat was chosen to avoid the potential negative consequences associated with enhancing one’s social identity. Glasford, Dovidio, and Pratto (2009) found that affirming one’s group identity reduced dissonance through out-group derogation (e.g., negative feelings towards outgroup) over activism to change the in-group behaviour (e.g., changing policy). I am interested in removing the threat experienced when exposed to information about past and present discriminatory events either towards one’s in-group, or by one’s in-group towards out-groups. By affirming one’s social identity, members of dominant groups may demonstrate more negative feelings towards the subordinate groups the redistributive policies are aimed to help. Thus by affirming one’s self-identity instead of one’s group identity, attitudes towards redistributive policies is not affected by the out-group derogation resulting from dissonance reduction.
Dependent Variables.

**Temporal Distance.** Examining the degree of distance between past and current discrimination will assess one’s temporal distance of the events presented in the information conditions (1950s) from the current day. Two items adopted from Peetz et al. (2010) were used to assess subjective distance by indicating how far the 1950s felt from the present by placing a mark on a line ranging from *feels very distant* (0) to *feels very recent* (10), and *feels very far from present* (0) to *feels very close to present* (10). The distance of the marks from the zero point (e.g., *feels very distant*) were measured and assigned a numerical value out of 10. The mean of the two scores was taken to indicate the degree of temporal distance. Greater temporal distancing is represented by indicating that the 1950s feels very distant or far from present, whereas lesser temporal distancing is represented by indicating that the 1950s feels very recent or close to the present.

**Support for Social Policies.** Participants indicated their support for various policies, based on platforms for the 2015 Canadian Federal election. These polices are based on real policies proposed for the four major political parties: NPD, Liberal, Conservative, and the Green Party. Participants indicated their degree of agreement or disagreement with each policy on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Participants were exposed to 16 randomly ordered policies based off of the true platforms of these parties. Policies fell into three categories: equalization of opportunity (e.g., *In most provinces, only private kindergartens with yearly tuition offer full-day kindergarten programs. Parents cannot afford these private kindergartens must find alternative arrangements for their children. This new school plan would allow kindergarten aged children to attend free, full-day schooling, which will lead to better*...
performance upon entry to elementary school, as well as better performance in both later school and economically in life); equalization of outcomes (e.g., If everyone pays the same percent of their income on taxes (e.g., 22%) then someone who earns $50,000 pays $11,000 a year in taxes, and someone who earns $90,000 pays $19,800 a year in taxes. With a progressive tax bracket, people who earn more money pay a higher percent of their income on taxes. For example, someone who makes $90,000 a year would fall into the 26% tax bracket and pay $23,400 a year in taxes, leaving them with $66,600 in income), or filler policies (e.g., a government legislation to introduce a new form of police ticketing for possession of small quantities of marijuana). Filler policies were not related to information presented in the informational passages, and were used in order to reduce suspicion and maintain the legitimacy of the cover story of study. Of interest to the current study is the amount of support individuals demonstrates for redistributive social policies aimed at equalizing opportunity and outcomes.

**Results**

**Data Preparation**

A total of 163 participants were removed from the analysis due to failure to pass the comprehension check and/or failure to properly complete the self-affirmation task. Individuals were required to accurately respond to 100% multiple-choice questions about the content of the information they read, and thus was a very stringent comprehension check. For those in the control condition, 15 failed one question and 11 failed two comprehension check questions. For those in the past discrimination condition, 45 failed one question and 12 failed two comprehension check questions. For those in the intergenerational injustice condition, 41 failed one question and 16 failed two
comprehension check questions regarding discrimination and 29 failed one question and 5 failed two comprehension check questions regarding intergenerational processes.²

Participants completed a second comprehension check at the end of the study, which involved correctly responding to a multiple-choice question about the informational passage they read at the beginning of the study. 84% of participants in the control information condition correctly responded to this question (Indicating Canadian History in the 1950s). 82% of participants in the past discrimination information condition correctly responded to this question (Indicating Canadian History in the 1950s, Discrimination in Canada in the 1950s, or both of these options). 60% of participants in the intergenerational injustice information condition correctly responded to this question (Indicating both discrimination in Canada in the 1950s and how people are affected by their parents’ circumstances).

In addition, responses to the self-affirmation task were reviewed to ensure participants followed the instructions to write about a value important to them in the self-affirmation condition, or a value important to others in the no affirmation condition. Individuals who were removed from the analysis may have written about themselves rather than others in the no affirmation condition (N = 31) or have written broadly about society rather than themselves in the self-affirmation condition (N = 5)³. Thus, 263

² The results of the main analyses did not replicate if these participants are in included in the analyses, as none of the main models were significant.

³ The results of the main analyses did replicate if these participants are in included in the analyses. Furthermore, the value participants chose to write about did not moderate the
participants were used in subsequent analyses. Based on a power analysis using a medium effect size ($f^2 = .25$), a sample size of 210 participants (35 per condition) was desired, thus the current sample size met these requirements. Preliminary tests were conducted to ensure that data could be collapsed across samples.

**Plan for Analyses**

In order to test the central hypotheses (H1, H2, H3), that there will be an information x affirmation condition interaction a 3 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA wherein the first factor of information has three levels (information about intergenerational injustice; information about past discrimination; or a no injustice information control), and the second factor of self-affirmation has two levels (affirmation of the self or no affirmation control) was conducted with each of the three dependent variables (attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, and temporal distance). Information condition was coded into two vectors, one of control versus experimental conditions, coded as -2 (control condition), 1 (discrimination condition) and 1 (intergenerational condition), and one of discrimination versus intergenerational condition coded as 0 (control condition) -1 (discrimination condition), 1 (intergenerational condition). Self-affirmation condition was coded as -1 (no affirmation condition) and 1 (affirmation condition).

effects of information condition on either attitudes towards redistributive policies or temporal distancing (all $ps > .05$). See Appendix X – Z for details.
System justification beliefs were assessed using both belief in social mobility and perception that meritocracy exists. In order to test the hypothesis that system justification beliefs will moderate the relationship between the information condition x affirmation condition interaction and attitudes towards redistributive policies (H4), attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies were regressed on information condition, affirmation condition, perception meritocracy exists/belief in social mobility, and the interactions among these variables. The same analyses were conducted for attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies. Social mobility and perception that meritocracy exists were first centered in order to allow for this predictor to be interpreted in the presence of an interaction. Main effects and interaction terms were all entered into the same step of the regression equation. Simple slopes were tested at one standard deviation below and above the mean.

In order to test H3, information condition, and self-affirmation condition were regressed on temporal distancing scores. Main effects and interaction terms were all entered in the same steps of the regression. Simple slopes were tested at one standard deviation below and above the mean. In addition, the interaction between information condition and system justification beliefs was tested by regressing belief in social mobility and perception that meritocracy exists, information condition, affirmation condition, and their interactions, on temporal distancing scores.

**Preliminary Analyses**

**Redistributive policies.** An exploratory factor analysis of the 15 redistributive policies, using varimax rotations was conducted, with the two-factor structure explaining 42% of the variance. The varimax rotation provided the best-defined factor structure.
Twelve policies had primary loadings above .5. The factor-loading matrix for this final solution is presented in Table 1. A parallel analysis confirmed that a factor structure of two factors best fit the data (see Table 2). As anticipated, policies grouped together on two factors: one of opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies (child care centres; access to childcare centres; post-secondary tuition decrease; women in STEM; employment equity; developing executive women; schools in need renovation; and same-sex spousal benefits) and one of outcome based redistributive policies (old age security benefit; affordable housing increase; minimum wage; and progressive taxing). Three policies had high cross-loadings (pay equity, safe drinking water for first nations act, and full day kindergarten programs) and thus were not included in the amalgamated outcome variables. Support for policies was amalgamated into two outcome variables: opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies (Cronbach’s alpha = .86) and outcome based redistributive policies (Cronbach’s alpha = .64). One item (progressive taxing) had a factor loading less than .4; however, removing it did not change the alpha so it was included in the aggregate.

The correlation between opportunity-enhancing and outcome-based redistributive policies was significant in the self-affirmation \( r(261) = .49, p = .01 \), no-self-affirmation conditions \( r(261) = .49, p = .01 \), and across all three information conditions (control condition \( r(261) = .31, p = .01 \); past discrimination condition \( r(261) = .57, p = .01 \); and intergenerational injustice condition \( r(261) = .55, p = .01 \)). There was no significant correlation between either type of redistributive policy and temporal distance, across any condition.
Zero-order correlations between scores for attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, the circles test, the temporal distance measure, political ideology, and perception meritocracy exists were conducted across the three information conditions among participants who were not affirmed (see Table 3) and affirmed (see Table 4). Both measures of temporal distance (circles test and marker) were significantly positively correlated across all six conditions. The two types of redistributive policies were significantly positively correlated across all conditions, except for the control information-no affirmation condition.

Political ideology was significantly negatively correlated with opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies in the discrimination-no affirmation conditions, as well as with outcome-based redistributive policies in the intergenerational injustice information condition, in both the affirmation and no affirmation conditions. It was also significantly negatively correlated with both measures of temporal distance in the intergenerational injustice-affirmation condition, and with the circles test in the intergenerational injustice-no affirmation condition. Perception that meritocracy exists was significantly positively related to political ideology in both the control and intergenerational injustice information conditions among participants who were affirmed.

**Social mobility.** A reliability analysis for the current sample demonstrated that the scale had reliability that was notably low with a Cronbach’s alpha of .29, as well as
inter-item correlations, which ranged from -.60 to .49. As such, analyses involving the social mobility scale were not included in the main analyses\(^4\).

**Main Analyses**

**Opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies.** The overall model was significant, \(F(6, 255) = 9.32, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = .18\), see Table 5. There was a significant main effect of the information condition on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies \(F(2, 255) = 5.08, p < 0.05, \eta^2 = .04\). Bonferroni tests revealed non-significant differences between the discrimination information condition and both the control, \(p = .162, d = -0.25\), and intergenerational injustice \(p = .714, d = .15\), information conditions. There was a significant difference between the intergenerational injustice condition and the control condition, \(p = .005, d = -0.40\), contrary to H1. There was also a significant main effect of political ideology on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies \(F(1, 255) = 44.35, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = .15\). No other effects were significant.

**Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies: meritocracy beliefs as moderator.** The overall model including perception meritocracy exists was not significant: attitudes towards opportunity enhancing policies, \(F(11, 232) = 1.72, p > .05\); attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, \(F(11, 232) = 1.04, p > .05\), and temporal distance, \(F(11, 224) = 1.01, p > .05\). See Appendix AN – AP.

---

\(^4\) For the interested reader a single item best representing the construct determined by face validity was used (*Most people who don’t achieve more than their parents did should not blame the system; they really only have themselves to blame*). None of the models were significant: attitudes towards opportunity enhancing policies, \(F(11, 232) = 1.72, p > .05\); attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, \(F(11, 232) = 1.04, p > .05\), and temporal distance, \(F(11, 224) = 1.01, p > .05\). See Appendix AN – AP.
significant, $F(11, 235) = 1.10, R^2 = .05, p = .36, 95\% \text{ CI} [.00, .07]$ (Table 6). There was no main effect of system justification beliefs on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, nor did system justification beliefs moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, contrary to H4.

