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ABSTRACT

The present study examined whether the value of self-transcendence and the degree to which individuals report behaving consistently with their values (value-behavior consistency) impact the association of meaning and racial prejudice against White and Black individuals. The study was conducted with a college population from a university located in the southern United States. The final sample was composed of 362 people, 281 females and 81 males, with a majority of participants self-identifying as White (73.8%). To assess meaning, the Purpose in Life test – Short Form (PIL-SF) and the Meaning in Life Questionnaire Presence subscale (MLQ-Presence) were administered. Social judgment was assessed through the Social Dominance Scale (SDS), the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPRS), and the Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales (PWBS). Finally, the Portrait Value Questionnaire Revised (PVQ-RR) and the Valued Living Questionnaire (VLQ) were administered to identify individual values and to measure value-behavior consistency, respectively. Demographic information collected included such areas as race, sex, age, religious, and political affiliation. The main proposed model stated that under high levels of the value of self-transcendence, the relationship between meaning in life and prejudice would be significantly mediated by value-behavior consistency. In the second model it was proposed that if the value of self-transcendence was not a significant moderator then both value-behavior consistency and the value of self-transcendence would significantly mediate the relationship between perceived meaning in life and prejudice. Standard path-analytic approaches were used to examine the models through the macro PROCESS, designed by Hayes (2013). Results refuted the first proposed model and partially supported the
second model by confirming self-transcendence as a significant mediator of the relationship between meaning in life and overall scores of prejudice. Findings suggested that White individuals who perceive greater meaning in their lives are more likely to endorse the value of self-transcendence, which in turn contributes to being less prejudicial.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The present investigation examines the role that values play in the relationship between perceived meaning in life and prejudice. In the introduction, the theoretical rationale of the study is delineated. First, the literature review of each of the constructs (perceived meaning, prejudice, and values) is introduced, with a focus on the definition, theories, and research underlying each of these variables. Moreover, throughout the introduction, empirical and theoretical findings supporting the relationship between perceived meaning, prejudice, and values are emphasized. Finally, the proposed models and hypotheses for each model are presented.

Meaning: Definition and Theories

Meaning in life has been empirically investigated over a period of decades (Battista & Almond, 1973; Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994; Melton & Schulenberg, 2008; Ortiz, Schulenberg, & Pacciolla, 2013; Reker, Peacock, & Wong, 1987; Wong, 2012). Even before becoming a target of scientific research, discovering meaning in life has been relevant to human existence and scholars for centuries (Battista & Almond, 1973; Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994; Lukas 1995; Reker et al., 1987). In the field of psychology, Viktor Frankl was one of the first to introduce meaning to the study of mental health and well-being (1959/1984). Frankl developed a meaning-centered psychotherapy, commonly known as logotherapy, to emphasize that humans are naturally meaning seekers (Frankl, 1959/1984).

In his theory, Frankl highlighted the fundamental role of meaning in helping people to overcome psychological problems and daily life struggles. He proposed that meaning refers to those reasons, tasks, and experiences that are inherent in every situation, giving a person a “why”
for existence (Frankl, 1959/1984). Meaning in life serves as a motivation to complete daily activities as well as to attain valuable goals (Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994). Moreover, meaning is a direct pathway to happiness and well-being (Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994). Frankl differentiated between meaning of the moment and ultimate meaning (Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994). Meaning of the moment refers to the meaning that can be discovered in every situation, even in the most adverse circumstances. Frankl also argued that there is a more transcendent form of meaning, termed ultimate meaning, in which individuals understand that meaning is inherent to life, directing efforts to encounter a higher, more coherent, and personal form of existence (Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994). He proposed that each individual has the responsibility of discovering the meaning of the moment and aiming for an ultimate meaning. Frankl further argued that without meaning, individuals are likely to develop mental health problems (Frankl, 1992; Schulenberg, Hutzell, Nassif, & Rogina, 2008).

Since Frankl popularized meaning in psychology and related mental health fields, a number of additional definitions and conceptualizations of meaning have been proposed. Most authors define meaning as the perception of one’s life as full of coherence and purpose (Bering, 2003; Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Längle, 2005; Park, 2010; Reker et al., 1987; Steger, 2012; Steger & Kashdan, 2007, 2013; Wong, 2012). This definition highlights two fundamental aspects of meaning. The first fundamental aspect relates to the ability to perceive significance from life events, integrating situations, beliefs, and values into a larger, coherent life framework (Baumeister, 1991; Steger, 2012; Wong, 2012; Zika & Chamberlain, 1992). The second fundamental aspect highlights the need for a sense of purpose, direction, and goal attainment (Park, 2010, 2013; Schulenberg et al., 2008; Steger, 2012; Steger & Kashdan, 2007, 2013; Wong, 2012; Zika & Chamberlain, 1992).
Most conceptualizations of meaning indicate a multifaceted nature, in which meaning in life is manifested cognitively, behaviorally, and emotionally (Baumeister, 1991; MacKenzie & Baumeister, 2014; Reker et al., 1987; Wong, 2012). Cognitively, meaning is represented by the ability to connect life situations and make sense of a network of events (Baumeister, 1991). This is evident when people attach significance to events and are able to make sense of unexpected and difficult experiences (e.g., discovering meaning in suffering as a drive to personal growth). Behaviorally, meaning is expressed through the actualization of goals and values that are personally relevant. A desire for meaning promotes behaviors that are consistent with a given person’s values system or hierarchy (e.g., exercising to actualize values of health and beauty). In turn, a meaningful life can only be achieved when the individual acts upon such values. Emotionally, meaning is understood as a motivational force that enables individuals to fulfill a need for purpose (Batthyány & Russo-Netzer, 2014; MacKenzie & Baumeister, 2014; Reker et al., 1987; Schnell, 2010). What is meaningful for each individual resonates emotionally, creating positive affect, a sense of well-being, and feelings of personal satisfaction. Broadly speaking, perceived meaning in life integrates our capacities to attribute significance to events, that is, to connect life events in order to make sense of our lives, to behave accordingly and in congruence with what we find meaningful, and to resonate emotionally with purposeful goals and situations (Reker et al., 1987; Schnell, 2010).

Baumeister (1991), a key figure in the area of meaning, has expanded on his own theory. He developed a model of meaning in which purpose, values, and a sense of self-worth and efficacy are vital, dictating what individuals find to be purposeful and coherent (MacKenzie & Baumeister, 2014). Moreover, for Baumeister, the psychological functions of meaning are to: (1) facilitate recognition and distinction of important cues and patterns in the environment (e.g.,
being able to connect signals that indicate a dangerous environment); (2) communicate and coordinate actions within groups (e.g., sharing what is meaningful and valuable with other members of a person’s culture); and, (3) self-regulate behavior and affect (e.g., if a person values education, he or she can regulate behaviors such as spending less time drinking with friends in order to meet his or her educational goals).

Terror Management Theory is another well-known theory of meaning, where meaning is defined as a buffer to existential anxiety (Kesebir & Pyszczynski, 2014). According to Terror Management Theory, the psychological function of meaning is to help individuals cope with the realization of death by providing a sense of symbolic immortality (Greenberg, Koole, & Pyszczynski, 2004; Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, & Lyon, 1989). Symbolic immortality is defined as perceiving a long-lasting existence by contributing to something important to one’s culture, such as participating in a greater cause (Routledge & Arndt, 2008). This theory asserts that an individual’s culture dictates what is meaningful, and thus, cultural norms constitute the framework to achieve symbolic mortality (Feldman & Snyder, 2005; Greenberg et al., 2004; Kesebir & Pyszczynski, 2014). From this perspective, cultural factors are pivotal to understanding meaning in life (Florez, Schulenberg, & Stewart, 2016).

Another popular, contemporary approach to meaning is referred to as meaning-making theory (Anderson, Kay, & Fitzsimons, 2013; Park, 2010, 2013). Meaning-making theory asserts that individuals build a meaning framework throughout their lives that functions as a means to organize beliefs, values, and goals (Park, 2010, 2013). This meaning framework provides a sense of what is important in life and serves as a method of interpreting the significance of events (Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012). Central to this theory is the idea that people continuously engage in meaning-making processes, using their meaning framework to discover the meaning of a
given situation. Furthermore, each individual holds both a situational meaning and a global meaning (Anderson et al., 2013; Park, 2010, 2013). Situational meaning refers to the meaning that individuals attribute to specific life events (Anderson et al., 2013; Park, 2010, 2013), whereas global meaning corresponds to the individual’s goals, subjective sense of purpose, and overall beliefs about how the universe works. The concepts of situational and global meaning are similar to Frankl’s concepts of meaning of the moment and ultimate meaning. Thus, these types of meaning are connected to the individual’s circumstances and overall meaning framework.

Meaning-making theory posits that individuals are continuously contrasting and aligning their situational meaning with their global meaning to assure that both meanings are congruent, facilitating a sense of meaning-related stability (Anderson et al., 2013; Park, 2010, 2013; Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012). Along the same lines, the meaning maintenance model states that individuals are constantly employing automatic mental efforts to monitor potential threats to their meaning framework (Heine, Proulx, & Vohs, 2006). This ongoing evaluation enables people to engage in automatic efforts to sustain meaning, and thus, protect their sense of global meaning when faced with situations that contradict their meaning framework (Cesario, Plaks, & Higgins, 2006; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Sheldon, 2012). For instance, if a person’s global belief is that people are inherently good, when facing situations in which an individual violates this expectation, he or she might justify the act in order to sustain a sense of meaning.

Additionally, according to the meaning maintenance model, for people to perceive their lives as being meaningful, they need to achieve a level of self-esteem, affiliation with others, certainty (a degree of predictability about the future), and symbolic mortality (Van Tongeren & Green, 2010). Research in favor of the meaning-making model indicates that when facing threats to beliefs or sense of self, individuals automatically, and actively, engage in attempts to sustain
meaning and protect their identity by bolstering self-esteem (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, & Schimel, 2004; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010), proximity to others (Pinel, Long, Landau, Alexander, & Pyszczynski, 2006; Williams, 2012), and reducing uncertainty (McGregor, Zanna, Holmes, & Spencer, 2001). Moreover, when any of the meaning areas are disturbed (self-esteem, affiliation, certainty, or symbolic mortality), individuals attempt to compensate for the loss of meaning, often reporting greater levels of fulfillment in the remaining areas (e.g., when the individual’s sense of affiliation is threatened, he or she compensates by reporting greater self-esteem, certainty, and symbolic mortality) (Van Tongeren & Green, 2010). These findings also validate Terror Management Theory’s perspective of meaning as a bolster of symbolic mortality (Kesebir & Pyszczynski, 2014).

In recent years, significant advances in the conceptualization of meaning have come from the positive psychology movement. Positive psychologists have allocated research efforts to better understand meaning and its relationship to such variables as happiness, positive affect, and well-being. They have also directed efforts to elucidate how perceived meaning in life correlates with social phenomena and individual and cultural differences (Hicks & King, 2007; King, Hicks, Krull & Del Gaiso, 2006). From this perspective, meaning in life is a core component of happiness (Peterson & Park, 2012). Specifically, meaning represents the eudaimonic approach to happiness, where individuals are thought to achieve life satisfaction (i.e., flourish) by engaging in purposeful activities (Peterson et al., 2005; Vella-Brodrick, Park, & Peterson, 2009). This conceptualization of meaning is different from what is commonly known as a hedonistic approach to happiness. A hedonistic approach to happiness emphasizes the pursuit of pleasure as the pathway (i.e., the ultimate goal) to achieving life satisfaction. Consistent with the eudaimonic approach, meaning has been shown to be a stronger predictor of life satisfaction when compared
to hedonistic approaches (Peterson et al., 2005; Vella-Brodrick et al., 2009). Moreover, from the positive psychology perspective, meaning is at the heart of the human virtues; the result of living a life that involves service to others, contribution to a greater good, transcendence, friendship, and guidance (Peterson et al., 2005; Vella-Brodrick et al., 2009).