**Outcome-based redistributive policies.** The overall model was significant, $F(6, 255) = 4.26, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = .09$, see Table 7. There was a significant main effect of political ideology on attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies $F(1, 255) = 19.18, p < 0.01, \eta^2 = .07$. No other effects were significant.

**Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies: meritocracy beliefs as moderator.** The overall including perception meritocracy exists was not significant, $F(11, 235) = 1.50, R^2 = .07, p = .13, 95\% \text{ CI} [0, .10]$ (Table 8). There was no main effect of system justification beliefs on attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, nor did system justification beliefs moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, contrary to H4.

**Temporal distance.**

The overall model was not significant, $F(6, 249) = .20, p > 0.05, \eta^2 = .01$, see Table 9, demonstrating no support for H3. No other effects were significant.

**Temporal distance: meritocracy beliefs as moderator.** The overall model including perception meritocracy exists $F(11, 227) = 1.34, R^2 = .06, p > .05, 95\% \text{ CI} [.00, .08]$ (Table 10), was not significant. There was no main effect of system justification beliefs on temporal distancing, nor did system justification beliefs moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, contrary to H5.
Exploratory Analyses: Political Conservatism as a Moderator

Political ideology was included in this study with the intention of using it as a covariate; however, unexpectedly, exploratory analyses revealed that political conservatism interacted with information condition, and with self-affirmation condition. As such, exploratory regression analyses were conducted with political conservatism and its interaction terms in multiple regression analyses.

In order to test the central hypothesis (H2), attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies was regressed on political ideology, information condition, affirmation condition, and all 2-way and 3-way interactions among these variables. Similarly, attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies were regressed on political ideology, information condition, affirmation condition, and all 2-way and 3-way interactions among these variables. Political ideology was first centered in order to allow this predictor to be interpreted in the presence of an interaction. Main effects and the interaction terms were all entered into the same step of the regression equation. Simple slopes were tested at one standard deviation below and above the mean.

Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies. The overall model for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies with political ideology as a factor was significant, $F(11, 248) = 6.72, p < .001, R^2 = .23, 95\% \text{ CI } [.11, .28]$ (Table 11). In addition, there was a main effect of information condition, such that the experimental conditions (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) were related to more negative attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies than the control condition ($B = -.09, SE B = 0.04, SR^2 = .020, p = .01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.16, -.02]$). This is contrary to H1, which predicted no effect of information condition on support for policies. There was a
main effect of political conservatism \( (B = -.24, SE B= 0.04, SR^2 = .099, p < .001, 95\% CI [-.33, -.16]) \), in that those who were more politically conservative show less positive attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies.

There was a significant interaction between self-affirmation condition and information condition (discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice) \( (B = .14, SE B = 0.06, SR^2 = .015, p = .03, 95\% CI [.01, .26]) \), supporting H2 (see Figure 1). Simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity enhancing programs did not significantly differ in the intergenerational injustice information condition and in the past discrimination information condition, \( B = -.093, SE B = .063, p = .14, 95\% CI [-.03, .22] \), because they were consistently favourable. However, among those who were not self-affirmed, participants’ attitudes towards opportunity enhancing redistributive policies depended on information condition, \( (B = .36, SE B = 0.14, SR^2 = .020, p = .01, 95\% CI [.08, .64]) \): those in the intergenerational injustice information condition were less favourable than those in the past discrimination condition. Thus, bolstering individuals’ self-identity removed the threat inherent in the information presented.

There is an interaction between political conservatism and self-affirmation condition \( (B = -.08, SE = 0.04, SR^2 = .08, p = .04, 95\% CI [-.16, -.02]) \), see Figure 2. Simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, those who were higher in political conservatism were less supportive of opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies \( (B = -.39, SE B = 0.90, SR^2 = .058, p < .001, 95\% CI [-.57, -.22]) \). Furthermore, among participants who were self-affirmed, those higher in political conservatism also were less supportive of opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies
(B = -0.26, SE B = 0.04, SR² = -0.137, p < .001, 95% CI [-.33, -.18]). The effects of political conservatism were 2.36 times greater in the self-affirmation condition than in the no self-affirmation condition. Thus, there is a differential strength of affirmation for individuals with more politically conservative views than for individuals with more politically liberal views.

In addition, there is an interaction between political conservatism and the experimental vs. control information conditions (B = -0.06, SE = 0.03, SR² = .06, p = .03, 95% CI [-.11, -.05]), (see Figure 3). Simple effects tests revealed that, for those lower in political conservatism, information condition had no significant effect on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing policies between the control and experimental conditions, (B = -0.00, SE B = 0.05, p = .93, 95% CI [-.10, .10]), because they were consistently favourable. In contrast, among those higher in political conservatism, the exposure to the experimental information conditions (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) resulted in more negative attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, compared with the control condition (B = -0.16, SE = 0.05, SR² = .033, p < .001, 95% CI [-.26, -.07]). Thus, individuals lower in political conservatism have consistently favourable attitudes towards redistributive policies, whereas individuals higher in political conservatism were influenced by information about past and intergenerational injustice.

**Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies.** The overall model for outcome-based redistributive policies was significant, F(11, 248) = 3.78, p < .001, R² = .14, 95% CI [.03, .18] (Table 12). Contrary to the results for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, there were no significant main or interactive effects of information condition predicting attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies. Thus,
information condition was not related to attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, (H1), nor did it interact with self-affirmation condition (H2).

There was a main effect of political conservatism \((B = -.26, SE B = 0.06, SR^2 = .069, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.37, -.15])\), in that those who were more politically conservative show more negative attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies.

Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between political conservatism and self-affirmation condition \((B = -.11, SE B = 0.05, SR^2 = .016, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.22, -.01])\) (see Figure 4). Simple effects test revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, those who were higher in political conservatism were less supportive of outcome-based redistributive policies, \((B = -.49, SE B = .12, SR^2 = .056, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.73, -.25])\). Furthermore, among participants who were self-affirmed, those higher in political conservatism were also less supportive of outcome-based redistributive policies \((B = -.26, SE B = .05, SR^2 = .088, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.36, -.16])\). The effects of political conservatism were 1.57 times greater in the self-affirmation condition than in the no self-affirmation condition. Thus, there is a differential strength of affirmation for individuals with more politically conservative views than for individuals with more politically liberal views.

**Temporal distance.** Due to the strong effects of political ideology on attitudes towards both opportunity-enhancing and outcome-based redistributive policies, the one-item liberal-conservative political ideology measure was included in the regression for temporal distance. The overall model was not significant, \(F(11, 242) = 1.37, R^2 = .06, p > .05, 95\% \text{ CI } [.00, .08]\), see Table 13. There was no effect of information condition, or
self-affirmation condition, or an interaction between these two on participant’s temporal distance of discriminatory events, contrary to H3.

**Discussion**

Scholars across a variety of disciplines have sought to understand why inequality is perpetuated across generations (Black & Devereux, 2010; Brunori, et al., 2013; Denenberg & Rosenberg, 1967; Knudsen et al., 2006; Merton, 1988). One common theme among these theories is that of cumulative advantage/disadvantage. Despite that a majority of individuals desire a society with less inequality (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Norton & Ariely, 2011); researchers agree that both dominant and subordinate groups take steps to deny that discrimination exists (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Dresler-Hawke, 2005; Major & O’Brien, 2005; Pennebaker, et al, 1997; Sahdra & Ross, 2007). This denial combined with the widely held sentiment that subordinate groups are afforded the same opportunities as dominant groups has more recently been proposed as a contributing factor to the growing divide between the have nots (Chambers et al., 2015). When individuals are unable to perceive the intergenerational effects of discrimination, they are unable to take steps to reduce this divide. In the current study, I explored factors preventing people from perceiving the intergenerational effects of discrimination by informing them about these effects, and by removing the threat experienced when exposed to information about discrimination. I also included system justification beliefs and political ideology as individual difference variables with the potential to influence these perceptions.

The results of the current study provided some support for the idea that information about both past and intergenerational injustice is threatening (H1). More
specifically, while there was no significant main effect of information condition on attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, main analyses revealed that information about both intergenerational injustice and past discrimination was found to lead to more negative attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies than neutral information, or only information about past discrimination. Exploratory analyses demonstrated a significant negative relation between information condition (control vs. experimental conditions) and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies. The latter finding is consistent with theory suggesting that exposure to information about how one’s in-group experiences or commits acts of discrimination can threaten one’s sense of self (Knowles et al., 2014; Wicklund & Brehm, 1976). Cognitive dissonance can cause individuals to choose not to acknowledge discrimination, and thus choose not to support redistributive actions to mitigate the effects of this discrimination (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1990; Tice, 1991). Overall, these findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating that information about discrimination is perceived as threatening (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1990; Tice, 1991).

However, the current study did provide some support for the idea that bolstering one’s self-identity after exposing them to information about both past and intergenerational injustice can remove this threat and lead to more positive attitudes towards redistributive policies (H2). Although the main analyses did not reveal any significant interaction between information and affirmation conditions, exploratory analyses demonstrated a significant interaction between information condition (discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice) and affirmation condition: among
individuals who were not self-affirmed, there was a significant negative relationship between information condition and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies: individuals who read information about both past and intergenerational injustice had more negative attitudes towards these policies than individuals who read only information about past discrimination (see Figure 1).

In contrast, among individuals who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity-enhancing policies did not significantly differ between the intergenerational injustice and past discrimination information conditions because they were consistently favourable (see Figure 1). These findings are consistent with past findings that presenting individuals with information about past discrimination is threatening to one’s self (Branscombe, et al, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O’Brien, 2005) and can lead to denial of discrimination, and thus leads to more negative attitudes towards redistributive actions. However, removing the threat to one’s self through the bolstering of identity can lead to more positive attitudes towards redistributive actions (Knowles et al., 2014; Swim & Miller, 1999). Overall, these exploratory findings are consistent with previous research that self-esteem threats can drive collective social change following a bolstering of one’s identity (Branscombe & Wann 1994; Turner et al. 1984).

Interestingly, these effects were only present for opportunity-enhancing and not for outcome-based redistributive policies. While there was no significant effect of information condition, there was a significant negative relation between self-affirmation condition and attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies suggesting that bolstering one’s identity led to more negative attitudes towards these policies. The null effects of information condition suggest that the information presented may have not
been perceived as related to the outcome-based redistributive policies presented. Because this information did not clearly map onto the policies presented (e.g., how not eating together as a family is related to an affordable housing increase), it was not perceived as relevant. Irrelevant information would not be perceived as threatening to one’s self or as persuasive in changing policy attitudes. Because this information was not persuasive, bolstering one’s identity led to stronger, more negative, attitudes towards redistributive policies. Overall, these finding are consistent with research that bolstering one’s identity can polarize views in the absence of a persuasive or threatening message (van Proojen, Sparks, & Jessop, 2012).

The current study found no support for an effect of information condition, self-affirmation condition, or an interaction between these two on participant’s temporal distances of discriminatory events (H3). Overall, the information presented to participants was unable to aid participants in seeing how past events can affect one’s current life circumstances, and bolstering one’s identity also was unable to aid participants in viewing discriminatory events as being closer in time. However, presenting individuals with lower beliefs in meritocracy information about the institutional factors contributing to the inequality between dominant and subordinate groups is concrete and thus more temporally proximal (Agerstrom & Bkorklunch, 2009; Kyung et al., 2010), whereas individuals with a higher belief in meritocracy consistently viewed discriminatory events as temporally distal (H5). These findings are consistent with theory purporting that individuals with higher beliefs in meritocracy endorse these beliefs in order to view themselves as possessing the necessary merit to maintain their social position and deny that any undeserved inequality exists (Knowledge & Lowery, 2012), and that this
information is threatening to the current collective self because it contains information about in-group historic injustices individuals temporally distance these discriminatory events (Peetz et al. 2010).

While these findings do not support the hypothesized interaction, they are consistent with theories of temporal distance: the information presented in the experimental conditions (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) contained information about failure (Ross & Wilson, 2002), and that are negative in valence (Gebauer, et al., 2015). Additionally, the events described laws which are no longer in place, they can be perceived as easy to forgive, and thus as irrelevant and temporally distant (Wohl & McGrath, 2007). The irrelevance of the information provided may explain why there was no threat to the self: with no need to maintain one’s self-integrity due to threat there is no effect of affirmation condition (Steele, 1988).

The current study found no support for an effect of system justification beliefs on attitudes towards either opportunity-enhancing or outcome-based redistributive policies (H4). This finding is consistent with previous findings that individuals with high system justification beliefs (e.g., meritocracy) do not support redistributive programs aimed at helping subordinate groups, as they do not believe the disadvantaged need assistance (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Norton & Ariely, 2011). The current study was only able to examine the effects of meritocracy beliefs due to the poor psychometric properties of the social mobility scale used. Because belief in social mobility is highly related to redistributive policy support (Benabou & Ok, 2001), the full extent of the relationship between system justification beliefs and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing and
outcome-based redistributive policies could not be accurately explored in the current study.

Unexpectedly, political ideology, more specifically political conservatism, played a strong influential role in attitudes towards redistributive policies, but not towards temporal distance. Initially intended to be included as a covariate, liberal-conservatism was included in the study to account for variance; however, preliminary analyses indicated it had a strong main effect on both types of redistributive policy attitudes. Following with previous research that liberals are more willing to support government spending on redistributive programs for minority groups, and that conservatives view redistributive programs as harming to themselves, and to their future offspring (Jacoby, 2000; Rudolph & Evans, 2005), results of the current study demonstrated how individuals higher in conservatism demonstrated more negative attitudes towards both types of redistributive policies (see Table 3 and 4). Results demonstrated how bolstering self-esteem has a differential strength on individuals who are already supportive of these policies: individuals who are less politically conservative and affirmed demonstrated the highest degree of support for opportunity-enhancing policies (see Figures 2 and 4). Thus providing individuals who are already in favour of policies an opportunity to bolster their self-identity can lead to greater policy support.

There was also a significant interaction between political ideology and information condition (control vs. experimental). More specifically, individuals who were lower in political conservatism demonstrated equally positive attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, whereas individuals who were higher in political conservatism demonstrated more negative attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing
redistributive policies in the experimental information conditions than in the control conditions. This is consistent with findings that liberals are more willing to support government spending on redistributive programs for minority groups, (Jacoby, 2000; Rudolph & Evans, 2005), and thus do not require information about the effects of discrimination on minority groups. In contrast, because conservatives incorrectly believe that supporting redistributive policies will harm rather than help future generations (Benabou & Ok, 2001), presenting them information about how the circumstances of minority groups in the past are worse than those today may further bolster these beliefs.

A supplemental analysis revealed that one’s group status might play a role in perception of privity. While ethnicity had no effect on one’s temporal distance or attitudes towards redistributive policies, there was a significant main effect of gender on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies. Females demonstrated more positive attitudes towards these policies, whereas males’ attitudes were influenced by the information and affirmation conditions. These former is consistent with previous research that females more than males support redistributive policies for the disadvantaged (Norrander, 2008).

For males, results demonstrated a significant interaction between information and affirmation condition. More specifically, among males who were not affirmed, there was a significant positive relationship between information condition and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing policies: those in the experimental information conditions demonstrated more positive attitudes than those in the control condition. In contrast, among males who were self-affirmed, there was a significant negative relationship between information condition and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing
redistributive policies: those in the experimental conditions demonstrated more negative attitudes than those in the control condition. This pattern of results is consistent with past affirmation findings that individuals may employ two forms of dissonance reduction: one of activism to change the in-group behavior when one does not experience affirmation, and one of out-group derogation following group affirmation (Glasford et al., 2009).

**Theoretical Contributions**

Subtle forms of discrimination are still prevalent in today’s society (e.g., gender wage gap). Failure to perceive these forms of subtle discrimination enhances the view that discrimination has been solved, and that the field is leveled (Offermann, Basford, Graebner, Jaffer, De Graaf, & Kaminsky, 2014). Members of subordinate groups are experiencing the on-going effects discrimination, as such, further consideration of race, gender, or other domains of potential discrimination is required. If disadvantaged groups fail to acknowledge the effect of past injustices on their current social state, they will be more likely to accept their disadvantaged status, due to the belief that this status was achieved by merit rather than by environmental or systemic factors. In failing to acknowledge and instead accepting their disadvantaged status, women will be less likely to take any action against it, thereby maintain status quo (Crosby, 1984). Additionally, dominant groups must recognize the role they play in perpetuating inequalities. Because these groups possess the power to push redistributive policies forward, thus leading to social change, an understanding of the factors that might encourage perception of privity is critical.

By developing a theoretically rigorous framework of privity, the present research makes several important contributions to research on discrimination, both
intergenerationally and within policy research. First, by integrating theories of cumulative advantage/disadvantage from sociology, psychology, economics, and epigenetics, I suggested how past subordination of groups may perpetuate the divide between the haves and the have nots in today’s society. This is important because there is considerable research about the effects of cumulative advantage/disadvantage across these areas of study, but there has yet to be an integrated theory of how all of these factors come together to influence one’s life chances. The current study sought to integrate economic theories of optimal investment in human capital with psychological theories of cumulative advantage/disadvantage, and with epigenetics theories of soft inheritance to present a concise view of how one’s future life chances are predicted by the investment one’s parents are able to make into one’s human capital, including the environment in which one grows up. In turn, the environment in which one grows up affects not only the individuals exposed to that environment, but also their future offspring, perpetuating a cycle of inequality. This framework of cumulative advantage/disadvantage drove the exploration of understanding perceptions of privity.

Second, following the development of an integrated framework of cumulative advantage/disadvantage, the exploration of factors preventing the perception of privity was possible. Drawing on past research, the current study expanded on the well-developed area of denial of disadvantage by exploring perceptions of privity rather than perceptions of discrimination. Because theories of cumulative advantage/disadvantage emphasize the cycle of the effects of discrimination, it is now important to explore why individuals are unable to see the overlap between past discrimination and current
treatment of subordinate groups. As such, the current study examined three commonly cited factors: information, self-esteem threat, and system justification beliefs.

An important contribution of the current study was the examination of types of information presented to individuals to draw out the perception of privity. Where previous research has presented information about past mistreatment of groups (e.g., Crosby 1984; Peetz et al., 2010), the current study goes beyond this to also include information about the intergenerational effects of discrimination to more explicitly draw the link between past and current mistreatment of subordinate groups.

Results demonstrated how presenting information about past discrimination was perceived as threatening; however, including information about the intergenerational effects of discrimination led to prosocial action when paired with a bolstering of self-identity. This is an important theoretical contribution to the area of understanding privity and the denial of discrimination, in that expecting individuals to make the cognitively complex connection between past and current mistreatment is too taxing, and that the link must be more explicitly provided to them to reduce the denial. Moreover, removing the threat associated with exposure to information about discrimination increased the effectiveness of the intergenerational information. Replicating past research, affirming one’s self-identity removes threat and increases one’s ability to take action to reduce discrimination (Crocker & Major, 1989).

Removing threat through the bolstering of identity had differential effects for dominant and subordinate group members. Bolstering the identity of males led to less prosocial behaviours. Perhaps due to the collective guilt experienced after being reminded of the injustices males committed against other subordinate groups, males
chose to employ defensive strategies by denying past injustices, or employed dissonance reduction strategies that involved out-group derogation. Thus, because their place in society was threatened, males were opposed to taking actions to redress the imbalance between their dominant group and subordinate groups. Further evidence for this is provided as males whose self-identities were not bolstered demonstrated pro-social behaviours through more positive attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies. In contrast, females demonstrated consistently positive attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, regardless of identity bolstering. Perhaps females sought to reap the benefits associated with acknowledging privity (e.g., accepting special compensation due to group membership) instead of maintaining their status quo.

The present research also makes a strong contribution to the research in that it provides a perspective on the types of individuals who are susceptible to influence by information in the presence and absence of affirmation. Because liberals already demonstrate strong support for redistributive policies, affirmation and information did not have any effects on attitude towards redistributive policies. However, because liberals fundamentally support redistributive policies, bolstering one’s identity may have increased their support for these policies, replicating past research that self-affirmation can polarize worldview orientations (van Proojen, et al., 2012). Interestingly, presenting conservatives with information about discrimination also made their attitude towards redistributive policies more negative, perhaps through a similar mechanism of validating one’s initial worldviews.

While it is unfortunate that the current study was unable to fully explore the effects of individual worldviews, it did highlight how individuals who hold a lower
perception that meritocracy exists can be influenced to perceive past discriminatory events to be closer to the present than those who hold a higher perception that meritocracy exists. Because these individuals do not believe that their outcomes are a function of personal control, they are able to understand how prejudice against one’s group is unjustified. Exposing these individuals to information that rewards are afforded to groups based on cumulative advantage allows them to question the system, thus supporting the understanding of how past mistreatment of subordinate groups still plays a role in their current life chances. Individuals lower in perception that meritocracy exists take into account institutional factors preventing this social value from being properly allocated, and thus are more open to perceiving how cumulative advantage/disadvantage perpetuates inequality.

An integrated theory of cumulative advantage/disadvantage to explore factors preventing the perception of privity is essential for further our understanding of inequality. While other areas of research are independently exploring cumulative advantage/disadvantage, they are doing so without an overarching understanding of the phenomenon. By exploring inequality across a broad definition of subordinate groups, as well as in various environments, the current study presents a significant contribution to the field as it enables researchers to take a small step towards further exploration of the perpetuation of inequality.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The current study possesses a number of strengths that make it a valuable contribution to the area of research. One strength of the current study is that I tested for the effects of multiple forms of information on both attitudes towards redistributive
policies, and temporal distance. By including information about discrimination, as well as information about the intergenerational effects of discrimination, more insight into what types of information aid individuals in perceiving privity was gained. This suggests that this information may be causing dissonance in individuals because it is informing individuals that their place in the world may not be a result of hard work, and instead may be due to group membership.