Michael Steger, an influential meaning researcher and positive psychologist, defines meaning as a high-order construct that integrates comprehension and purpose (Steger, 2012). Comprehension entails making sense of the world and one’s life. Purpose refers to establishing aspirations and long-term goals consistent with one’s meaning framework. Steger also elaborates upon Frankl’s and Crumbaugh’s (Crumbaugh is a logotherapist who developed several early measures to assess meaning) original distinction between the concepts of search for meaning and presence of meaning (Crumbaugh, 1977; Frankl, 1988; Steger & Frazier, 2005; Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006). Search for meaning refers to motivation and efforts to enhance or discover meaning. When meaninglessness is perceived, a search for meaning, or a desire to discover meaning, is commonly experienced (Crumbaugh, 1977). Search for meaning is often associated with forms of psychopathology, such as depression and anxiety (Schulenberg, Baczwaski, & Buchanan, 2014). However, in a healthy and adaptive fashion individuals can engage in a search for meaning to augment existing perceptions of meaning (Damon, Menon, & Bronk, 2003; Skaggs & Barron, 2006; Steger, Kashdan, Sullivan, & Lorentz, 2008).

Alternatively, presence of meaning refers to the perception of life as being meaningful (Steger et al., 2008). According to Steger, presence of meaning includes an understanding of one’s own self, the world, and positive relationships (Batthyány & Russo-Netzer, 2014; Heintzelman & King, 2014; Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; King et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2008; Wong, 2014).
In summary, most theories of meaning postulate that meaning in life is composed of underlying beliefs, values, and goals that constitute an explanatory meaning-making framework (Heine et al., 2006; Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010). Meaning frameworks guide individuals in their capacity to evaluate life events, as well as assign significance and coherence to situations and to their larger existence (Baumeister, 1991; Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994; Heine et al., 2006; Längle, 2005; Schulenberg et al., 2008; Steger, 2012). The need for meaning is a motivational force that promotes behavior directed by valuable goals (Baumeister, 1991; Frankl, 1959/1984, 1994; Proulx, 2013; Schulenberg et al., 2008; Sheldon, 2012). Moreover, even though the perception of meaning in life is subjective, what people find meaningful is culturally shaped and socially shared, and thus, meaning-based processes are an essential aspect of human functioning and well-being (Bar-Tur, Savaya, & Prager, 2001; Baumeister, 1991; Emmons, 2005; Florez et al., 2016; Heine et al., 2006; Kashdan & Steger, 2007; Kesebir & Pyszczynski, 2014; McDonald, Wong, & Gingras, 2012; Ortiz et al., 2013; Schnell, 2011; Steger, 2012; Wong, 2012).

For the purpose of this study meaning is defined as the degree to which an individual perceives that his or her life has a purpose. Meaning is conceptualized as the articulation of clear and meaningful goals, and the congruence between a person’s thoughts, actions, and values with his or her respective goals (Frankl, 1959/1984; Schulenberg et al., 2008).

Empirical Findings in Meaning

Consistent with the rapid expansion of meaning-based theories and conceptualizations over the years, research efforts in this area have also proliferated (Batthyány & Russo-Netzer, 2014; Melton & Schulenberg, 2008; Schulenberg et al., 2008; Wong, 2012). A major impetus for this empirical growth was due to the development of psychometrically sound measures of
meaning, which contributed to the cultivation of a science of meaning (Melton & Schulenberg, 2008; Morgan & Farsides, 2009). Contemporary measures of meaning focus on a person’s perceived meaning in life, the underlying assumption being that self-reported perception of meaning, or the self-reported lack of it, represents an adequate indicator of the amount of meaning in life that an individual identifies (Morgan & Farsides, 2009).

Based on this premise, numerous instruments have been designed to measure perceived meaning, as well as different components of the concept of meaning in life (Brandstätter, Baumann, Borasio, & Fegg, 2012; Heintzelman & King, 2014; McDonald et al., 2012; Melton & Schulenberg, 2008; Morgan & Farsides, 2009; Park & George, 2013). Studies and reviews of the literature have indicated that measures such as the Purpose in Life test, the Meaning in Life Questionnaire, and the Life Regard Index yield reliable and valid scores that are useful in assessing perceived meaning (Fjelland, Barron, & Foxall, 2008; McDonald et al., 2012; Reker & Fry, 2003; Schulenberg & Melton, 2010). Findings from such studies and reviews offer empirical support for the significance and utility of the meaning concept. Measures of meaning have systematically validated the expected theoretical relationships between meaning and mental health adjustment, well-being, and positive factors such as self-esteem, social support, and resilience (McDonald et al., 2012; Melton & Schulenberg, 2008; Morgan & Farsides, 2009). Thus, the science of meaning has allowed for an enhanced understanding of the nature and benefits of the concept.

For instance, today it is known that perceived meaning is an individual’s default state; most individuals do not actively or consciously engage in a search for meaning when there is absence of a threat to the individual’s identity (King, 2012a). When individuals report how meaningful their lives are, they tend to use readily accessible information that affirms their sense
of meaning (Hicks, Schlegel, & King, 2010; King, 2012a, 2012b). In turn, people tend to discard information that has a negative valence and which would contradict their sense of meaning (Hicks et al., 2010; King, 2012a, 2012b). People make their judgments about how meaningful their lives are based on information about social relationships, self-identity, and positive affect (Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Hicks et al., 2010; Schlegel, Hicks, King, & Arndt, 2011). Thus, some variables that strongly predict perceived meaning are positive affect (King, 2012a; Lightsey & Boyraz, 2011), social relatedness (Hicks & King, 2009b; Lopez, Ramos, Nisenbaum, Thind, & Ortiz-Rodriguez, 2014), and authenticity (an individual’s ability to present his or her true self) (Lopez et al., 2014). Along these lines, Lightsey and Boyraz (2011) found that positive affect and positive cognitions accounted for 48% of the variance in the perception of the presence of meaning. Their results also indicated that positive cognitions mediated the relationship between positive affect and meaning, such that individuals reporting higher positive affect also reported significantly more positive cognitions, and thus greater perceptions of meaning. Therefore, it is partially via positive automatic thoughts that positive affect results in the self-reported experience of meaning.

Additionally, empirical studies on the importance of meaning in life to the human condition have systematically demonstrated the positive relationships between meaning and aspects of well-being, and the negative associations between meaning and psychological issues (DeWitz, Woolsey, & Walsh, 2009; Mascaro & Rosen, 2005, 2008; Pan, Wong, Chan, & Joubert, 2008). In terms of well-being, individuals that report higher levels of meaning in life also report more positive affect (Lightsey & Boyraz, 2011; Pan et al., 2008), resilience (Aiena, Buchanan, Smith, & Schulenberg, 2016; Pan et al., 2008), perceived social support (Ulmer, Range, & Smith, 1991), posttraumatic growth (Dursun, Steger, Bentele, & Schulenberg, 2016;
Triplett, Tedeschi, Cann, Calhoun, & Reeve, 2012), and physical health (Bower, Kemeny, Taylor, & Fahey, 2003; Krause, 2009; Park, Malone, Suresh, Bliss, & Rosen, 2008; Pinquart, 2002). Meaning also positively relates to other well-established protective mental health factors, such as personal growth, sense of control, self-acceptance, autonomy, self-esteem, and self-efficacy (Debats, 1996; DeWitz et al., 2009; Drescher et al., 2012; Halama, 2003; Steger et al., 2008; Zika & Chamberlain, 1992).

Additionally, higher levels of perceived meaning are associated with fewer symptoms of general distress (Pan et al., 2008), anxiety (Rahiminezhad, Kazemi, Farahani, & Aghamohamadi, 2011), depression (Mascaro & Rosen, 2005, 2008; Rahiminezhad et al., 2011; Schulenberg et al., 2014; Schulenberg, Smith, Drescher, & Buchanan, 2016), substance use (Addad & Himi, 2008; Flora & Stalikas, 2012; Newcomb & Harlow, 1986; Noblejas de la Flor, 1997; Rahman, 2001; Schnetzer, Schulenberg, & Buchanan, 2013), suicidal ideation (Henry et al., 2014; Kleiman, Adams, Kashdan, & Riskind, 2013), and posttraumatic stress (Drescher et al., 2012; Schulenberg et al., 2016; Triplett et al., 2012). Moreover, meaning making (the ability to discover meaning in a range of situations, even difficult or stressful ones) is a beneficial long-term coping strategy in trauma, predicting better social and emotional adjustment afterwards (Boehmer, Luszczynska, & Schwarzer, 2007; Gillies & Neimeyer, 2006; Park, 2010).

Regarding the stability of meaning over time, research shows that in adulthood, self-reported levels of meaning in life are moderately stable (Krause & Hayward, 2014; Steger & Kashdan, 2007, 2013), with instability in the perception of meaning being significantly associated with symptoms of distress, negative affect, depression, and social anxiety (Steger & Kashdan, 2013). Moreover, one of the factors that may account for changes in meaning are stressful, traumatic, or otherwise difficult situations (Krause & Hayward, 2014). Alternatively,
not all studies support the view that changes in meaning are associated with psychopathology. Changes in meaning may be considered adaptive depending on a person’s developmental and situational demands and experiences (Brassai, Piko, & Steger, 2011; Dittman-Kolhi & Westerhof, 2000). For example, in adolescence, changes in the perception of meaning are expected, and a search for meaning is encouraged with respect to healthy identity formation (Brassai et al., 2011; Bronk, Hill, Lapsley, Talib, & Finch, 2009; Park, Park, & Peterson, 2010).

The growth in the number of studies focusing on meaning has resulted in a number of promising areas of empirical inquiry, one of which relates to the role of meaning in social functioning. Meaning appears to play an important role in the quality of social interactions and satisfaction in social relationships. The following section summarizes the available research as to the relationship between meaning in life and social functioning.

Meaning and Social Functioning

Most definitions of meaning assert a natural connection between meaning and social functioning, emphasizing social relatedness as an important source of meaning (Fave & Coppa, 2009; Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Stillman et al., 2009). Stated simply, meaning is strongly embedded in social concerns and social processes (Fave & Coppa, 2009; Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Stillman et al., 2009). Moreover, cultural socialization tends to be viewed as the background for meaning discovery and maintenance (Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Steger & Kashdan, 2013). In other words, in the case of some theoretical approaches, Terror Management Theory being one example, meaning is analyzed and constructed through the cultural lens (Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012), which incorporates salient social values, beliefs, and goals that help individuals achieve symbolic immortality within their social groups (Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2004). Theoretically, meaning in life and social
processes interact to inform an individual’s identity, promote closeness with others, motivate self-transcendent behavior, and reduce existential anxiety (Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2004).