The inclusion of multiple outcome variables enabled the examination of how different types of information can affect both policy attitudes, as well as temporal distancing. By measuring temporal distance, the current study was able to explore whether or not individuals viewed the information presented as relevant, or close to them. By understanding if individuals viewed the discriminatory events as relevant or close to them, insight into the effectiveness of information to alter individuals’ perception of discrimination was gained. Information about what types of events influence individuals’ perceptions, as well as how far away in time events need to have occurred to be relevant to individuals was gained. The null results indicate that the information presented may have been too distant or irrelevant to influence individuals’ temporal distancing. Because this information was irrelevant to these individuals, it was not able to influence their temporal distance of the events described. As a result, this information was not suitable for aiding individuals in perceiving privity. Additionally, by measuring attitudes towards redistributive policies, the current study was able to build on the current body of research that explores pro-social movement as an indicator of acknowledgement of discrimination (e.g., Brown, González, Zagefka, Manzi, & Čehajić, 2008; Harvey & Oswald, 2000; Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003).
Another key strength of the current study was the inclusion of individual
difference variables to explore how different people respond to privity. The inclusion of
political ideology was a key contributor to the findings of the study, as well as
interpretation of the results. Liberals demonstrate consistent positive attitudes towards
redistributive policies, indicating that this group may understand the intergenerational
nature of discrimination more than conservatives, or that this group may naturally desire
less inequality. In contrast, conservatives demonstrated consistently negative attitudes
towards redistributive policies, and exposure to information about discrimination as well
as self-affirmation increased the negative attitudes even more, due to their desire for more
societal inequality.

Furthermore, data were collected from a diverse sample of participants,
representing different ethnic, socioeconomic, and political groups. As such, results of the
study are generalizable across a wider population. Furthermore, a range of redistributive
policies, encompassing various minority groups (e.g., elderly, Aboriginals, women,
homosexuals, ethnic minorities, low SES), as well as various environments (e.g.,
workplace, school, child care, housing) was used to ensure that results could be
generalized to a broad range of subordinate groups and environments. Moreover, because
these policies were drawn from the 2015 Canadian Federal Election, these policies should
have been familiar to participants at the time of the study and may have held more
relevance to participants, enhancing external validity.

Although the current study possesses a number of strengths, it is not without
limitation. 95% confidence intervals were included to explore whether the sample used
produces a confidence interval that represents a range of potential population parameters
(effect sizes) that could have produced the sample parameter (effect size). While all confidence intervals for significant effect sizes did not zero, indicating that the potential population parameter could have produced the sample parameter, the range of the interval that falls in the expected direction varies. Some confidence intervals had great range, indicating that there are a number of potential population parameters that could have produced the sample parameter. As such, interpretation of these results should be done with caution.

A major theoretical basis of the current study is that of cumulative advantage/disadvantage. While all subordinate groups experience cumulative disadvantage, it affects some more directly than others. For example, socioeconomic status is more directly tied to the disadvantage of racial minority groups than gender minority groups, as is evidenced by the perpetual divide between African American and White neighbourhoods, and the opportunities offered in each (Shuey & Wilson, 2008). However, gendered subordinate groups also experience a disadvantage tied to SES, in that women are paid less than men, and also not afforded the same opportunities for advancement in their careers. This leads to less advantage for women in terms of income, as well as in terms of opportunities to pass on to their offspring. While the results are generalizable across a range of policies, it does not tease apart the specific ties between the information presented and each individual policy. Because a range of information was presented to match a range of policies, no specific conclusions can be drawn about which pieces of information had the most influence on policy attitudes.

The inclusion of system justification beliefs also led to interesting findings, in that individuals low in the belief that meritocracy exists lessened the temporal distance
between discriminatory events and the present following exposure to information about
intergenerational injustices. However, one limitation of the current study stems from the
low Cronbach’s alpha associated with the belief in social mobility scale. The current
study used three items from Major et al.’s (2007) protestant work ethic measure, which
had been used on an undergraduate student population, and thus was similar in length to
the original scale and was administered to a similar population. Major et al. (2007)
combined their protestant work ethic measure with a measure of belief in individual
mobility as a result of a factor analysis demonstrating that these two constructs loaded
onto a single factor. Perhaps the inability of this social mobility measure to act as a
reliable measure of this construct was due to criterion deficiency, in that this scale was
not adequately tapping into the construct. As such, results of this study lack the inclusion
of an important construct. With a more reliable measure, the perhaps the effects of social
mobility could be explored. Future research should seek to explore how information and
self-affirmation affect individuals with varying belief in social mobility.

Given the nature of the information manipulation used (factoids read by
participants), a comprehension check was used to ensure participants paid attention to
and absorbed the information presented in the information manipulations. A stringent cut-
off criterion for including participants in the study was used: participants must have
answered all comprehension check questions correctly to be included in the study.
Questions were designed to be difficult to answer correctly, unless participants properly
read and understood the material presented. This was to ensure participants understood
the information presented to them. There was a high failure rate for questions regarding
the past discrimination information, thus suggesting that the questions for this
information may have been too difficult, or that the questions across the other two information conditions may have been too easy to respond to. As a result, the manipulations used may have produced differential levels of understanding across each information condition. Future research should consider pilot testing information manipulations to ensure comparable fail rates across information conditions.

Due to the use of a widely cited self-affirmation task, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1960) the study of values, a measure of self-esteem to validate the effectiveness of the task was not included. As the study has demonstrated the robust ability to bolster self-identity (Fein & Spencer, 1997; Liu & Steele, 1986), and thus increase self-esteem, the inclusion of a manipulation check was deemed unnecessary. Retrospectively, the inclusion of a self-esteem measure to validate the efficacy of the self-affirmation task would have provided insight into the effectiveness of this task, within the context of this study, as well as its ability to interact with specific individual difference variables. Future research should consider an affirmation check to examine the influence of affirmation across individual difference variables (e.g., political ideology).

Lastly, given that I relied on self-report questionnaires, it is possible that participants may have deliberately altered their responses to create a positive image. For instance, people may have inflated their support for redistributive policies to create a positive image. Future research should investigate the effects of impression management. However, given the main effects of political ideology, as well as the strong correlation between policies aligning with political interests, impression management is not of great concern.
Practical Applications

Society at large is motivated to avoid the unnecessary subordination of groups as a result of misunderstood systemic factors. Research suggests that individuals do not support redistributive policies because they believe they are in direct conflict with their personal abilities to move up the social hierarchy (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Norton & Ariely, 2011), as well as prevent future generations from achieving more than the previous generations (Benabou & Ok, 2001). Organizations are motivated to avoid lawsuits, negative reputations, and the mistreatment of their employees that stem from systemic barriers to equal opportunities for their employees such as biases in hiring, promotion, and benefits policies. Thus, there is a need for a solution on how to align objectives to reduce inequality with the education that redistributive programs will not harm current or future life chances. The present research provides policy makers a way in which to present their policies, as well as influencers a way to educate others: policies that are perceived as non-threatening and that include information about how the policies can influence subsequent generations may help policy makers garner more support. By presenting programs aimed at mentoring women into upper management positions in a way that demonstrates organizational success for all members both in the present and in years to come, organizations can take steps to decrease the glass ceiling.

It also provides specific strategies for presenting information to certain groups of individuals. For example, because conservatives are fundamentally opposed to government spending on redistributive resources due to the threat to social mobility (Benabou & Ok, 2001), influencers must present the information in such a way that enables these individuals to understand that social mobility will not be threatened, but
instead, enhanced for subordinate groups without the removal of opportunity for dominant groups. Moreover, because males may perceive redistributive policies as a means to take away the benefits they have undeservingly gained, bolstering males’ before informing them of the injustices their group have committed causes an averse and defensive reaction. However, presenting males with information about their dominant groups’ past injustices without bolstering their identity leads to more positive attitudes towards redistributive policies.

In contrast, certain groups of individuals demonstrate a natural support for redistribution, thus bolstering of identity and/or the presentation of intergenerational injustice information do not play a large effect in female and liberals’ support of redistributive policies. As such, policy makers and influencers should be strategic in their employment of redistributive policy buy-in strategies. Given the prevalence and negative impact of inequality in both society and across organizations, policy makers and influencers alike could benefit from the use of the strategies employed in the current study to increase perceptions of privity and the associated support for redistributive policies.

**Future Directions**

Given the potential of inequality to continue to perpetuate the divide between the haves and the have nots, researchers may want to investigate the extent to which perception of privity leads to the reduction in inequality through the support of redistributive actions. At the same time, it is also pertinent that researchers explore specific factors associated with perceiving privity conceptually. While the current study identified that information about the intergenerational effects of discrimination enabled
an increased perception of privity through redistributive policy support, it did not tease apart which specific pieces of information were tied to specific redistributive policies. Researchers could investigate which pieces of information are tied to each type of redistributive policy. For example, exploring whether information about gender inequality is specifically tied to supporting gender-focused redistributive policies. It is also possible that individuals are more influenced by information pertinent to their own experience of discrimination, and thus information should be tailored to one’s group status. This would enable policy makers and influencers to gain a better understanding of how to garner support for redistributive actions.

Another direction for future research is to study privity conceptually. While the current study took steps to conceptually view privity using temporal distance, results were inconclusive. Future research could explore how privity operates using more specific examples of intergenerational injustice to seek to understand what types of information allow individuals to move past discrimination more temporally close. This suggests individuals are able to understand the intergenerational effects of discrimination. For example, by expanding on past research (e.g., Peetz et al., 2010) exploring larger events of injustice compared, such as genocides, with an accumulation of smaller events of injustice, such as day-to-day prejudice faced by ethnic minorities. This would allow for the understanding of how large of an event of discrimination is necessary to enact change in individuals’ perception of privity.

While the current study employed a self-affirmation task to bolster personal identity, another way to bolster identity is through bolstering one’s group identity. While this has been shown to have negative repercussions (e.g., out-group derogation; Glasford,
Dovidio, and Pratto (2009)), bolstering group identity allows individuals to reduce cognitive dissonance using a variety of strategies. Following from the current study’s findings that males with a bolstered identity are less supportive of redistributive policies, future research could explore how bolstering group identity interacts with the presentation of information about both past and intergenerational injustice. This would allow for the understanding of how information can influence different groups, especially groups with a strong group identity. These results could help influence extreme groups or individuals with strong beliefs to recognize the inequality they may be perpetuating.

Conclusion

I developed an integrated framework of cumulative advantage/disadvantage based on concepts from sociology, psychology, economics, and epigenetics to explore factors preventing the perception of privity. The results of this research are important in that they enable researchers to build on the strategies used to enable the perception of privity to further explore why individuals struggle with seeing the connection between past and present discrimination. I demonstrated that presenting information about intergenerational discrimination has an effect on understanding the effects of discrimination, by demonstrating how individuals are more willing to support redistributive policies. I also added to a growing body of evidence that removing threat to one’s self through bolstering one’s identity allows one to process information about discrimination and be open to perceiving privity. Lastly, I provided evidence that the ability for information and self-affirmation to affect the perception of privity depends on individual differences such as political ideology and perception that meritocracy exists. Overall, I anticipate the use of intergenerational injustice information paired with self-
affirmation as a strategy that will enable researchers to acquire a better and more accurate understanding of perceptions of inequality.
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Table 1

*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis With Varimax Rotation for 15 Redistributive Policies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistributive Policy</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centres</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Child Care</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary Tuition Decrease</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in STEM</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity Act</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Executive Women</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Schools in Need” Renovations</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Equity</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water for First Nations Act</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex Spousal Benefits</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day Kindergarten Program</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Security Benefit</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Increase</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Wage</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Tax</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Total N = 429.
Table 2

*Parallel Analysis for 15 Redistributive Policies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Raw Data Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Raw Data Means</th>
<th>Percentile Random Data Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Ncases = 429, Ndatasets = 1000.
Table 3

**Correlations Between Dependent Variables and Moderators (No Affirmation).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Information Condition</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Discrimination Information Condition</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergenerational Injustice Information Condition</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. OB = Attitudes Towards Outcome-based Redistributive Policies, OE = Attitudes Towards Opportunity-Enhancing Redistributive Policies, CT = Circles Test, TD = Temporal Distance Measure, PI = Political Ideology, and PME = Perception Meritocracy Exists.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
Table 4

Correlations Between Dependent Variables and Moderators (Affirmation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Information</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past Discrimination Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intergenerational Injustice Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OB = Attitudes Towards Outcome-based Redistributive Policies, OE = Attitudes Towards Opportunity-Enhancing Redistributive Policies, CT = Circles Test, TD = Temporal Distance Measure, PI = Political Ideology, and PME = Perception Meritocracy Exists.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 5

*Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) Between Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Opportunity-Enhancing Redistributive Policy Support with Political Ideology as a Covariate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.35</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information *Affirmation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15, .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11, .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20, .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07, .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18, .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21, .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16, .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03, .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17, .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16, .13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 247$, $R^2 = .05$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p = .00$. 
Table 7

*Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) Between Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Outcome-Based Redistributive Policy Support with Political Ideology as a Covariate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information * Affirmation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07, .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02, .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.30, .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 247, $R^2 = .07$.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .00.
Table 9

Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) Between Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Temporal Distance with Political Ideology as a Covariate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information * Affirmation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Regression Analyses: Temporal Distance Regressed on Perception Meritocracy Exists, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08, -.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02, .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04, .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02, -.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception meritocracy exists x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 239, $R^2 = .07$.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .00.
### Table 11


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.33, -.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16, -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.21, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06, .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11, -.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02, .17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16, -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01, .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06, .13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 260, R²=.23.*

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 12

Regression Analyses: Attitudes Towards Outcome-Based Redistributive Policies Regressed on Political Ideology, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.37, -.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18, .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01, .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12, .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01, .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22, -.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01, .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11, .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09, .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03, .23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Regression Analyses: Temporal Distance Regressed on Political Ideology, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal distance of 1950s and present</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$\text{SR}^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34, 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22, 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25, 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37, 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-0.23$^{***}$</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.38, -0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20, 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03, 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18, 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33, 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13, 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11, 0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 254$, $R^2 = .06$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p = .00$. 


Figure 1. Scores for opportunity-enhancing policy support at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for discrimination and intergenerational injustice information conditions in participants in the no-affirmation and self-affirmation conditions.
Figure 2. Scores for attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for participants higher or lower in political ideology among those in the self-affirmation and no affirmation conditions.
Figure 3. Scores for opportunity-enhancing policy support at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for control and experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information conditions in participants lower in political conservatism and higher in political conservatism.
Figure 4. Scores for attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for participants higher or lower in political ideology among those in the self-affirmation and no affirmation conditions.
Appendix A: Information-Consent Form [Crowd Flower]

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

You are invited to participate in three short research studies. The first research study is titled “The Medium is the Message: How Presentation of Information Affects Reading Comprehension” conducted by Dr. Deborah Powell from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate how different ways of presenting information will affect short-term recall. Participation in this study involves reading a passage, after which you will be asked to respond to multiple-choice questions based on memory. The second research study is titled “About Values: Understanding People’s Values” conducted by Kelsea Beadman from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph as part of a master’s thesis. The purpose of this study is to investigate the values that different people hold. You will be asked to write about things that are important to different people. The third research study is titled “In the Context of the Canadian Election Young Canadian’s Attitudes Towards Policies of the Four Major Parties” conducted by Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of young Canadians towards policies of the four major political parties.

It should take approximately fifty-minutes to complete these three short studies and participants will be compensated with $2.00.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, or you would like to know the results of this research should they be published, please feel free to contact Kelsea Beadman (kbeadman@uoguelph.ca or 226-971-2014).

There are no direct benefits from participating in this study except that you will gain a better understanding of how psychological research is conducted, and you will learn more about Canadian life in the 1950s.

In addition, every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity.

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Director; Research Ethics                Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
University of Guelph                    E-mail: reb@uoguelph.ca

CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do not wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

Do you agree to participate in this study?

I agree to participate
I decline to participate
Appendix B: Information-Consent Form [Social Media]

You are invited to participate in three short research studies. The first research study is titled “The Medium is the Message: How Presentation of Information Affects Reading Comprehension” conducted by Dr. Deborah Powell from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate how different ways of presenting information will affect short-term recall. Participation in this study involves reading a passage, after which you will be asked to respond to multiple-choice questions based on memory. The second research study is titled “About Values: Understanding People’s Values” conducted by Kelsea Beadman from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph as part of a master’s thesis. The purpose of this study is to investigate the values that different people hold. You will be asked to write about things that are important to different people. The third research study is titled “In the Context of the Canadian Election Young Canadian’s Attitudes Towards Policies of the Four Major Parties” conducted by Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of young Canadians towards policies of the four major political parties.

It should take approximately fifty-minutes to complete these three short studies and participants will be eligible to participate in a draw for $50.00.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, or you would like to know the results of this research should they be published, please feel free to contact Kelsea Beadman (kbeadman@uoguelph.ca or 226-971-2014).

There are no direct benefits from participating in this study except that you will gain a better understanding of how psychological research is conducted, and you will learn more about Canadian life in the 1950s.

In addition, every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity.

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Director; Research Ethics
University of Guelph
Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
E-mail: reb@uoguelph.ca

CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do not wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

Do you agree to participate in this study?

I agree to participate

I decline to participate
Appendix C: Information-Consent Form [SONA]

You are invited to participate in three short research studies. The first research study is titled “The Medium is the Message: How Presentation of Information Affects Reading Comprehension” conducted by Dr. Deborah Powell from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate how different ways of presenting information will affect short-term recall. Participation in this study involves reading a passage, after which you will be asked to respond to multiple choice questions based on memory. The second research study is titled “About Values: Understanding People’s Values” conducted by Kelsea Beadman from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph as part of a master’s thesis. The purpose of this study is to investigate the values which different people hold. You will be asked to write about things that are important to different people. The third research study is titled “In the Context of the Canadian Election Young Canadian’s Attitudes Towards Policies of the Four Major Parties” conducted by Dr. Leanne Son Hing from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of young Canadians towards policies of the four major political parties.

It should take approximately fifty-minutes to complete these three short studies and participants will be compensated with 1.0 research participation credits.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, or you would like to know the results of this research should they be published, please feel free to contact Kelsea Beadman (kbeadman@uoguelph.ca or 226-971-2014).

There are no direct benefits from participating in this study except that you will gain a better understanding of how psychological research is conducted, and you will learn more about Canadian life in the 1950s.

In addition, every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity.

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.
You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Director; Research Ethics
University of Guelph

Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
E-mail: reb@uoguelph.ca

CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

If you wish to participate in this study, please click the “I agree to participate” button below. If you do not wish to participate, please click the “I decline to participate” button below.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.

Do you agree to participate in this study?

I agree to participate
I decline to participate
Appendix D: Screening Questionnaire

1. Please enter your age (in years):

2. What is your gender?
   Male  
   Female  
   Other/prefer not to say

3. Are you a Canadian Citizen?
   Yes  No

4. Are you English speaking?
   Yes  No
Appendix E: Belief in Social Mobility (Major et al., 2007)

Below are a number of statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Moderately Slightly Neither Agree Slightly Moderately Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Agree Agree

1. Most people who don’t achieve more than their parents did should not blame the system; they really only have themselves to blame.

2. Even if people work hard, they don’t always achieve more than their parents did.

3. In Canada, achieving more than one’s parents did doesn’t always depend on hard work.
Appendix F: Perceptions Meritocracy Exists (Son Hing et al., 2011)

Below are a number of statements concerning how employment opportunities and wages are currently distributed. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In organizations, people who do their job well rise to the top.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. In life, people are rewarded on the basis of their competence and ability.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. Success is possible for anyone who works hard enough.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. In general, people's financial success depends on their skills.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. Anyone who is willing to work hard enough is able to find a decent job.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. People’s financial success depends primarily upon their natural abilities.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. In most circumstances, organizations offer the job to the most highly skilled candidate.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

8. People’s wages always are determined by their effort and ability.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

9. People who work hard have the most opportunities for advancement.  
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

10. Employers always hire the most skilled candidate for a job.  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11. In organizations, raises are determined primarily by employees’ effort.  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Appendix G: Control Information Condition

Putting History into Perspective
“A Snapshot of Canadian History

When people are presented with information what makes them remember it well? Is it the case that, people remember it well when they see it or when they hear it? We are interested in how different ways of presenting information will affect your short-term recall. We have multiple conditions to test this. In some conditions people will get to read information presented in a story format or in factoids, in some conditions people will get to listen to an audio recording, and in others, people will get to watch a video recording.

You have been randomly assigned to the factoid condition.

Below are a number of statements concerning Canadian life in the 1950s.

Please carefully read the following passage. You will be asked to answer multiple choice questions from memory once you have finished reading. These questions will test general comprehension, not specific details.

The Canadian flag we know today was adopted in 1965 by Lester B. Pearson. After a serious debate about changing the flag from the Union Flag, the iconic maple leaf flag was selected out of three choices. Its design was based on the flag of the Royal Military College of Canada.

Marilyn Bell was the first person to swim across Lake Ontario in 1954. She swam from Queens Beach Niagara on the Lake to Toronto. She relied on Pablum, corn syrup, and lemon juice for energy to complete the swim in less than a day.

Watching TV was a favourite family pastime, and CBC introduced Hockey Night in Canada in 1952. On Saturday nights, families would gather to watch a broadcast of that week’s NHL game, with enjoyable segments during the intermissions. The original theme song was called “Saturday’s Game.”

Students began staying in school longer to receive more education. The number of students going to university in the 1950s doubled, causing The University of Victoria, Carleton University, and York University to open to accommodate this growth.

In the late 1950s, Sputnik (the first satellite) was launched into space by the Soviet Union. This launched the race to space between the U.S.S.R and the United States. Sputnik orbited for three months before falling and burning on re-entry into the earth’s atmosphere.
Expo '67 was held in Montreal in 1967, and is considered to be the most successful World’s Fair of the century. The Expo saw millions of visitors and dozens of nations participate. This World Festival of Art and Entertainment featured art galleries, opera, ballet and theatre companies, and musical groups.

As a result of soldiers returning home from WWII in 1945, and the baby boom, Canada’s population grew by nearly six million, and half of the Canadian population was below the age of 25 by the end of the 1950s.

Workers in the 1950s made an average of $1.22 per hour. With rent costing less than $50 a month, workers could easily afford rent with less than a week’s salary.

On January 14th 1950, the first non-stop flight across Canada was made. The Royal Canadian Air Force North Star flew from Vancouver to Halifax without making any stops.
Appendix H: Control Information Condition Comprehension Check

Please answer the following questions about the passage you just read.