From an empirical perspective, meaning in life correlates inversely with social anxiety (Steger & Kashdan, 2013), feelings of alienation and social inadequacy (Yee Ho, Cheung, & Cheung, 2010), social exclusion, and perceived loneliness (Stillman et al., 2009; Van Beest & Williams, 2006; Williams, 2012; Zadro, Boland, & Richardson, 2006). Moreover, perceived meaning is associated positively with social skills (Steger et al., 2008; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997), sense of closeness to others (Lambert et al., 2010; Steger & Kashdan, 2013), interpersonal appeal (Bligh & Kohles, 2009; Stillman, Lambert, Fincham, & Baumeister, 2011), group achievement (Bligh & Kohles, 2009; Hutzell, 1988), and ethical behavior at work (Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010; Weinstein, Xie, & Cleanthous, 1995; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

In one study of social interactions, meaning in life was predictive of being rated more positively by others in conversation skills, potential friendship, and likeability (Stillman et al., 2011). In the context of working environments, individuals who perceive greater meaning in their lives are also more likely to indicate fewer team problems, greater job satisfaction and team identification, better relationships with co-workers, more engagement and cooperation with the work team, and overall healthier group processes (Rosso et al., 2010). Meaning is also positively associated with openness to ideas, cognitive flexibility, altruism, compassion, warmness, positivity, and self-transcendence (Burrow, O’Dell, & Hill, 2009; King, 2012a, 2012b; Schnell, 2011; Steger et al., 2008).
Clearly, there is much interest in the area of meaning in social functioning, with findings suggestive of meaning’s importance to a range of social functioning variables. However, while there is an increasing number of studies focusing on the role of meaning in social functioning, there are only a few investigations examining the role of meaning in social interactions with out-group members, or individuals that are identified as belonging to a different group (e.g., social, cultural, or racial) (Burrow & Hill, 2013; Burrow, Stanley, Sumner, & Hill, 2014; Florez, Walsh, Bowden, Stewart, & Schulenberg, 2013). Considering that individuals relate differently with members of their own group (individuals that are considered to belong to the same self-identified group) when compared to members of different groups (Brewer & Harasty, 1996), it is important to also establish the role of meaning in these interactions. More specifically, given that perceived meaning is embedded in social processes that are culturally shaped and are said to be an essential part of an individual’s meaning framework, meaning could be implicated in basic processes of social identity and intergroup conflict (Florez et al., 2016). For instance, different groups or cultures may hold different values, different ideas as to what constitutes meaning and how meaning should be obtained. Thus, conflict could emerge when groups perceive threats to their sources or avenues to meaning (e.g., an individual that derives meaning from religious values might perceive a threat to meaning when interacting with an individual from an atheistic culture and engage in efforts to sustain meaning by increasing negative attitudes towards that individual). Conversely, given that meaning in life positively relates to self-transcendence, social proximity, prosocial behavior, altruism, and empathy, meaning could potentially facilitate better intergroup social relationships (Florez et al., 2016).

Although scarce, there is some research that supports the hypothesis that meaning-related components (values, goals, purpose) might facilitate better intergroup relationships. For instance,
Burrow and Hill (2013) designed a two-part study of undergraduates to examine whether purpose in life (a component of meaning related to meaningful goals that gives a sense of direction; Damon et al., 2003) buffers the effect of negative affect caused by exposure to racial and ethnically diverse groups. In their investigation, they used Frankl’s definition of purpose, which refers to the establishment of goals that help regulate behavior and foster a sense of meaning. In the first study, they found that individuals who endorsed a greater sense of purpose reported significantly less negative affect after being exposed to a situation in which the majority of individuals belonged to a different racial-ethnic group. In the second study, they found that when participants were asked to briefly write about purpose (e.g., future meaningful goals) prior to being exposed to diverse racial-ethnic groups, they were more likely to report significantly less distress after the same exposure task in comparison to a control group. Results suggested that purpose, a component of meaning, can potentially buffer against anxiety associated with interacting with people from other racial/ethnic groups.

Following up on these initial findings, Burrow et al. (2014) published an article that documented three studies of White individuals. The focus of the article was on the relationship between dispositional purpose (the tendency for people to self-direct themselves to attain meaningful goals) and comfort with racial-ethnic diversity. In the first study, the authors found that purpose significantly predicted greater comfort with diversity, even when controlling for individual differences such as sex, age, and out-group connectedness. In the second study, using an experimental condition, the authors elicited fear by presenting demographic statistics estimating the occurrence of a largely diverse society in the future. The experimenters found that purpose in life buffered against negative feelings originated by predicted demographic shifts. Thus, in the experimental group, participants who reported a stronger sense of purpose indicated
significantly less distress associated with thoughts of an increasingly diverse society. In the third study, participants were asked to decide if they would like to live in a predominately White neighborhood or a neighborhood characterized by racial-ethnic diversity. Participants engaged in a task priming a sense of purpose prior to making the decision were significantly more likely to choose a neighborhood characterized by racial-ethnic diversity than the control group.

The findings of Burrow and Hill (2013) and Burrow et al. (2014) suggest that purpose in life (considered in the study as a synonym for meaning in life) is a key variable in buffering against anxiety generated by exposure to out-group members, in these cases where “out-group” was defined by differences in racial-ethnic diversity, and consequently, promoting better intergroup interactions and comfort. In their discussion, Burrow et al. (2014) postulated that individuals endorsing greater purpose are more likely to focus on larger goals oriented to the well-being of others. Focusing on these meaningful goals could potentially reduce anxiety associated with encountering diversity. The authors suggested that purpose may allow people to discover significance in the context of diversity, thus affording opportunities to experience positive adaptation.

Furthermore, in the study of automatic stereotyping (the automatic activation of stereotypes towards other groups), Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, and Schaal (1999) found that people with lower levels of automatic stereotyping tended to activate chronic egalitarian goals (goals of equality and fairness for every social group) during stereotyping tasks that help to counteract automatic processes of stereotyping. Along the same lines, Sassenberg and Moskowitz (2005) found that by making individuals engage in tasks that called for creativity, they could decrease stereotypic associations among participants. These results suggest that automatic stereotyping can be reduced or regulated by activating implicit goals, such as the goal
of being creative. Moreover, implicit stereotyping can be diminished even when the goal is not related to a specific category (e.g., being egalitarian), but also when people possess a general goal to think differently (Sassenberg & Moskowitz, 2005).

Based on these findings, some researchers have argued that processes of automatic stereotyping are goal dependent, in other words, influenced by goal-driven behavior (Moskowitz et al., 1999; Pendry, 2013; Sassenberg & Moskowitz, 2005). Whether an individual experiences lower or higher levels of automatic stereotyping may be moderated based on whether there is a specific goal in place that can further help to overcome automatic stereotypes (Moskowitz et al., 1999; Pendry, 2013; Sassenberg & Moskowitz, 2005). Considering that the concept of meaning in life itself is associated with a given person’s engaging in goals that are consistent with his or her values, and in directing behaviors in line with these goals, people with higher levels of meaning are more likely to sustain goals consistent with personal beliefs and to attribute more significance to these goals (King, 2012a; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Rosso et al., 2010; Schnell, 2011; Sheldon, 2012; Steger, 2012; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010; Williams, 2012). At the same time, and as indicated previously, higher levels of meaning in life facilitate social and cognitive processes such as altruism (Steger et al., 2008), self-transcendence (Peterson & Park, 2012), social relatedness (Lambert et al., 2010; Steger & Kashdan, 2013; Steger et al., 2008), and cognitive flexibility (King, 2012a, 2012b). Theoretically, these social and cognitive processes could facilitate the cultivation of implicit goals that may function to override negative automatic stereotyping and, consequently, decrease negative attitudes towards other groups.

With this rationale, Florez et al. (2013) conducted a study to examine the association between meaning and intergroup biases and attitudes in a sample of White college students with regard to Black individuals. The authors found a statistically significant, negative correlation
between indices of prejudice (holding negative attitudes against Black individuals) and meaning in life. Specifically, greater levels of perceived meaning were associated with lower levels of negative attitudes, social dominance beliefs, and negative automatic stereotyping. Following these results, Florez, Schulenberg, and Stewart (2016) advocated for more rigorous and in-depth research as to the nature of the relationship between perceived meaning and processes of automatic stereotyping.

In a related investigation of these variables, Florez (2014), nonetheless, was unable to confirm a statistically significant, negative association between perceived meaning in life and automatic stereotyping in White individuals toward Black individuals. Upon further analysis employing a median split procedure, however, meaning in life was significantly and negatively correlated with automatic stereotyping in participants who displayed lower levels of automatic stereotyping. The same finding was not found for participants with higher levels of automatic stereotyping. Perceived meaning in life was only related to automatic stereotyping when individuals evidenced lower negative implicit beliefs toward Black individuals. Findings from this study highlighted the complexity involved in processes of automatic stereotyping. In the discussion, the possibility of a conditional relationship between meaning in life and out-group biases was suggested with regard to people with lower levels of automatic stereotyping (in comparison to those with greater levels of automatic stereotyping). Moreover, the mixed findings highlighted the importance of including variables that could influence processes of meaning related to intergroup biases and negative intergroup attitudes. One of the suggested variables that would theoretically influence this relationship is values. Prior to discussing in greater depth the role of meaning and values, the literature relating to racial prejudice is summarized.

Racial Prejudice
Race is a complex arbitrary social category that is based on family ancestry and distinctive physical characteristics such as skin color and facial features (Lewis, 2013; Winston, 2012). Individuals use their race to identify themselves, assess group membership of other individuals, and distinguish themselves from other groups (Winston, 2012). An individual’s race has great influence in social relationships (Lewis, 2013; Quillian, 2006; Winston, 2012). Namely, racial groups are associated with specific stereotypes and cultural differences that impact interactions within groups and foster positive or negative group relationships (Brown & Zagefka, 2005; Effron & Knowles, 2015; Quillian, 2006).

Throughout history, prejudice has been strongly associated with the social category of race (Brown & Zagefka, 2005; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Lewis, 2013). In the field of psychology, Allport (1954) was one of the first to draw attention to the problem of prejudice. In his work, he defined racial prejudice, or racism, as a group evaluation based on negative bias about another individual’s race. Other definitions expand on Allport’s view of prejudice and define it as holding unfavorable or negative attitudes towards particular individuals based on their group membership and stereotypes (Allport, 1954; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Dambrun & Guimond, 2004).

Prejudice is different than discrimination, in that the former refers to an attitude and the latter to a behavior (Allport, 1954; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Dambrun & Guimond, 2004). Thus, prejudice and prejudicial attitudes are interchangeable terms in the literature of intergroup biases. The concept of prejudice encompasses a cognitive and affective component that may or may not result in discrimination (acting on the prejudicial attitudes by offending people from other groups) (Kawakami, Dion, & Dovidio, 1998; Lambert et al., 2010). The cognitive component is related to bias associated with racial stereotypes (a set
of beliefs about a group), and the affective component is associated with the valence of feelings held towards a group (positive, neutral, or negative). Individuals can express racial prejudice at any time (Lambert et al., 2010; Lepore & Brown, 1997; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001). However, prejudice is especially active in the presence of members of ethnic or racial groups with which the negative stereotypes and attitudes are associated (Lambert et al., 2010; Lepore & Brown, 1997; Wittenbrink et al., 2001). Prejudice is shaped by mainstream cultural beliefs about out-groups, parental socialization regarding individuals of different races, media exposure, and direct negative interactions with members of other groups (Bodenhausen & Richeson, 2010; Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000).

In the United States of America (USA), racial prejudice continues to be a pervasive problem. Instances of individuals acting on prejudicial attitudes have been documented against immigrants and minority groups (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b; Danbold & Hue, 2015; Ross & Turner, 2005). In the USA, however, racial prejudice has been mostly documented as occurring against Black people (Charles & Guryan, 2008; Irizarry, 2012; Orsi, Margellos-Anast, & Whitman, 2010; Pager, 2007; Vaught, 2009). Due to a history of negative relationships between Black people and White people, racial classification of Black individuals occurs automatically and negative stereotypes are embedded within the culture (Dovidio & Gartner, 2004). In a recent national survey of individuals identifying as Black, a large percent of the sample perceived that racial prejudice has increased over time (Irizarry, 2012). Moreover, perceived demographic shifts reflecting an increased percentage of racial-ethnic minority people in the US have elicited new feelings of prejudice towards minority groups and immigrants (Craig, 2014a).
Problems of racial prejudice affect individuals and groups vastly (Orsi et al., 2010; Pewewardy & Severson, 2003; Vaught, 2009). At the group level, prejudicial attitudes are associated with discrimination, segregation, and group disparities that hinder socio-economic mobility for racial-ethnic minority groups (Lewis, 2013; McKay & McDaniel, 2006; Orsi et al., 2010; Pewewardy & Severson, 2003; Vaught, 2009). At the individual level, prejudice negatively affects a person’s self-image, and generates identity conflicts and feelings of resentment towards other groups (Major, Quinton, & McCoy, 2002; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002; Winston, 2012).

Additionally, individuals that are victims of discrimination engage in self-protective strategies such as avoiding contact with members of other groups, distracting themselves from thinking about prejudice, confronting people acting on prejudicial beliefs, and escaping from uncomfortable situations (Swim, Cohen, Hyers, & Swim, 1998; Winston, 2012). As a means of compensating for the effects of racism, individuals also engage in self-enhancing behaviors such as increased proximity to members of their own group and favoritism towards in-group practices (Major et al., 2002; Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002; Winston, 2012). This in turn reinforces tensions between groups and generates internal conflict with respect to self-image and racial identity (Major et al., 2002; Winston, 2012).

Recent empirical findings have shown that prejudice can be either implicit or explicit (Devine, 2001; Latu et al., 2011).Implicit prejudice refers to the automatic activation of negative attitudes towards members of a specific group (Devine, 2001; Latu et al., 2011). This activation is not within the awareness of the individual, and thus, is out of his or her control (Devine, 2001; Latu et al., 2011). On the other hand, explicit prejudice occurs when people consciously hold a negative attitude toward an individual or group (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). The relationship
between implicit and explicit prejudice has shown mixed results (Dambrun & Guimond, 2004; Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; Spears & Tausch, 2013). In some studies, individuals holding greater implicit prejudice also report higher explicit prejudice (Dambrun & Guimond, 2004; Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; Spears & Tausch, 2013). However, in other studies the relationship is non-existent or negatively correlated (Dambrun & Guimond, 2004; Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; Spears & Tausch, 2013). Considering that implicit prejudice is not within the awareness of the individual, findings suggest that even people with lower levels of explicit prejudice can experience some automatic prejudice due to the pervasiveness of negative stereotypes (Devine, 2001; Latu et al., 2011).

Another recent phenomenon is that increased awareness of racial prejudice, coupled with current efforts to decrease discrimination, has generated feelings of ambiguity in individuals that hold prejudicial attitudes (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Dovidio, 2001; Ellemers & Barreto, 2009; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). These mixed feelings about racism are associated with new forms of prejudice in which the beliefs of individuals towards other races might be inconsistent with their behaviors or reports (e.g., a person that holds negative attitudes towards Black people hides prejudicial beliefs, and in turn reports to be indifferent to the topic) (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). The theory of modern racism highlights this conflict between social desirability, egalitarian values, negative stereotypes and anti-Black biases (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Dovidio, 2001). By way of example, an individual that thinks that Black people are dangerous, but also believes in fairness and social justice, might find himself or herself in a situation that generates a conflict of beliefs. As a result, he or she might engage in explicit attempts to control prejudice or hide prejudice in contexts in which he or she might be judged. He or she might also engage in more subtle forms of racial prejudice such as avoiding contact
with out-group members or acting differently around people from different racial groups (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Ellemers & Barreto, 2009; Rodenburg & Boisen, 2013).

Concepts such as aversive racism, modern racism, and motivation to control prejudice have emerged to explain these contemporary forms of racial prejudice (Akrami, Ekehammar, & Araya, 2000; Miglieta, Gattino, & Esses, 2014; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gartner, 2009). Presumably, a traditional form of racial prejudice refers to a time when individuals were perceived to be biologically or innately superior to individuals from another racial category (Ellemers & Barreto, 2009; Pearson et al., 2009). For instance, this was the form of racism that justify slavery, the Holocaust, and segregation. Modern racism, in turn, refers to an expression of prejudice because of a perceived superiority in values, beliefs, and lifestyle (Berg, 2013; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). The more explicit form of modern racism is known as symbolic racism, which refers to the idea of moral superiority of White individuals over Black individuals (Berg, 2013; Sears & Henry, 2003).

Among other forms of racial prejudice, a distinction is also made between dominative racism and aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000, 2004; Pearson et al., 2009). The former form of racism corresponds to individuals that blatantly and explicitly recognize feelings of superiority and negative attitudes towards a given racial group. This is associated with a more traditional expression of racism (Pearson et al., 2009). In contrast, aversive racism describes individuals that support racial equality, but still endorse automatic prejudice and negative stereotypes towards another group (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000, 2004). Often, these individuals feel shame and guilt when negative beliefs about a racial group are activated (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). The consequence of aversive racism is intergroup anxiety followed by active avoidance of interracial relationships and unconscious negative attitudes towards out-group
members (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005). These unconscious attitudes negatively influence the service provided to Black individuals in legal and health contexts, and also in situations characterized by ambiguity (e.g., when there is not enough information to judge the behavior of another; Dovidio et al., 2008; Rodenborg & Boisen, 2013).

Another form of subtle prejudice occurs when individuals deny the existence and negative implications of prejudicial attitudes towards racial-ethnic minorities (Miglietta, Gattino, & Esses, 2014; Swim et al., 1998). In this form of prejudice, individuals express disapproval for regulations favoring minority group members, blaming the targeted group as being responsible for perpetuating intergroup conflict and group disparities (Miglietta et al., 2014; Swim et al., 1998). This form of prejudice reinforces an ongoing tension between White and Black individuals, which in turn negatively influences the willingness of in-group members to interact with out-group members (Miglietta et al., 2014). Moreover, group members that endorse this form of prejudice are less likely to support policies designed to decrease the economic gap between privileged and less privileged groups (Miglietta et al., 2014).

Theories of Racial Prejudice and Intergroup Conflict

There are several theories that attempt to explain the phenomenon of racial prejudice. Among the most accepted theories is social categorization theory (Wittenbrink, Hilton, & Gist, 1998). This theory asserts that negative stereotypes and in-group biases constitute the foundation of prejudice (Pendry, 2013; Spears & Tausch, 2013; Uhlmann & Nosek, 2012). Within this framework, it is maintained that individuals have a natural tendency to categorize others as either being an in-group member or an out-group member, and based on this, to engage in more negative social bias against the out-group and more positive bias towards the in-group (Pendry, 2013; Spears & Tausch, 2013).
Some of the social biases that form the basis of prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior are the ultimate attribution error (Coleman, 2013; Spears & Tausch, 2013), the illusory correlation effect (Murphy, Schmeer, Vallée-Tourangeau, Mondragón, & Hilton, 2011), and the out-group homogeneity effect (Brauer, 2001). The ultimate attribution error proposes that individuals have the tendency to favor the in-group when explaining negative behavior. For instance, for in-group members attributions of negative behavior tend to be directed to situational factors, whereas for out-group members attributions tend to be directed to individual and group variables. This means that explanations of the negative behavior of out-group members are more likely to be attributed to dispositional traits embedded in the group itself (see Coleman, 2013). The illusory correlation is the tendency to falsely believe that two variables are associated because they occurred at the same time or because of the saliency of their association. In social interactions this translates to the tendency to assign an attribute to a group, when in fact the attribute is not associated in any meaningful way with the social category of race (e.g., White people overestimating the number of Black people involved in crimes or Black people overestimating Black deaths by White police officers) (Murphy et al., 2011). The out-group homogeneity effect refers to the tendency of perceiving lower variability in members of other groups (e.g., White individuals being perceived by Black people as all being the same, and vice versa). These biases further generate strong feelings of favoritism, pride, perceived superiority, and loyalty towards one’s own group (Brewer, 1999; Effron & Knowles, 2015). These strong, positive sentiments towards in-group members are also referred to as ethnocentrism (Effron & Knowles, 2015). The natural bias against other groups also relates to a greater tendency to endorse negative stereotypes against other groups (Effron & Knowles, 2015).
Allport (1954) also suggested that prejudice is rooted in the Principle of Least Effort. The principle refers to the tendency to use stereotypical information to guide interactions with out-group members in order to avoid conducting individual analyses. By doing this, people save time (not having to engage in greater efforts to know a given person) and protect themselves from potential negative interactions (Winston, 2012). In fact, prejudice seems to meet the evolutionary function of protecting members of one’s own group, also setting boundaries to limit prosocial and altruistic behavior to members of one’s own group (Brewer, 1999). From an evolutionary perspective, a negative bias towards other groups allows people to justify not sharing with or otherwise helping other groups, which in turn allows people to save resources to maximize the chances that their group will survive (Brewer, 1999; De Dreu, 2010).

The human need to be a part of a group and be distinct from one another also underlies the process of prejudice. Empirical findings have shown that social differentiation is important to maintain group cohesiveness and guarantee benefits of cooperation within the group (Brewer, 1999). Negative out-group biases also allow individuals to feel special and distinct from other people, satisfying identity needs (Brewer, 1999; Effron & Knowles, 2015). From a more contemporary perspective, prejudice serves the function of maintaining a social hierarchy (Eagly & Diekman, 2005). Prejudice reduces empathy, allows people to engage in discriminatory behavior, separates individuals from one another, and enables people to engage in efforts to guarantee the social dominance of their group (Winston, 2012).

Other theories of group conflict have emphasized the importance of perceived threat between groups (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006). The realistic group conflict theory poses that the presence of intergroup conflict is caused by a perceived threat that jeopardizes the well-being of a group and compromises common tangible (e.g., money, land) and non-tangible (e.g., power,
control) resources (Riek et al., 2006). The realistic group conflict theory has been validated in several studies in which participants hold negative attitudes toward a group as a result of goal conflicts (Beaton & Tougas, 2001; Riek et al., 2006). This theory has been used to explain the more traditional form of prejudice. In terms of symbolic racism (Whites are morally superior to Blacks or vice-versa), symbolic racism theory argues that a conflict of values and beliefs underlies contemporary forms of racism (Berg, 2013; Sears & Henry, 2003). According to this theory, when individuals perceive that out-group members hold values or beliefs that are a threat to the members of the in-group, they endorse prejudice and hostility towards that group (Berg, 2013; Riek et al., 2006; Sears & Henry, 2003).

To account for these theories, the intergroup threat theory has integrated the realistic group conflict theory and the theory of symbolic racism (Riek et al., 2006). In the intergroup threat theory both realistic threats (i.e., fighting over resources) and value conflicts explain negative attitudes between groups (Riek et al., 2006; Tur-Kaspa & Schwarzwald, 2003). Additionally, this theory asserts that negative stereotypes and intergroup anxiety (feelings of discomfort when interacting with members of other groups) also account for racial prejudice (Stephan et al., 2002; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). In the case of stereotypes and intergroup anxiety there is a perceived threat of a potential negative outcome when people interact with members of other groups (Plant & Devine, 2003). Several studies have supported these four factors (realistic threats, value conflicts, negative stereotypes, and intergroup anxiety) as predictors of perceived intergroup threat, which in turn predicts greater prejudice (McLaren, 2003; Miller & Effron, 2010; Wilson, 2001).

The cognitive mechanism that has been suggested to explain the relationship between perceived threat and prejudice is called the licensing effect (Miller & Effron, 2010). The
licensing effect refers to justifying acting on prejudicial attitudes when out-group behaviors or values represent a threat to the in-group (Riek et al., 2006). Along the same lines, the norm of group interest (Effron & Knowles, 2015) indicates that it is acceptable to engage in prejudice against another group when these attitudes are said to benefit or prevent damage to the in-group (Effron & Knowles, 2015).

Apart from intergroup threat, empirical findings indicate that another strong predictor of prejudice is parental racial attitudes (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Dixon et al., 2010; Duriez & Soenens, 2009; Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009). When parents express prejudice against other groups, children are more likely to endorse the same bias in the future. Interestingly, this association appears to be stronger in adolescents when compared to pre-adolescents (Dixon et al., 2010). Results suggest that individuals are more influenced by a parent’s negative racial opinions in their teen years. Other predictors of prejudice are authoritarianism (valuing submission to authority and order; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), an individual’s group identification (Brown & Zagefka, 2005), and group cohesiveness and homogeneity (Effron & Knowles, 2015; Newheiser, Tausch, Dovidio, & Hewstone, 2009).