Please answer these questions based on memory.

1. How much did a month of rent cost in the 1950s?
   a. Less than $20
   b. Less than $30
   c. Less than $40
   d. Less than $50

2. After WWII what happened to the Canadian population?
   a. It decreased
   b. It stayed the same
   c. It increased
Appendix I: Past Discrimination Information Condition

Putting History into Perspective
“A Snapshot of Canadian History

When people are presented with information what makes them remember it well? Is it the case that, people remember it well when they see it or when they hear it? We are interested in how different ways of presenting information will affect your short-term recall. We have multiple conditions to test this. In some conditions people will get to read information presented in a story format or in factoids, in some conditions people will get to listen to an audio recording, and in others, people will get to watch a video recording.

You have been randomly assigned to the factoid condition.

Below are a number of statements concerning Canadian life in the 1950s.

**Please carefully read the following passage. You will be asked to answer multiple choice questions from memory once you have finished reading.** These questions will test general comprehension, not specific details.

Being gay was illegal until the 1960s. If a gay couple was seen in public, or if anyone knew they were a couple, they would both be put in jail.

Prior to 1960, Status Indians were not allowed to vote in any elections unless they gave up both their treaty rights and Indian Status. This means all First Nations people would have to give up the rights they fought for at the time of Confederation.

In the 1950s, immigrants were denied entry into Canada arbitrarily based on where they were from. For instance, if you were Israeli, you could be denied entry simply because you were from Israel.

Until the late 1960s, women did not have any legal rights. For instance, women were unable to get a divorce if their husbands were abusive. The only reason a woman was allowed to get a divorce was if the husband cheated.

Companies were allowed to hire whoever they wanted to in the 1950s. Companies could choose not to hire you because you were a woman, or because of your ethnicity (e.g., Chinese or Arab). They could also choose not to promote you because you were Black. This was all legal.

Blacks and Whites were not allowed to attend the same schools in Ontario until 1965. Black children had to attend separate schools, limiting their access to proper education.

Before the 1950s, access to birth control was highly restricted. Women were not allowed to use birth control, so they risked an unplanned pregnancy every time they had sex. Women did not have reproductive rights.
People in the 1950s had to work until they were 70 years old to receive a pension, which was too low to support them. Canada’s elderly population were working until they died, or were living below the poverty line if they were still alive.
Appendix J: Past Discrimination Information Condition Comprehension Check

Please answer the following questions about the passage you just read.

Please answer these questions based on memory.

1. In the 1950s which group was not allowed to vote in elections?
   a. Immigrants
   b. First Nations
   c. French speakers
   d. The elderly

2. In the 1950s, which of the following was illegal?
   a. A woman divorcing her husband because he cheated
   b. Choosing not to hire someone because they were Arab
   c. Publicly being gay
   d. Attending a White only school in Ontario
Appendix K: Intergenerational Injustice Information Condition

Putting History into Perspective
“A Snapshot of Canadian History

When people are presented with information what makes them remember it well? Is it the case that, people remember it well when they see it or when they hear it? We are interested in how different ways of presenting information will affect your short-term recall. We have multiple conditions to test this. In some conditions people will get to read information presented in a story format or in factoids, in some conditions people will get to listen to an audio recording, and in others, people will get to watch a video recording.

You have been randomly assigned to the factoid condition.

Below are a number of statements concerning Canadian life in the 1950s.

Please carefully read the following passage. You will be asked to answer multiple choice questions from memory once you have finished reading. These questions will test general comprehension, not specific details.

Being gay was illegal until the 1960s. If a gay couple was seen in public, or if anyone knew they were a couple, they would both be put in jail.

Prior to 1960, Status Indians were not allowed to vote in any elections unless they gave up both their treaty rights and Indian Status. This mean all First Nations people would have to give up the rights they fought for at the time of Confederation.

In the 1950s, immigrants were denied entry into Canada arbitrarily based on where they were from. For instance, if you were Israeli, you could be denied entry simply because you were from Israel.

Until the late 1960s, women did not have any legal rights. For instance, women were unable to get a divorce if their husbands were abusive. The only reason a woman was allowed to get a divorce was if the husband cheated.

Companies were allowed to hire whoever they wanted to in the 1950s. Companies could choose not to hire you because you were a woman, or because of your ethnicity (e.g., Chinese or Arab). They could also choose not to promote you because you were Black. This was all legal.

Blacks and Whites were not allowed to attend the same schools in Ontario until 1965. Black children had to attend separate schools, limiting their access to proper education.

Before the 1950s, access to birth control was highly restricted. Women were not allowed to use birth control, so they risked an unplanned pregnancy every time they had sex. Women did not have reproductive rights.
People in the 1950s had to work until they were 70 years old to receive a pension, which was too low to support them. Canada’s elderly population were working until they died, or were living below the poverty line if they were still alive.

Mothers in low-income neighbourhoods who do not work and are unable to provide a meal each night, have children who grow up malnourished. These children are less likely to graduate high school, and are more likely to grow up with heart disease.

Researchers studied fathers and sons and their places of employment and find that sons’ first jobs are likely to be with their fathers' place of employment. This means that if your father works in a plant on the assembly line, your first job will likely also be at the plant, and that you will become an assembly line worker.

In Canada, 8% of the population are nurses. This means 8 out of every 100 people hold the occupation of nurse. Interestingly, among women whose mothers were nurses, 20/100 become nurses themselves.

Researchers have studied families’ eating habits. Some children eat dinner with their families. Some children do not eat dinner with their families, and instead eat in front of the TV, because their parents are outside the home working. Children who do not eat dinner with their families, are more likely to grow up to be obese or have alcohol and substance abuse problems.

Researchers studied attendance at university and found that if your parents went to university then chances are you will also attend university. Once you graduate, you are more likely to have an average income of $49,000. In contrast, if your parents only have a high school education, then chances are you will join the workforce right out of high school, and will likely have an average income of $30,000.

Economists found a trend that children who were raised in poor neighborhoods had a lower income, making just $19,500 by the time they were 26 than children raised in middle-class neighborhoods, who made $26,000.

Children whose families are on welfare hear about 600 words an hour, whereas working-class children hear 1,200 word an hour, and children from professional families hear 2,100 words per hour. By age 3, a poor child will have heard 30 million fewer words in the home environment than a child from a professional family. Poor children reflect this gap in language with a lower IQ and poorer performance in school.

Researchers in sociology have found that children who grow up in smaller houses, and sharing bedrooms with their siblings, have less opportunity to study in a quiet, private space. Their performance at school is dramatically lower than those who have their own rooms. This lower academic performance leads to these children being held back in grade school, a lower likelihood to graduate university, and a low income by the time they were 25.
Appendix L: Intergenerational Injustice Information Condition Comprehension Check

Please answer the following questions about the passage you just read.

Please answer these questions based on memory.

1. In the 1950s which group was not allowed to vote in elections?
   a. Immigrants
   b. First Nations
   c. French speakers
   d. The elderly

2. In the 1950s, which of the following was illegal?
   a. A woman divorcing her husband because he cheated
   b. Choosing not to hire someone because they were Arab
   c. Publicly being gay
   d. Attending a White only school in Ontario

3. Poor performance in school is NOT linked to:
   a. Malnourishment in childhood
   b. The number of words children head an hour
   c. Mother’s hip-to-waist ratio
   d. Sharing a room with your sibling

4. Children who did not sit down for dinner with their families were more likely to:
   a. Become a nurse
   b. Develop alcohol and drug dependencies
   c. Get married
   d. Get divorced
Appendix M: Self-affirmation Conditions

We would now like you to write about values.

A number of values are given below. Please select the value that is MOST/LEAST important to you personally, and write a few lines explaining why this value is important to you/could be important to someone else.

1. **Theoretical:** main interest in the discovery of the truth; attitudes are cognitive, empirical, critical, and rational; aim is to acquire a systematized knowledge
2. **Economic:** interest in what is useful and practical; interest in consumption of goods and the accumulation of wealth; thinks education should be practical; unapplied knowledge is a waste
3. **Aesthetic:** values beauty, form and harmony; interest in people but not necessarily in their welfare; tends towards individualism and self-sufficiency
4. **Social:** Interest in people; has an altruistic, philanthropic love of people; regards love as itself, the only suitable form of human relationship
5. **Political:** primary interest in power, competition, and struggle; often found in leadership positions
6. **Religious:** values unity; seeks to relate oneself to the universe as a whole; directs self to the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience
Appendix N: Redistributive Policies

In the context of the 2015 Federal Election, we are interested in young Canadians’ attitudes towards policies of the four major parties.

Below are a number of policies taken from platforms for the 2015 Canadian Federal Election. These policies are from the Conservative, Green, Liberal and NDP parties.

Imagine these policies are to be enacted.

Please indicate the extent to which you are likely to support or oppose each of the policies listed below by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>Moderately Oppose</td>
<td>Slightly Oppose</td>
<td>Neither Oppose or Support</td>
<td>Slightly Support</td>
<td>Moderately Support</td>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canada Defence First Strategy: A government investment strategy in military, whereby the Canadian government will invest $490 billion of taxpayer dollars in Canadian defence over 20 years.

Anti-urban Sprawl: Urban sprawl describes the expansion of residential building away from central urban areas into the surrounding area, often dimishing farm and wetlands, and resulting in less greenspace. This policy would prevent the building of urban communities in greenspace. This will prevent a decrease in greenspace, but will force the building of larger apartment complexes in urban areas.

Investment in Research: A government plan to invest $100 million over five years in undergraduate research fellowships to support innovation, and encourage young Canadians to pursue careers in research.

Marijuana Ticketing: A government legislation to introduce a new form of police ticketing for possession of small quantities of marijuana.

Member of Parliament Expense Disclosure: A government legislation requiring all members of parliament to disclose their business-related expenditures to the public.

Court Leave: Workers must take a leave of absence without pay but are guaranteed the right to resume work if an employee is summoned to service on a jury, selected to serve on a jury, and/or serviced with a summons to serve as a witness.

Progressive Tax: A progressive tax is in contrast to everyone paying the same on their taxes. If everyone pays the same percent of their income on taxes (e.g., 22%) then someone who earns $50,000 pays $11,000 a year in taxes, and someone who earns
$90,000 pays $19,800 a year in taxes. With a progressive tax bracket, people who earn more money pay a higher percent of their income on taxes. For example, someone who makes $90,000 a year would fall into the 26% tax bracket and pay $23,400 a year in taxes, leaving them with $66,600 in income.

**Safe Drinking Water for First Nations Act:** First Nations do not currently have access to safe, clean, and reliable drinking water. This government partnership with the First Nations would require investment of infrastructure, including taxpayer dollars, to develop enforceable regulations to not only give access to, but also protect sources of drinking water on First Nation lands.

**Affordable Housing Increase:** Not all Canadians can afford housing. This plan would use $500 million tax dollars to build 10,000 affordable rental housing units over 10 years.

**Old Age Security Benefit:** As Canadians are living to an older age, the elderly can no longer afford daily necessities. This benefit is a monthly payment available to Canadians 65 years of age, paid from each working Canadian’s pay cheque.