Religious beliefs have also been associated with prejudice. The relationship between religion and prejudice appears to be mediated by cognitive rigidity (Shen, Yelder, Haggard, & Rowatt, 2013), right-wing authoritarianism, radical religious beliefs, and higher need for cognition and closure (Brandt & Reyna, 2010; Hill, Terrel, Cohen, & Nagoshi, 2010; Johnson et al., 2011). Believing in God has been associated with prejudice against groups of individuals with conflicting values (Shen et al., 2013). On the other hand, individuals that consider themselves to be spiritually-oriented, reporting flexibility of religious beliefs and a drive for
spiritual knowledge, endorse lower levels of prejudice (Hunsinger, Livingston, & Isbell, 2014; Shen et al., 2013).

Another important factor influencing the expression of prejudice is motivation to control prejudice (Chen, Moons, Gather, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2014; Glaser & Knowles, 2008; Maddux, Barden, Brewer, & Petty, 2005). Motivation to control prejudice refers to an individual’s efforts to engage in behaviors to reduce and oppose prejudicial attitudes and beliefs (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002). This motivation can be internal or external (Plant & Devine, 1998). Internal motivation to control prejudice is defined as an intrinsic, genuine motivation to be fair and egalitarian with individuals from other races (Plant & Devine, 1998). An external motivation, on the other hand, is defined as a motivation to regulate the expression of prejudice to avoid social punishment (Chen et al., 2014; Plant & Devine, 1988). Thus, intrinsic motivation to control prejudice tends to be value driven, whereas external motivation tends to be socially driven. The former occurs automatically and is associated with greater interracial contact (Devine et al., 2002; Glaser & Knowles, 2008; Maddux et al., 2005). In the latter instance, individuals show greater prejudice and avoid contact with individuals from other races (Chen et al., 2014).

To summarize, when it comes to prejudice there appear to be different underlying factors that justify the existence of prejudicial attitudes (Akrami et al., 2000; Miglieta, Gattino, & Esses, 2014; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gartner, 2009). Furthermore, negative bias can vary to extremes. Prejudice can be presented in the form of blatant racism or as mild subtle racism in which individuals avoid contact with other groups (Akrami et al., 2000; Miglieta et al., 2014; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gartner, 2009). Moreover, regardless of the form of prejudice, holding negative attitudes towards other groups increases the likelihood of pervasive intergroup conflict and
significant negative consequences for the most vulnerable group (Lewis, 2013; McKay & McDaniel, 2006; Orsi et al., 2010; Pewewardy & Severson, 2003; Vaught, 2009). As a consequence, during the last decade significant efforts have been directed to develop research with respect to effective interventions to reduce racial prejudice and facilitate better intergroup interactions.

Interventions to Reduce Racial Prejudice

The most well-known strategy to reduce prejudice is based on the contact hypothesis (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2011; Dixon et al., 2010; Hodson, 2011; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The contact hypothesis poses that participating in interracial relationships decreases out-group biases and prejudice. Increased contact with members of other groups buffers against prejudice by decreasing perceived out-group threat and increasing out-group trust (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2011; Hodson, Harry, & Mitchell, 2009; Dixon et al., 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Overall, empirical findings have supported this hypothesis showing that increased contact with members of other groups reduces racial prejudice (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009; Dixon et al., 2010; Hodson et al., 2009; for a review see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Furthermore, positive intergroup contact significantly reduces the effect of parental racial prejudice and authoritarianism in adolescents (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2012; Hodson et al., 2009; for a review see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Nonetheless, it appears that in specific instances being in contact with members from other groups can generate even greater prejudice (Dixon et al., 2010; Irizarry, 2012; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). For example, some studies have shown that when Black individuals move to a neighborhood that is largely represented by White individuals, they are increasingly exposed to prejudice and more likely to hold bias against White individuals (Craig & Richeson, 2014a,
This study evidences that only in residential neighborhoods that are racially balanced will contact be effective in reducing intergroup biases (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b).

Moreover, empirical findings suggest that the contact hypothesis applies differently to White people than to Black people (Dixon et al., 2010; Irizarry, 2012). Presumably, with Black people, increased contact with White people does not significantly affect beliefs about the negative intentions and prejudicial biases of White people (Irizarry, 2012; Tropp, 2007). As mentioned before, for Black people increased interracial contact can be associated with more opportunities to be discriminated against when Black individuals still represent a minority (Hagan, Shedd, & Payne, 2005; Ross & Turner, 2005). Additionally, from the perspective of minority groups there is scarce research that specifies the conditions under which contact with other racial members significantly reduces prejudice (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b; Irizarry, 2012).

Another limitation of the contact hypothesis is that contact is often hindered by intergroup anxiety (Irizarry, 2012; Riek et al., 2006). It has been documented that White individuals avoid interracial contact with minority groups due to anxiety related to negative stereotypes or a history of negative experiences with out-group members (Dhont, Roets, & Van Hiel, 2011; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). Alternatively, Black individuals also avoid contact with White people as a result of anxiety associated with vulnerability to being discriminated against and feelings of resentment (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b; Outten, Schmitt, Miller, & Garcia, 2012). Therefore, in spite of evidence supporting intergroup contact as a means of decreasing prejudice, there are other factors that hinder an individual’s willingness to interact with members of other racial groups (Dhont et al., 2011; Perry, Dovidio, Murphy, & Van Ryn, 2015; Riek et al., 2006).
With this in mind, some interventions have focused on the effects of re-categorizing out-group individuals based on other relevant characteristics (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). To enhance quality of contact, for example, de-categorizing the construct of race by identifying differences among out-group individuals, and focusing on the distinctiveness of each person, has shown some positive effect in reducing biases (Hewstone et al., 2002). Nonetheless, this strategy has limitations. Changes in biases might not generalize to other members of the out-group when individualizing the out-group member, and thus, might not reduce overall prejudice but only attitudes related to a specific individual (Hewstone et al., 2002).

Creating a new category (superordinate category) based on commonalities between groups (i.e., a classification that includes similarities between Black and White individuals) has also been associated with lower prejudice (Geartner et al., 2000; Hunsinger et al., 2014). However, this approach has been criticized because the formation of a new category based on similarities is likely to overlook obvious intergroup differences (e.g., skin color, customs) and as a result fails to produce long-term changes in bias (Hewstone et al., 2002). A contrary approach to reduce bias has focused on making more salient the distinctiveness of each group (Hewstone et al., 2002). This approach argues that highlighting positive differences between groups, and thus each group’s unique contribution in interactions, has a greater effect in generalization of positive biases and maintenance of negative bias reduction. However, this approach also has disadvantages as it has the potential of strengthening boundaries between groups by highlighting differences between groups and failing to emphasize similarities among groups. Therefore, empirical findings show the need for a more comprehensive perspective on the phenomenon of racial prejudice and intergroup biases (Hewstone et al., 2002).
Other efforts to reduce racial prejudice have been allocated to education in high schools and colleges (Pettijohn & Walzer, 2008; Radloff, 2010). Multicultural classes that explicitly address racial prejudice are associated with decreased negative stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes. Education in multicultural issues is also related to increased multicultural awareness in college students (Cole, Case, Rios, & Curtin, 2011; Pettijohn & Walzer, 2008; Radloff, 2010; Umbach & Kuh, 2006). Nonetheless, the introduction of multicultural classes in college has been questioned. Van Ryn and Saha (2011) suggested that educating people to counteract bias is ineffective if the anxiety related with interracial contact is not addressed. Furthermore, these studies lack randomized control trials to validate multicultural courses as an effective intervention to decrease racial prejudice (Gassner & McGuigan, 2014).

Reductions in prejudice have also been associated with contexts that promote positive out-group bias and empathy towards other groups (Hunsinger et al., 2014; Wittenbrink et al., 2001). Interventions increasing empathy through perspective-taking have been shown to significantly reduce negative stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes (Dovidio et al., 2004; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Shih, Wang, Trahan Bucher, & Stotzer, 2009; Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003). Novel interventions have also focused on the benefits of broader individual practices to indirectly reduce prejudice. For instance, some studies indicate that meditation practices and mindfulness are associated with reductions in prejudicial attitudes and racial bias (Gervais & Hoffman, 2013; Djikic, Langer, & Stapleton, 2008; Hunsinger et al., 2014). In one study the relationship between meditation and lower prejudice was found to be completely mediated by higher empathy reported by individuals that practice meditation (Vescio et al., 2003).

Less attention has been paid to interventions that aim to increase individual characteristics associated with reduced prejudice (Locke, MacLeod, & Walker, 1994). Although
several studies have shown that individual characteristics such as self-esteem (Barden, Maddux, Petty, & Brewer, 2004; Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001), chronic egalitarian goals (Moskowitz, Solomon, & Taylor, 2000), empathy (Vescio et al., 2003), personal values (Chambers, Schlenker, & Collisson, 2012), and personality differences (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008) also play a role in the expression of prejudice, there is scarce research exploring the nature of these relationships. Given the limited efficacy of current interventions designed to decrease prejudice, new and innovative approaches to understand and alleviate this continuing social problem are needed (Hewstone et al., 2002; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

One unexplored approach to reducing prejudice is the study of perceived meaning in life. As mentioned in the literature review of meaning, meaning is embedded in the core of human functioning (Heine et al., 2006; Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010). Individuals are consistently looking to sustain meaning and interpret situations based on their meaning framework (Heine et al., 2006; Proulx, 2013; Sheldon, 2012; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010). Thus, it makes sense to assert that attitudes and beliefs towards other groups ought to be related to aspects of meaning. Moreover, culture and social interactions are related to meaning-making processes in basic, fundamental ways (Fave & Coppa, 2009; Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Stillman et al., 2009). Culture dictates vastly what is meaningful to the individual, and social proximity represents a significant predictor of greater meaning (Stillman et al., 2009; Van Beest & Williams, 2006; Williams, 2012; Zadro, Boland, & Richardson, 2006). Therefore, meaning is socially shaped, representing cultural processes that are likely to influence in-group and out-group relationships.

In a different vein, meaning in life can potentially reduce prejudice by promoting behaviors, values, and beliefs that stand in contrast to holding negative evaluations towards other
groups (Burrow & Hill, 2013; Burrow, O’Dell, & Hill, 2009; Burrow et al., 2014; King, 2012a, 2012b; Steger et al., 2008). Given that meaning is associated with healthy social interactions, cognitive flexibility (King, 2012a, 2012b), prosocial behavior, altruism (Peterson & Park, 2012; Peterson et al., 2005; Schnell, 2011; Vella-Brodrick et al., 2009; Williams, 2012; Zadro et al., 2006) and greater comfort with diversity, greater meaning could enhance the quality of intergroup relationships and a person’s willingness to engage in contact with out-group members (Burrow & Hill, 2013; Burrow et al., 2014). Along the same lines, because the psychological functions of meaning are similar to some of the psychological functions of prejudice (distinctiveness, symbolic mortality, group belonging), meaning may provide an adaptive and indirect route to meet such needs, and as a result, reduce the need for prejudicial attitudes and negative stereotyping (Florez et al., 2016). So, meaning is potentially a key variable in reducing intergroup anxiety, promoting goals associated with the welfare of others, and having better adjustment when being exposed to ethnically diverse groups (see also Burrow & Hill, 2013 and Burrow et al., 2014).

In the few studies that have explored the relationship between meaning and prejudice, the results are promising, indicating that meaning could potentially facilitate positive intergroup relationships by reducing anxiety generated by threats to group identity, facilitating goals that promote the welfare of others, and providing a personal purpose that goes beyond personal gains. As stated previously, in Florez’s (2014) initial work in this area, the role that values plays in prejudice was suggested to be particularly important in this complex relationship. Considering that some individuals might hold values related to greater racial prejudice (e.g., traditionalism, authoritarianism), it logically follows that such individuals derive meaning from prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior, as it aligns with their values. On the contrary, in
individuals that hold values that are opposed to prejudicial attitudes (egalitarianism, fairness, openness), meaning should be associated with lower negative attitudes towards other groups, as it is consistent with their values. Thus, it seems clear that social values influence the relationship between meaning and racial prejudice. Before expanding on the aim of the present study, the values literature is reviewed, including values’ relationship with meaning and prejudice.

Values

Values constitute a central concept in the study of individual and social motivations. Values are defined as abstract and enduring principles that guide an individual’s behavior and transcend situations, objects, and relationships (Allicock, Sandelowski, DeVellis, & Campbell, 2008; Schwartz, 1992, 2007). They represent intrinsic preferable goals, desirable end-states, and personal and cultural aspirations that vary among individuals and groups (Allicock et al., 2008). Values relate to, but are different than, attitudes (Piurko, Schwartz, & Davidov, 2011). Values are pervasive across situations and objects, whereas attitudes refer to favorability towards particular objects. Thus, values encompass a higher-order category that is at the core of an individual’s beliefs system (Piurko et al., 2011).

Social values refer to the set of values shared by a social group (Schwartz, 2007; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). These values determine what is important for the group, and guide behavior and decision-making processes within the group (Gouveia, Milfont, & Guerra, 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). Individual and social values are often aligned (Gouveia et al., 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014; Van Quaquebeke, Graf, Kerschreiter, Schuh, & Van Dick, 2014). As a process of socialization, individuals acquire values that are important to their in-group to conform to society (Van Quaquebeke et al., 2014). These social values influence an individual’s self-concept and identity. Thus, individual values are strongly shaped by social
norms (Gouveia et al., 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2014). Moreover, values vary within individuals and groups. Each individual and group has a different hierarchy of values that establishes priority of ideals and the importance of each value relative to other values (Feather & McKee, 2008; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2014).

An important characteristic of values is that they are intrinsically reinforcing (Plumb, Stewart, Dahl, & Lundgren, 2009). When an individual engages in a situation in which his or her values are actualized, he or she feels a sense of personal satisfaction that transcends any tangible outcome of the situation (Feather & McKee, 2008; Plumb et al., 2009; Wallace, 2014). Across different contexts and situations, it is expected that most of the time individuals match their behaviors to their values to gain a sense of satisfaction and personal coherence (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992; Sheldon & Krieger, 2014). Similarly, a discrepancy between values and behaviors is perceived as punishing (Roccas, Sagiv, Oppenheim, Elster, & Gal, 2013).

Values are also reinforced by others. When acting upon values, individuals receive approval from society and in-group members that hold similar ideologies (Roccas et al., 2013). By providing group approval, the importance of social values is maintained and groups guarantee endurance and continuity of beliefs and principles (Dobewall, Aavik, Konstabel, Schwartz, & Realo, 2014; Knafo & Schwartz, 2001, 2003). Based on this premise, groups constantly provide individuals with opportunities to display value-behavior congruence. This in turn allows individuals to experience self-affirmation, as well as strengthens their sense of self-concept and group belonging (Roccas et al., 2013; Wallace, 2014).

Values are also sensitive to contexts (Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). The importance of values changes as a function of environmental cues that make one value more salient than another (Chartier et al., 2009; Roccas et al., 2013; Schwartz, 1992; Tsirogianni & Sammut,
For example, a freshman college student who previously held values of family over values of friendship might re-organize his or her hierarchy of values to emphasize the importance of peer relationships, something more valuable within the context of college. Therefore, some values may be more or less salient, or applicable, depending on the characteristics of the environment (Schwartz, 1992; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). Moreover, one situation can be relevant to multiple values (Schwartz, 1992; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). For instance, exercise can be associated with several values such as fitness, discipline, and health. In some circumstances, values’ relevance can conflict with one another and the actualization of one value compromises the actualization of another value (Allicock et al., 2008). For example, family values and professional values can come into conflict when individuals make career decisions. In this situation, individuals need to evaluate their values hierarchy for that specific moment in life. Individuals can also adjust their hierarchy of values to justify behaviors and decrease dissonance (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

Overall, being consistent with values is influenced by environmental factors such as relationships, culture, developmental stage, and situational circumstances (Chartier et al., 2009). The link between values and behavior varies across individuals (Hackett, 2014; Maio, Olson, Allen, & Bernard, 2001). Empirical findings suggest that when individuals do not reflect on their values the link between values and behavior is weaker. In contrast, when individuals understand the importance of personal values the link appears to be stronger (Hackett, 2014; Maio & Olson, 1998; Strelan & McKee, 2014). Furthermore, people that are less influenced by context display more value consistency across situations than individuals that are constantly monitoring situations to adapt their behaviors to environmental demands (Maio & Olson, 1998). In the latter case, individual values may be more context-dependent, and thus, group values might be
perceived as more important when other members of the same group are present (Hackett, 2014). In general, the more relevant values are for the individual, the higher the likelihood of value-congruent behavior (Hackett, 2014; Maio et al., 2001).

It also appears that the discrepancy between values and behavior can result in distress and problem behaviors (Plumb et al., 2009; Wallace, 2014). In fact, research findings demonstrate that there is a greater prevalence of value-behavior incongruence in individuals experiencing high levels of discomfort associated with mental health issues (Allicock et al., 2008; Chartier et al., 2009; Wallace, 2014). Furthermore, commitment to values and values clarification is often useful to promote change in people who engage in substance use, unhealthy habits, high-risk behaviors, or otherwise undesirable behavior (Allicock et al., 2008; Chartier et al., 2009; Dahl, Plumb, Stewart, & Lundgren, 2009; Fischer, 2011; Schwartz, 2006, 2007; Verkasalo, Lönnqvist, Lipsanen, & Helkama, 2008; Wallace, 2014).

In summary, values are a fundamental aspect of human functioning, whether at the individual or group level (Piurko et al., 2011; Schwartz, 1992, 2007). They are a function of social norms, individual preferences, and group values (Piurko et al., 2011; Schwartz, 1992, 2007). The strength of value-behavior consistency varies within individuals (Hackett, 2014). However, it appears that value-behavior congruency is a motivational factor with respect to reaffirming an individual’s self-concept (Gouveia et al., 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2014). Moreover, social values play a pivotal role in maintaining social organization and communicating what is important to the group (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014).

In the social sciences, Schwartz’s theory of values constitutes the dominant conceptualization of individual and social values. His model of values has been validated in
studies cross-culturally (Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). For the purpose of this study, his theory will be adapted to conceptualize and measure types of social values.

Schwartz’s Model of Values

Different theoretical models have been proposed to explain the nature of individual and social values. Rokeach’s theory of values was one of the starting points for the conceptualization of values as an organized system of abstract ideals (Rokeach, 1973; Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). Rokeach (1973) proposed two different types of values: instrumental and terminal values. According to Rokeach, instrumental values refer to those values that are important to the degree that they are necessary to attain terminal values (Gouveia et al., 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). In turn, terminal values represent a desirable end-state for the individual (Gouveia et al., 2014; Tsirogianni & Sammut, 2014). By way of an example, consider a person who holds a terminal value of power. To obtain power, this person may find it essential to value education and hard work. Education and hard work were not originally important to the individual in this case; however, to the degree that those values are instrumental to achieve a desired ultimate goal, they are integrated into the person’s value system (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989).

Deviating from Rokeach’s emphasis on instrumental and terminal values, Schwartz developed a model of values that is present across cultures with varying degrees of importance (Schwartz, 1992, 2011). Schwartz argued that the role of values is to satisfy three kinds of human needs: biological (oriented to survival requirements), relational (the need for interactions with others), and group needs (to protect group welfare) (Schwartz, 1994). Based on these motivations, Schwartz proposed a model of individual and social values organized in a circular structure representing a continuum of human motivations (see Figure 1; Schwartz, 2011, 2012). According to Schwartz (1992), each value represents a unique motivational goal or desirable
end-state. Values that are closer to each other in the circular structure are more compatible (complementary) than values that are further away (Schwartz, 1992, 1994, 2012). In turn, values that are opposite to each other in the structure are viewed as conflicting in terms of their intrinsic goals (Schwartz, 1992, 1994, 2012).

In Schwartz’s model there are 10 universal values that are organized across two overarching bipolar dimensions. The 10 individual values are power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security (definitions for each term are provided in Table 1). The first overarching bipolar dimension corresponds to the value of self-transcendence (universalism, benevolence) versus the value of self-enhancement (power, achievement) (Schwartz, 1994). The value of self-transcendence encompasses values that are oriented to promote others’ welfare, understanding, and appreciation. The value of self-enhancement, on the other hand, relates to efforts oriented to attain personal interests regardless of others. The second bipolar values dimension is openness (self-direction, stimulation) versus conservation (security, tradition, conformity) (Schwartz, 1994). Openness emphasizes values oriented to explore new ideas and experiences as well as appreciation of change. On the contrary, conservation refers to preferences of social order, maintenance of status, and avoidance of threat. Hedonism is located between the dimensions of self-enhancement and openness to change (Schwartz, 1992, 1994, 2012).

Schwartz’s theory of values has become widely accepted, as it has garnered impressive empirical support (Fisher, 2011; Schwartz, 2006, 2007, 2011). Research conducted with more than 70 cultures has supported the relationships proposed in the model (Schwartz, 1992, 1994, 2012; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995; Struch, Schwartz, & van der Kloot, 2002). Thus, as hypothesized via the circular structure, values that are closer to one another are correlated higher than values
that are located further away from one another. Moreover, as anticipated in the bipolar dimension, opposite values are negatively and significantly associated (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004). The model has also shown utility in predicting behaviors that are consistent with an individual’s values such as volunteerism, behavior directed to protect the environment, and actions aimed to enhance personal safety (Barnea, 2003; Caprara, Schwartz, Capanna, Vecchione, & Barbaranelli, 2006; Piurko et al., 2011).

Despite the empirical support of the initial model, Schwartz et al. (2012) recently proposed a refined version. In the new version of the model he gives more emphasis to the idea of values existing on a continuum. Moreover, he clarified that the organization of the circular structure was arbitrarily partitioned for research purposes. He argued that, in reality, values overlap and operate on a continuum to fulfill basic motivations. In his refined theory, Schwartz proposed the existence of 19 value facets (see Table 2 for definitions). He refined some of the original values, introduced some new ones, and sub-divided some of the more general values into narrower values to better differentiate what each of them entails. For instance, in the updated model, face and humility were introduced as two different values. With this, Schwartz increased the conceptual definition of each value (see Table 2). Schwartz put forward a hierarchical organization of values that goes from more narrow categories to higher-order dimensions (Figure 1). These higher-order dimensions further include the more specific values. The 19 values are placed in the first level and are sub-dimensions of the 10 original values, which form the second level. The third level corresponds to the bipolar dimensions of self-transcendence versus self-enhancement and openness to change versus conservation, with these concepts comprised of the 19 values (Cieciuch, Davidov, Vecchione, & Schwartz, 2014; Schwartz et al., 2012).
The model was also updated because researchers demonstrated that some psychometric issues existed in the old model, particularly relating to low internal consistency reliabilities in some of the higher-order factors, multicollinearity of compatible values, and items loading onto more than one dimension (Davidov, Schmidt, & Schwartz, 2008; Knoppen & Saris, 2009; Schwartz et al., 2012). To address these flaws, Schwartz refined his theory of values (developing the 19 values and three-tier structure). He also designed a new scale that better assesses his conceptualization of values: the Portrait Values Questionnaire – Revised (PVQ-RR; Schwartz, 2012). In this new scale, Schwartz corresponds items with the underlying motivation of each proposed value (Schwartz et al., 2012). Moreover, he increased the number of values to 19 to decrease multicollinearity amongst the values and provide increasingly clear boundaries within values that appear to overlap in their definitions (see Table 2). For each value, in order to increase the internal consistency reliabilities of the indexes, Schwartz also created a more homogeneous set of items.

Confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses support the three-tier structure of the model (Beierlein, Davidov, Schmidt, Schwartz, & Rammstedt, 2012; Cieciuch et al., 2014; Cieciuch & Schwartz, 2012; Davidov et al., 2008; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004; Vecchione, Casconi, & Barbaranelli, 2009). In addition, and as intended, empirical findings indicate that the PVQ-RR has greater predictive power and higher internal consistency reliability coefficients than its predecessor (Cieciuch et al., 2014; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014; Schwartz et al., 2012).

Schwartz’s values classification has been useful in predicting a variety of behaviors and preferences (Maio, Pakizeh, Cheung, & Rees, 2009; Sagiv, Sverdlik, & Schwarz, 2011; Verplanken & Holland, 2002). For example, values predict a healthier lifestyle (Karel, 2000), enjoyment derived from work lives (Allicock et al., 2008), better academic grades (Allicock et
al., 2008), leadership approaches (Groves, 2014), activist behavior (Groves, 2014), time spent volunteering (Shantz, Saksida, & Alfes, 2014), parenting styles (Knafo & Schwartz, 2003), and friendly environmental attitudes (Nilsson, Hansla, & Biel, 2014). The study of values has been particularly important with respect to predicting attitudes associated with high or low levels of prejudice.

Values and Prejudice

In the area of prejudice, several researchers have argued that values lie at the core of intergroup conflict as well as anti-bias attitudes (Berg, 2013; Feather & McKee, 2008; Sears & Henry, 2003). From theories of prejudice, an individual’s perception of a threat to group values results in prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. Specifically, symbolic racism sustains that modern racism differs from traditional racism in that it is a consequence of value conflicts between groups and a sense of superior morality (Berg, 2013; Sears & Henry, 2003). Research in symbolic racism has demonstrated that when individuals perceive that members from other groups endorse values that stand in contrast to their own, they are more likely to experience racist attitudes and engage in racist behaviors (Cook, Cottrell, & Webster, 2014).

From justification theory, an individual’s values are used to justify prejudice (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). Given that values represent ideals and aspirations, acting in alignment with values might become a justification to behave against the welfare of other individuals that are perceived to threaten higher-order principles (Jost et al., 2004). Moreover, from a social perspective, group values meet the function of maintaining the social structure of the group, and guarantee the consistency of the system by perpetuating beliefs and social norms (Schwartz, 1992, 1994). Thus, prejudice towards other groups can be justified through values in order to
maintain the social structure of the in-group and set boundaries for in-group membership (Jost et al., 2004).

To some degree, group values aim to promote closeness with one another as well as to promote separation and competition with other groups (Madureira, 2007). Therefore, prejudice can be considered an active internalization and externalization of group values that establish symbolic and affective boundaries (Madureira, 2007). The affective component of values, furthermore, promotes efforts to protect values even when the welfare of others is compromised. Based on this premise, prejudice is not only associated with members of a different race, but is also associated with in-group members that fail to meet social expectations of the group. For instance, individuals deviating from accepted sex roles or religious views may become victims of discriminatory behavior from members of the in-group (Madureira, 2007).

In terms of the values underlying prejudice, Feather and McKee (2008) found that benevolence and universalism significantly predict lower levels of prejudice, whereas power and security predict greater levels of prejudice. Furthermore, individuals who valued social status, dominance over others, and safety were more likely to report prejudicial attitudes. On the contrary, individuals who valued welfare and tolerance for others were less likely to express prejudicial attitudes (Duckitt, 2006; Duckitt & Sibley, 2010).

Two of the most widely researched variables in the study of prejudice and values are political attitudes and social dominance. Particularly, conservatism and right-wing political beliefs are related to lower tolerance for other groups and individuals that hold different values (Barnea & Schwartz, 1998; Caprara et al., 2006). Conservatives emphasize more self-reliance and individualism. Along the same lines, they are less tolerant of differences and equality (Echebarria-Echabe & Gude, 2007; Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997; Terrizzi, Shook, & Ventis,
Liberals, on the other hand, advocate for equality of groups, inclusion of different people, and religious, political, and moral diversity. Empirical findings have demonstrated that, in comparison to liberals, conservatives report more unfavorable attitudes toward Black individuals and other minority groups, such as people who identify as being gay or lesbian (Echebarria-Echabe & Guede, 2007; Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997; Sears & Henry, 2003; Terrizzi, Shook, & Ventis, 2010). Additionally, individuals endorsing conservative beliefs are less supportive of governmental policies designed to promote social fairness, such as affirmative action (Chambers et al., 2012).

In a recent study of conservatives and liberals, Chambers et al. (2012) found that levels of prejudice are not a function of race per se, but rather depend on conflicting ideologies or values. In this study, prejudicial attitudes were associated with individuals who opposed liberal or conservative beliefs, not necessarily with race in and of itself. This finding suggests that political affiliations are not intrinsically racist, but based on differing ideologies prejudice may develop if racial groups are seen as a threat to the values of the group. In another study, it was found that the salience of conservative values in White people increases based on changes in demographics, mortality salience, terrorist attacks, and perceived threat to the American way of life (Craig & Richeson, 2014b). As conservative values get stronger based on these events, policy law enforcement towards minority groups also increases (Craig & Richeson, 2014b).

Research findings have also linked right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice (Barnea, 2003; Caprara et al., 2006). Right-wing authoritarianism emphasizes values of conformity and tradition. People holding this orientation tend to support submission to authority and increasingly punitive strategies as a means of maintaining social order. Individuals who are more likely to vote for right-wing political parties endorse values related to security and power (Barnea, 2003;
Caprara et al., 2006; Livi, Leone, Falgares, & Lombardo, 2014). These political orientations emphasize maintenance of social order, traditional values, and order and control. Conversely, individuals who value universalism and benevolence are more likely to vote for left-wing political parties, which emphasize equality and less governmental control (Piurko et al., 2011). Overall, right-wing authoritarianism is associated with prejudicial attitudes and endorsement of negative stereotypes towards minorities (Livi et al., 2014).

Social dominance orientation is another significant predictor of prejudice (Akrami et al., 2000; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003; Pratto et al., 1994). Social dominance orientation refers to individuals who advocate for the maintenance of a social hierarchy in which some groups are at the top of the social structure and other groups are at the bottom (Pratto et al., 1994). Individuals who are high in social dominance orientation are more likely to hold values of power, dominance, self-enhancement, and superiority (Duckitt & Sibley, 2010). Moreover, social dominance orientation is negatively associated with benevolence and universalism (Pratto et al., 1994).

In addition, social dominance orientation is significantly correlated with conservative beliefs, radical Protestant philosophy, elitism, sexism, and nationalism (Pratto, 1999). Empirical findings also indicate a significant association between social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. Nonetheless, using Schwartz’s model, social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism appear to be motivated by distinct higher-order values (Livi et al., 2014). Specifically, social dominance orientation appears to fall in the bipolar dimension of self-enhancement (achievement, power, and hedonism) versus self-transcendence (universalism, benevolence), whereas right-wing authoritarianism lies in the bipolar dimension of conservatism.
(security, conformity, and tradition) versus openness to change (stimulation and self-direction) (Livi et al., 2014).

Values of security, conformity, power, and tradition have also been found to predict “blind” patriotism, which in turn predicts greater intolerance for other groups (Schwartz, Caprara, & Vecchione, 2010). Alternatively, universalism, stimulation, hedonism, and self-direction are associated with decreased tendency toward “blind” patriotism (Livi et al., 2014). Both right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation seem to mediate the relationship between these values and “blind” patriotism (Schwartz et al., 2010). Other empirical findings relevant to this study demonstrated that individual values also mediate religious views and intolerance for groups that hold different values (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995). For instance, in a study of Israeli Jewish and Israeli Arab contact, it was found that Israeli Jewish teachers’ readiness to approach Israeli Arabs was positively related with values of universalism and self-direction (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995). On the contrary, values of tradition, conformity, and security predicted less contact for both groups (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995).

Additionally, moral traditionalism is associated with opposition to gay rights, while egalitarianism is associated with support for gay rights, as well as less activation of negative automatic stereotypes towards out-group members (Brewer, 2003; Moskowitz et al., 1999; Moskowitz et al., 2000). Finally, values of justice, equality, and reciprocity are associated with promotion of human rights and less concern with using military force to resolve conflict (Çalışkan, Sapmaz, & Uzunkol, 2014; Kertzer, Power, Rathbun, & Lyer, 2014). Overall, the data suggest that universalism and benevolence predict attitudes that support fairness, as well as prosocial inclination (Feather, Woodyatt, & McKee, 2012; Strelan, Feather, & McKee, 2011). On the contrary, values associated with power are predictive of increased acceptance for the use
of aggressive behaviors to deal with conflict (Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielman, 2005), a punitive preference (Strelan et al., 2011), and prejudicial attitudes (Feather & McKee, 2012).

To summarize, empirical findings support a strong, statistically significant relationship between values and prejudice (Çalışkan et al., 2014; Feather & McKee, 2008; Kertzer et al., 2014). Particularly, values of power, security, tradition, conformity, and dominance are predictive of greater levels of prejudice, whereas values of benevolence and universalism are predictive of reduced levels of prejudice (Feather & McKee, 2008). The influence of values such as hedonism and self-direction is less clear, and seems to be mediated by larger ideologies or political beliefs (Feather & McKee, 2008).

Considering these findings it becomes essential to include interventions that promote individual values associated with lower levels of prejudice. Nonetheless, research in this area is scarce. There are only a few studies in the available literature designed to clarify the potential of values as a means of reducing prejudice. The cultivation of values such as benevolence and universalism is a logical step to promoting tolerance and acceptance of individuals who hold different beliefs. Meaning, for instance, can bolster such values and indirectly reduce prejudicial attitudes.

Values and Meaning

The concepts of meaning and values are strongly related. From several conceptualizations of meaning, values are a core component of a meaningful life and a fundamental motivation that is enhanced by the pursuit of meaning (Baumeister, 1991; Eakman, 2013; Frankl, 1959/1984; Wong, 2012). Values are those areas and principles that are perceived as important and resonate emotionally with the individual, motivating him or her to act upon what is meaningful and establish congruent goals (MacKenzie & Baumeister, 2014). Values organize individuals’
behaviors, and by doing this, constitute a framework that establishes guidelines to discover purpose (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004; Rohan, 2000). Thus, meaning and values are interdependent on each other and grounded within one another. Values lead to a meaningful life, and a meaningful life is based on what is important to each person (Eakman, 2013).

In Frankl’s theory of meaning, he emphasizes the role of values as routes to attain meaning (1994). He proposed three types of values that allow the individual to discover the meaning in every situation: attitudinal values, creative values, and experiential values. Attitudinal values correspond to the ability of reacting positively to a negative situation that cannot be changed or controlled. Through these values people can assume an attitude that makes them thrive despite circumstances where even suffering may be involved. Creative values are actualized when individuals contribute to someone or something, perhaps by creating something new, by teaching, or by serving others. In short, it is what one gives to others and/or to the environment (Schulenberg et al., 2008). Experiential values are realized when individuals learn from experiences and from others. It is what one receives from others and/or the environment (Schulenberg et al., 2008). Through these different kinds of values, people have the ability to discover meaning in every circumstance (Frankl, 1994; Schulenberg et al., 2008).