**Same-sex Spousal benefits:** The new definition of a spouse will cover a partner in any legally recognized marriage, allowing married same-sex spouses to be eligible for benefits under their partner’s coverage in all organizations.

**Employment Standards Act: Minimum Wage:** An increase in minimum wage to $15 progressively over the next 3 years. Wage will be calculated based on a 35-hour work-week, and updated every year with the cost of living. This will increase business expenses as wages are now higher and will increase the amount of money workers have to spend on their needs (e.g., food, housing).

**Developing Executive Women:** Of the top 500 companies, only 5% of CEOs are women. In order to increase the opportunity for women to achieve executive positions, a women’s mentoring program which pairs female leaders with mentors will be developed. Programs will include virtual workshops; strategies for career navigation; and providing networking tips to encourage and support the advancement of women within the organization.

**Women in STEM Initiative:** Only 20% of engineers in Canada are women. This plan of action proposes to increase the number of female graduates in science, technologies, engineering and math by at least 50% by 2025, creating more opportunity for women to access and hold engineering jobs.

**Pay Equity:** Job evaluations are created to define the tasks involved for each job. These job evaluations are used to determine the salary for each job, regardless of the job incumbent. This ensures men and women are paid the same amount for filling the same role.
Employment Equity Act: Government legislation ensuring improved job opportunities for four protected groups: women, Aboriginal people, visible minorities, and people with disabilities through creating equal access to jobs. This can be accomplished, for example, through targeted advertising of jobs to protected groups and mentorship programs.

Post-secondary Tuition Decrease: This government is committed to transfer funds to provinces to offer students increased funding for post-secondary education. As well, a 20% reduction in tuition costs would reduce parental obligation, making it easier to send children to university, as well as decrease students’ own debt upon graduation.

Access to Child Care: Not all Canadians have access to affordable, high-quality child care close to home or work. Children who receive high quality child-care perform better in school. This government commitment would ensure all Canadians have access to affordable, high-quality child care spaces in every community.

Full-Day Kindergarten Program: In most provinces, only private kindergartens with yearly tuition offer full-day kindergarten programs. Parents who cannot afford these private kindergartens must find alternative arrangements for their children. This new school plan would allow kindergarten-aged children to attend free, full-day schooling, which will lead to better performance upon entry to elementary school, as well as better performance in both later school and economically in life.

“Schools in Need” Renovations: Children attending inner-city and on-reserve schools often come from low-income households. These children come to school hungry. Due to the location of the school, these schools do not have play grounds or outside spaces for children to play. This government commitment to a $1 billion annual investment in renovations of on-reserve and inner city schools would increase greenspace, and introduce new technologies and breakfast programs.

Child Care Centres: Finding help for a child with special needs, including both mental, physical, and health care needs, is costly and can be difficult to find. This government commitment to ensure the creation of a transparent and accountable funding system for services for young children including centres for children with special needs, child care providers, and health care services, would allow equal access to services for all Canadians. This would provide an enriched early childhood, allowing for better adjustment for children later in life.
Appendix O: Political ideology (Napier & Jost, 2008)

In politics, people sometimes talk of ‘left’ and ‘right’. Where would you place yourself on this scale where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Strong Liberal

2

3

4

5

6

7 Strong conservative
**Appendix P: Measure of Temporal Distance**

Past events may sometimes *feel* quite recent or distant, regardless of how long ago they actually occurred. Please think specifically about the 1950s as described in Study 1. Place a mark on the lines below by marking a dash at the points that best indicate how far away 1950 feels from the present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feels very far from present</th>
<th>feels very close to present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feels very distant</td>
<td>feels very recent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Q: Operational Manipulation Check

Thinking about the passage you read in Study 1, which of the following statements best summarize what it was about:

a) Canadian History in the 1950s  
b) Discrimination in Canada in the 1950s  
c) How people are affected by their parents’ circumstances  
d) Both a and b  
e) Both b and c
Appendix R: Demographics

1. **Which of the following BEST describes your ethnic background? Please TICK ALL THAT APPLY.**
   
   Aboriginal/First Nations/Metis  
   White/European  
   Black/Africa/Caribbean  
   Southeast Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Filipino, etc.)  
   Arab (Saudi Arabian, Palestinian, Iraqi, etc.)  
   Latin American (Costa Rican, Guatemalan, Brazilian, Colombian, etc.)  
   West Asian (Iranian, Afghani, etc.)  
   Other (Please specify)

2. **What year of university are you currently in?**
   
   1\textsuperscript{st} year  
   2\textsuperscript{nd} year  
   3\textsuperscript{rd} year  
   4\textsuperscript{th} year or greater

3. **What is your sexual orientation?**
   
   Heterosexual  
   Gay  
   Lesbian  
   Other

4. **Approximately what is the combined income of your parents?**
   
   Less than $35,000  
   $35,001 - $50,000  
   $50,001 - $65,000  
   $65,001 - $80,000  
   $80,001 - $95,000  
   $95,001 - $110,000  
   $110,001 - $120,000  
   $120,001 - $135,000  
   $135,001 - $150,000  
   $150,001 - $165,000  
   $165,001 - $180,000  
   More than $180,000  
   Other/prefer not to say
Appendix S: Suspicion Probe

1. Did anything in these studies appear suspicious, strange, or weird?
   Yes       No

2. If yes, what did you find suspicious, strange, or weird?
Appendix T: Debriefing Form and Post-Debriefing Consent [SONA sample]

Thank you for your participation in the three studies. You were told that these were three separate studies, when, in fact, this was just one study. In very simple terms, what we are interested in is how people think about historical discrimination and its relevance for groups today, as well as how people thinking about these issues influences their attitudes towards social policies.

In the initial part of the study, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: in the control condition participants read about life in the 1950s in Canada; in the discrimination condition participants read about discrimination that existed against marginalized groups in the 1950s in Canada; and in the legacy condition participants read both about discrimination against marginalized groups in the 1950s in Canada, as well as about how parents’ circumstances affect their children’s likely life outcomes. In the second part of the study, participants were either made to feel good about themselves by writing about their most cherished value or not. Finally, we assessed your support for social policies that would help marginalized group members today. We hypothesize that participants who learn about legacy effects will have the highest levels of support to help marginalized groups, especially when they have been made to feel good about themselves.

We apologize for deceiving you. We masked the true purpose of the study because if we had been forthcoming about the goals of the study then participants may have behaved or reacted in a contrived manner or changed their responses to either assist the researchers to find what was expected or to obstruct such efforts. Hence, it was important to mask the true nature of the study.

Because you were deceived, you have the right to not submit your responses, and thus withdraw your data from our study. Should you choose to withdraw your data from our study, you will still be compensated with 1 credit for your participation. Should you wish to withdraw your data from our study, please select “Please discard my data”. As there are no identifiers associated with your data, researchers will be unable to withdraw your data unless you indicate this.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Data from this study will be stored for seven years after the publication of analyses associated with the research; after that time, questionnaire materials will be destroyed. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.
If you have any further questions about the study or would like a copy of the results, please contact Dr. Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or 519-824-4120 x 55475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact Sandy Auld, Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or sauld@uoguelph.ca.

For more information about how marginalized groups are still affected by discrimination today, and how you can get involved, visit the University of Guelph Diversity and Human Rights website at: https://www.uoguelph.ca/diversity-human-rights/

CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

By clicking the “I agree to submit my data” button below, you will be granting permission to the researchers to use your data (the information you provided) in their study. If you want to exit the study and not grant permission to the researchers to use your data, please click the “Please discard my data” button below. If you choose to discard your data, you will still receive compensation.

If you have any questions or ethical concerns with this study, you may contact Sandy Auld at (519) 824-4120 Ext. 56606 or by e-mail at sauld@uoguelph.ca.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.
Thank you for your participation in the three studies. You were told that these were three separate studies, when, in fact, this was just one study. In very simple terms, what we are interested in is how people think about historical discrimination and its relevance for groups today, as well as how people thinking about these issues influences their attitudes towards social policies.

In the initial part of the study, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: in the control condition participants read about life in the 1950s in Canada; in the discrimination condition participants read about discrimination that existed against marginalized groups in the 1950s in Canada; and in the legacy condition participants read both about discrimination against marginalized groups in the 1950s in Canada, as well as about how parents’ circumstances affect their children’s likely life outcomes. In the second part of the study, participants were either made to feel good about themselves by writing about their most cherished value or not. Finally, we assessed your support for social policies that would help marginalized group members today. We hypothesize that participants who learn about legacy effects will have the highest levels of support to help marginalized groups, especially when they have been made to feel good about themselves.

We apologize for deceiving you. We masked the true purpose of the study because if we had been forthcoming about the goals of the study then participants may have behaved or reacted in a contrived manner or changed their responses to either assist the researchers to find what was expected or to obstruct such efforts. Hence, it was important to mask the true nature of the study.

Because you were deceived, you have the right to not submit your responses, and thus withdraw your data from our study. Should you choose to withdraw your data from our study, you will still be compensated for your participation. Should you wish to withdraw your data from our study, please select “Please discard my data”. As there are no identifiers associated with your data, researchers will be unable to withdraw your data unless you indicate this.

We ensure confidentiality in our treatment of your study responses. Your responses will not be associated with your identity. Data from this study will be stored for seven years after the publication of analyses associated with the research; after that time, questionnaire materials will be destroyed. The data will be used for scientific purposes only and any publication of these data will not contain references to your identity. Finally, all data is studied at the group level rather than at the individual level. Researchers will not be looking at your individual responses.
If you have any further questions about the study or would like a copy of the results, please contact Dr. Leanne Son Hing at sonhing@uoguelph.ca or 519-824-4120 x 55475. If you have any concerns with ethical issues related to this research, please contact Sandy Auld, Director of Research Ethics at (519) 824-4120 x. 56606 or sauld@uoguelph.ca. For more information about how marginalized groups are still affected by discrimination today, and how you can get involved, visit the Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion website at: http://www.ccdi.ca/

CONSENT OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

By clicking the “I agree to submit my data” button below, you will be granting permission to the researchers to use your data (the information you provided) in their study. If you want to exit the study and not grant permission to the researchers to use your data, please click the “Please discard my data” button below. If you choose to discard your data, you will still receive compensation.

If you have any questions or ethical concerns with this study, you may contact Sandy Auld at (519) 824-4120 Ext. 56606 or by e-mail at sauld@uogelph.ca.

Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. You may print this page.
Appendix V: Draw Participation Form [Social Media Participants]

If you wish to participate in the draw for $50.00, please enter your email address below. The information below will only be used for the purpose of the draw, and will be stored separately from your survey data. You will only be contacted for the purposes of the draw.

Email address:
Appendix W: Mood Repair Task [Online Sample]

Thank you for participating in our study. Please take a few minutes and watch the joyful video below.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cbP2N1BQdYc]

*The link above is a light-headed video entitled “The Top 10 Best Cat Videos of All Time”. It features short clips of pet cats playing and interacting with each other.*
Appendix X

Table 14

Proportion of Each Value Identified Across Information and Self-affirmation Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>No Affirmation Condition</th>
<th>Affirmation Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Discrimination</td>
<td>Past Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>12% (6)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>14% (7)</td>
<td>12% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>8% (4)</td>
<td>14% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>12% (6)</td>
<td>8% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>18% (9)</td>
<td>21% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>36% (18)</td>
<td>38% (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total \( N = 438 \). No affirmation condition = select the value that is least important to you; self-affirmation condition = select the value that is most important to you; control condition = neutral information about the 1950s in Canada; past discrimination condition = information about Canadian discriminatory laws in the 1950s; and intergenerational discrimination condition = information about how parents’ life circumstances affect one’s own and information about Canadian discriminatory laws in the 1950s.
Appendix Y

Table 15

*Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Between Information Condition, Value, and Opportunity-Enhancing Redistributive Policy Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition*Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Z

Table 16

*Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Between Information Condition, Value, and Outcome-Based Redistributive Policy Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition*Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AA

Table 17

*Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Between Information Condition, Value, and Temporal Distance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Condition*Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AB

Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies: meritocracy beliefs as moderator. The overall model including perception meritocracy exists was not significant, $F(11, 235) = 1.10, R^2 = .05, p = .36$, 95% CI [.00, .07] (Table 6). Furthermore, perception meritocracy exists did not moderate the relationship between the information condition x affirmation condition interaction and attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, contrary to H4.

There was a significant interaction between self-affirmation condition and information condition (discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice), ($B = .18, SE B = .07, SR^2 = .02, p = .016$, 95% CI [.03, .33]), see Figure 5. Simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity enhancing policies did not significantly differ in the intergenerational injustice information condition and in the past discrimination information condition, $B = .06, SE B = .071, p = .37$, 95% CI [-.08, .20], because they were consistently favorable. However, among those who were not self-affirmed, participants’ attitudes towards opportunity enhancing redistributive policies depended on information condition, ($B = -.36, SE B = 0.16, SR^2 = .020, p = .028$, 95% CI [.04, .69]): those in the intergenerational injustice information condition were less favourable than those in the past discrimination condition, providing support for H2. Thus, bolstering individuals’ self-identity removed the threat inherent in the information presented.
Figure 5. Scores for opportunity-enhancing policy support at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for discrimination and intergenerational injustice information conditions in the no-affirmation and self-affirmation information conditions.
Appendix AD

Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies: meritocracy beliefs

as moderator. The overall including perception meritocracy exists was not significant, $F(11, 235) = 1.50, R^2 = .07, \ p = .13, 95\%\ CI [0, .10]$ (Table 8). Furthermore, perception meritocracy exists did not moderate the relationship between the information condition x affirmation interaction and attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies, contrary to H4. Counter to expectations, there was a significant effect of self-affirmation condition, in that the self-affirmation condition was related to more negative attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies than the no-affirmation condition ($B = -.16, SE\ B = .08, SR^2 = .017, p < .05, 95\%\ CI [-.30, -.07]$). Thus, bolstering one’s self-identity led to more negative attitudes towards redistributive policies.
Appendix AE

**Temporal distance: political conservatism as moderator.** Due to the strong effects of political ideology on attitudes towards both opportunity-enhancing and outcome-based redistributive policies, the one-item liberal-conservative political ideology measure was included in the regression for temporal distance. The overall model was not significant, $F(11, 242) = 1.37, R^2 = .06, p > .05, 95\% \text{ CI} [.00, .08]$, see Table 13. There was no effect of information condition, or self-affirmation condition, or an interaction between these two on participant’s temporal distance of discriminatory events, contrary to H3.

There was an interaction between political conservatism and the experimental vs. control information conditions ($B = -.24, SE = 0.07, SR^2 = .036, p = .002, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.38, - .09]$), (see Figure 6). Simple effects tests revealed that, for those lower in political conservatism, the exposure to the experimental information conditions (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) resulted in more temporal distancing between the 1950s and the present, compared with the control condition ($B = .32, SE B = 0.14, SR^2 = .017, p = .033, 95\% \text{ CI} [.03, .61]$). In contrast, among those higher in political conservatism, the exposure to the experimental information conditions (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) resulted in less temporal distancing between the 1950s and the present, compared with the control condition ($B = -.35, SE = 0.14, SR^2 = .025, p = .013, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.63, -.08]$). Thus, individuals higher in political conservatism perceived the 1950s to be closer to the present than those lower in political conservatism.
Appendix A

Figure 6. Scores for temporal distance between the 1950s and the present at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for participants in the control information condition and experimental information conditions (discrimination information condition and intergenerational injustice information condition) among those higher or lower in political conservatism.
Appendix AG

Temporal distance: meritocracy beliefs as moderator. The overall model including perception meritocracy exists $F(11, 227) = 1.34, R^2 = .06, p > .05, 95\% \text{ CI } [.00, .08]$ (Table 10), was not significant. There was no main effect of system justification beliefs on temporal distancing, nor did system justification beliefs moderate the information condition x affirmation condition interaction, contrary to H5.

There was a significant interaction between perception meritocracy exists and information condition (discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice), $(B = -.59, SE B = .18, SR^2 = .04, p = .002, 95\% \text{ CI } [.23, .95])$, see Figure 7. Simple effects tests revealed that, for those lower in perception that meritocracy exists, those in the intergenerational injustice information condition perceived less temporal distance between the 1950s and the present than those in the past discrimination information condition $(B = -.48, SE B = .24, SR^2 = .016, p = .048, 95\% \text{ CI } [.01, .95])$. In contrast, among those higher in perception meritocracy exists information condition did not affect temporal distance between the 1950s and the present, $(B = -.37, SE B = .26, p = .15, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.89, .14])$. Thus, information about both past and intergenerational discrimination allowed individuals lower in perception meritocracy exists to view the 1950s as closer to the present.
Appendix AH

Figure 7. Scores for temporal distance between the 1950s and the present at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for participants in the discrimination information condition and intergenerational injustice information condition among those higher or lower in perception that meritocracy exists.
Appendix AI

Supplemental Analyses

Gender. To test if gender may play a role in one’s support of redistributive policies, attitudes towards redistributive policies were regressed on information condition, affirmation condition, and the interaction between these variables for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies and for outcome-based redistributive policies\(^5\). The overall model for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies was significant, \(F(11, 249) = 4.03, p < .001, R^2 = .15, 95\%\ CI [.05, .20]\) (Table 20)\(^6\).

There was a significant main effect of gender on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, \((B = .28, SE B = .07, SR^2 = .007, p < .001, 95\%\ CI [.15, .41])\), in that females were more supportive of opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies than males. Counter to expectations, there was also a significant main effect of self-affirmation condition, in that those who were not self-affirmed were more supportive of opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies than those who were self-affirmed \((B = -.17, SE B = .09, SR^2 = .0014, p = .045, 95\%\ CI [-.34, -.01])\).

There was a significant interaction between self-affirmation condition and information condition, \((B = -.47, SE B = .02, SR^2 = .02, p = .029, 95\%\ CI [-.88, -.05])\),

\(^5\) The effect of ethnicity on attitudes towards redistributive policies and on temporal distance was tested. All models were non-significant.

\(^6\) The overall models for outcome-based redistributive policies and for temporal distance were non-significant. The overall model for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies including political ideology was also non-significant.
see Figure 8. Simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, participants’ attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies did not significantly differ across information condition, \( (B = .12, SE B = 0.09, p = .21, 95\% CI [-.29, .07]) \). Among participants who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity-enhancing policies also did not significantly differ in the control information condition and in the experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information condition, \( B = -.04, SE B = .04, p = .24, 95\% CI [-.11, .03] \).

Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between self-affirmation condition, and experimental information conditions, \( (B = .32, SE B = .12, SR^2 = .02, p = .009, 95\% CI [.08, .55]) \), see Figure 9. Simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, participants’ attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies did not significantly differ across information condition, \( (B = -.17, SE B = 0.15, p = .27, 95\% CI [-.14, .48]) \). Among participants self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity-enhancing policies also did not significantly differ in the control information condition and in the experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information condition, \( B = .00, SE B = .07, p = .99, 95\% CI [-.13, .13] \).

There was also a significant three-way interaction between gender, self-affirmation condition, and information conditions, \( (B = .20, SE B = .10, SR^2 = .014, p = .039, 95\% CI [.01, .39]) \), see Figure 10. For males, simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, participants support for opportunity-enhancing policies did significantly differ in the control information condition and in the experimental information condition (discrimination and intergenerational injustice), \( B = \)
.55, $SE_B = .21$, $SR^2 = .022$, $p = .01$, 95% CI [-.97, -.13]: those in the experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information condition were more favourable than those in the control condition. Among men who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity-enhancing policies also significantly differed in the control information condition and in the experimental information condition (discrimination and intergenerational injustice), $B = -.17$, $SE_B = .09$, $SR^2 = .014$, $p = .04$, 95% CI [-.34, -.01]: those in the experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information condition were less favourable than those in the control condition. For females, simple effects tests revealed that among participants who were not self-affirmed, participants support for opportunity-enhancing policies did not significantly differ in the control information condition and in the experimental information condition (discrimination and intergenerational injustice), $B = .31$, $SE_B = .20$, $p = .11$, 95% CI [-.07, .70]. Among women who were self-affirmed, participants’ support for opportunity-enhancing policies also did not significantly differ in the control information condition and in the experimental information condition (discrimination and intergenerational injustice), $B = -.08$, $SE_B = .08$, $p = .30$, 95% CI [-.07, .24]. Thus, females’ attitudes towards redistributive policies do not differ following exposure to information or as a result of bolstering self-identity. In contrast, when males are exposed to information about past and intergenerational injustice, they have more favourable attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies; however, this effect only holds when males’ self-identities have not been bolstered. When males’ self-identities are bolstered, exposure to information about past and intergenerational injustice has the opposite effect on attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies.
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Table 20

*Regression Analyses: Temporal Distance on Gender, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal distance between 1950s and present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SR²</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>90% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31, .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06, .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-13, .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.34, -.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N=261, R² = .15.*

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p = .00.
Figure 8. Scores for opportunity-enhancing policy support at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for control and experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information conditions in participants in the no-affirmation and self-affirmation conditions, with gender as the moderator.
Figure 9. Scores for opportunity-enhancing policy support at one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean for discrimination and intergenerational injustice information conditions in participants in the no-affirmation and self-affirmation conditions, with gender as the moderator.
Figure 10. Relation between control and experimental (discrimination and intergenerational injustice) information conditions for opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies, among those in the no-affirmation and self-affirmation conditions, for females and males.
Appendix AN

Table 21


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards opportunity-enhancing redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14, .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09, .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19, .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition:</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08, .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control vs. experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition:</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03, 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07, .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05, .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04, .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04, .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01, .16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=247, R²=.07.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .00.
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Table 22

*Regression analyses: Attitudes Towards Outcome-Based Redistributive Policies Regressed on Belief in Social Mobility, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes towards outcome-based redistributive policies</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SR^2</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10, .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02, .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.18, .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.31, -.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=247, R^2=.05.  
*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p = .00.
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Table 23

Regression Analyses: Temporal Distance Regressed on Belief in Social Mobility, Information Condition, Affirmation Condition, and Their Interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal distance of 1950s and present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x self-affirmation condition</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Control vs. experimental</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in social mobility x Self-affirmation condition x Information condition: Discrimination vs. intergenerational injustice</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 239, $R^2 = .05$. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .00.