Frankl (1994) asserted that in order for a person to perceive his or her life as having a meaning, he or she must demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with his or her values. Frankl believed that meaningful values have a subjective nature, and thus, vary from individual to individual and from group to group (Frankl, 1954/1984). People aim to discover what is personally valuable to them and strive to find a meaning in every situation. Beyond the subjective nature of meaning, Frankl also introduced the concept of self-transcendence, or the human capacity to intentionally direct our attention and efforts to something or someone other
than ourselves (e.g., investing ourselves to a cause, another person, or a higher power) (Frankl, 1954/1984). He argued that meaning in life was related to self-transcendence and a value-behavior lifestyle characterized by congruency (Frankl, 1954/1984, 1994). Frankl’s theory of meaning was so influential that it is not uncommon for subsequent theories of meaning to assert that values are a pivotal component of a meaningful life.

Beyond the importance of the endorsement of values, theories of meaning argue that some values bring more meaning than others (Baumeister, 1991; Eakman, 2013; Frankl, 1959/1984). Wong (1998), for instance, maintained that transcendent values and social service to others form one of the dimensions of the structure of meaning. He went on to indicate that responsible action in relation to others is a vital part of meaning. These ideas are consistent with Frankl’s theory, which suggested that self-transcendence and pursuit of meaning bring a greater sense of satisfaction than pursuing pleasure and/or power (Frankl, 1994). Thus, higher levels of meaning are hypothesized to correlate positively with self-transcendence, personal growth, and collectivism (Reker, 2000; Schnell, 2009).

When asked about sources of meaning, people report that their primary sources are values. (Della Fave, Brdar, Wissing, & Vella-Brodrick, 2014). Moreover, in qualitative studies, among the values that are perceived as more meaningful are self-transcendence, personal growth, well-being, and self-actualization (Della Fave et al., 2014; Wong 2012), values that reflect the desire to become a better person. Research has also supported the social nature of meaning. In several studies, individuals indicate social interactions, contributions, and caring for others as meaningful activities (Aguilar, Boerema, & Harrison, 2010; Eakman, 2013; Ludwig, Hattjar, Russell, & Winston, 2007). Moreover, higher levels of meaning appear to be related positively with valuing spirituality and service to others. Reker and Woo (2011), in a study of older adults,
found that participants with higher levels of purpose were more likely to value self-transcendence, sense of coherence, responsibility, and agreeableness, as opposed to individualism or other values oriented to serving personal interests.

Several studies have also shown a strong link between religious beliefs and meaning (Emmons, 2005; Park, 2005; Steger & Frazier, 2005). Religious beliefs appear to strengthen meaning frameworks and foster value-behavior consistency (Park, 2005). Moreover, religious beliefs are associated with the values of self-transcendence and spiritual striving (Emmons, 2005; Park, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Similarly, service and personal growth, which are perceived as going beyond one’s own interests, correlate positively with a sense of meaningfulness (Easterlin & Crimmins, 1991; To, Tam, Ngai, & Sung, 2014). For example, Martos and Kopp (2012) found that when it comes to individualism, personal growth is positively associated with perceived meaning, whereas self-preoccupation is negatively associated with perceived meaning. In this study, the value of materialism showed a weaker association with perceived meaning, relative to other values (Martos & Kopp, 2012).

Along the same lines, Kasser and Ryan (1993) proposed a differentiation between intrinsic and extrinsic values (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996; Sheldon & Kasser, 2008). Intrinsic values reflect personal interests that go beyond social norms. Personal growth, service to others, and self-transcendence are considered intrinsic values (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996). Extrinsic values, alternatively, are driven by social pressure and standards. Ultimate goals of being famous, rich, or powerful are considered extrinsic values (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996). Based on this classification, intrinsic values are proposed to appeal to greater levels of perceived meaning and greater well-being in comparison to extrinsic values (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996; Sheldon & Kasser, 2008). Additionally, Kasser and Ryan (1993, 1996) argued that when an individual
pursues extrinsic values in lieu of intrinsic values, he or she might experience psychological problems or lower levels of subjective well-being. Research in this area supports the idea that intrinsic values are predictive of better mental health and greater life satisfaction (Kasser, Ryan, Couchman, & Sheldon, 2004), and that allocating importance to extrinsic values over intrinsic values can result in decrements in mental health (Niemiec, Ryan, & Deci, 2009; Sheldon, Gunz, Nichols, & Ferguson, 2010). Individuals who report a greater sense of purpose also tend to endorse values that go beyond self-interests, such as self-transcendence and service to others (Della Fave et al., 2014; Siu-ming, Hau-lin, Steven, & Wai-Leung, 2014). Moreover, greater levels of perceived meaning are associated with value-behavior consistency (Sheldon & Krieger, 2014), which in turn is related to subjective well-being (Chartier et al., 2009).

From these studies, it can be concluded that meaning in life and values play an important role with respect to well-being and social relationships. Meaning is a broad category that includes value-behavior congruency as a dimension that needs to be fulfilled to attain a meaningful life (Baumeister, 1991; Frankl, 1994). Furthermore, meaning seems to cultivate values related to the welfare of society and others, as well as promote behaviors congruent with individuals’ values. Nonetheless, research on values and meaning across different areas of human functioning is scarce (To et al., 2014). For example, the idea that values underlie behaviors that could be considered negative, or that could lead to negative consequences, such as drinking, smoking, or even prejudicial attitudes and discrimination, has not been systematically explored. Specifically, what is needed are studies that investigate the idea that people can build meaning frameworks based on values that compromise the welfare of others. For instance, some individuals might derive a sense of meaning out of prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior as a means of protecting in-group beliefs and values. This can be seen perhaps in
radical Muslims who, based on their religion, enlist in a mission to kill people of a different faith, or when White individuals reinforce their prejudicial attitudes to protect values of traditionalism and security. Thus, in the study of prejudice, the role of meaning and its relationship with values needs to be clarified in a more rigorous, systematic fashion.

The Present Study

In this study, the influence that individuals’ values have on the relationship between meaning and prejudice was examined. The results of the initial study of White students by Florez et al. (2013) indicated that meaning was significantly and negatively associated with a social dominance orientation and negative attitudes toward Blacks. These results were promising, suggesting that meaning could potentially buffer psychological needs in such a way as to lessen the endorsement of automatic stereotypes and negative attitudes against out-groups.

However, despite promising initial results and the need for research in this area (see Florez et al., 2016), Florez (2014) was unable to replicate these preliminary findings. In her discussion, she suggested that the lack of replication was perhaps due to an administration effect in which measures of automatic bias prompted participants to change their reports of meaning. Moreover, she did not examine potential mediators of the relationship between meaning and negative attitudes in White individuals with respect to Black individuals. For instance, she did not control for important variables that could influence the relationship, such as motivation to control prejudice, political affiliation, and religious orientation. It is apparent that this is a novel line of research that has significant implications for interventions geared to reduce prejudice, and therefore a line of empirical inquiry that necessitates further study. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to better clarify the relationship between meaning and prejudice, with particular regard for the role of values.
Specifically, the aim of this study was to test a model in which the value of self-transcendence was examined, coupled with value-behavior consistency, with regard to the relationship between meaning in life and prejudice. Two main models were suggested to explain the relationships among these variables. The first model was the primary model tested. The second model was going to be examined if the relationships suggested in the first model did not emerge. The sample included individuals attending college at a university located in the southern United States. The following hypotheses were suggested for each of the proposed models:

**Model 1.** Under high levels of the value of self-transcendence, the relationship between meaning in life and prejudice would be significantly mediated by value-behavior consistency (see Figure 2).

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived meaning in life would be a statistically significant, negative predictor of prejudice.

Hypothesis 1b: Perceived meaning in life would be a statistically significant, positive predictor of value-behavior consistency.

Hypothesis 1c: Value-behavior consistency would be a statistically significant, negative predictor of prejudice.

Hypothesis 1d: Value-behavior consistency would be a statistically significant mediator between perceived meaning and prejudice.

Hypothesis 1e: The mediational model of meaning, value-behavior consistency, and prejudice would only hold under high levels of the value of self-transcendence.

**Model 2.** If the first model was not confirmed, and there was not an interaction effect between self-transcendence and the mediation model, the value of self-transcendence would then be examined as a second mediator. Thus, in the second model it was proposed that both value-
behavior consistency and the value of self-transcendence would significantly mediate the relationship between perceived meaning in life and prejudice (see Figure 3). For this model the following alternative hypotheses were suggested:

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived meaning in life would be a statistically significant, positive predictor of the value of self-transcendence.

Hypothesis 2b: The value of self-transcendence would be a statistically significant, negative predictor of prejudice.

Hypothesis 2c: The value of self-transcendence would be a second, statistically significant mediator between perceived meaning and prejudice.

The two models were tested using two different measures of meaning in each case, namely the Purpose in Life test – Short Form (PIL-SF) and the Meaning in Life Questionnaire – Presence subscale (MLQ-P). Additionally, the significance of associations was evaluated controlling for motivation to control prejudice and social dominance orientation. Beyond the proposed models, demographic variables such as race, sex, and political and religious affiliation were investigated with respect to prejudicial attitudes.

This study contributes independently to the scientific literatures of perceived meaning, values, and prejudice. The study further promotes new lines of research related to the underlying processes of perceiving meaning in life in association with values and intergroup relationships. Moreover, this is one of the few studies that not only assesses White individuals’ prejudice toward Black individuals, but that also examines prejudice toward White individuals among Black people. The study ultimately has potential to inform meaning-based interventions developed to reduce intergroup conflict, and which promote a value-orientation with respect to the welfare of others and one’s own personal growth.
II. METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited from a medium-sized university located in the southern United States, via the Department of Psychology’s SONA system (an online participant recruitment and management tool). To participate in the study, participants had to be a college student aged 18 years or older. There were no other exclusion criteria. Data were collected during the spring and fall semesters of 2015. A total of 422 students completed the administered measures, 179 surveys were completed during the spring and 241 surveys were completed during the fall. After data cleaning, the final sample was composed of 362 people, 281 females (77.6%) and 81 males (22.4%). Regarding their race and how they identified, 73.8% of the students identified themselves as being White, 15.7% identified as being African-American, 5.5% identified as being Asian, 2.8% identified as being Hispanic/Latino, and 2.2% identified as being Native American, multiracial, or Arabic. In terms of political affiliation, 52.5% of the participants reported to be Republican, 22.7% reported to be Democrat, 16.6% reported not having any political affiliation, 6.6% reported to be Libertarian, and 1.9% reported as identifying with another political party. The average age of the participants was 19.19 years old (SD age = 2.06) with ages ranging from 18 to 38 years old.

The final sample size of the study was appropriate to conduct the proposed analyses. For single mediation and moderation analyses using bias-corrected bootstrap and an alpha and beta value of 0.26, a minimum sample size of 148 participants is recommended (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007; Prayer & Hayes, 2004). This sample size was empirically calculated by
simulating a process of resampling (drawing different samples from a pull of various scores) to identify the sample size required for a power of .8 (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007).

Measures

*The Purpose in Life test – Short Form* (PIL-SF; Schulenberg, Schnetzer, & Buchanan, 2011; Appendix F). The PIL-SF was developed from the original 20-item Purpose in Life test (PIL; Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964, 1969) as a brief scale to measure perceived meaning in life. The PIL-SF assesses the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as having identified, and to some level obtained, clear and meaningful goals. The PIL-SF is comprised of four items, and employs a 7-point Likert-type response format ranging from 1 to 7. The highest and lowest numbers represent extremes of a continuum. The anchors of each item’s response format changes depending on the content of the item. For instance, with the item “My personal existence is…” respondents can choose 1 to 7, with 1 being “utterly meaningless without purpose”, 4 being neutral, and 7 being “very purposeful and meaningful”. Responses to individual items were summed to compute a total score ranging from 4 to 28. Higher scores are suggestive of greater perceived meaning in life.

The PIL-SF has sound psychometric properties. With regard to reliability, internal consistency coefficients range from the low to mid .80s (Aiena et al., 2016; Drescher et al., 2012; Schnetzer et al., 2013; Schulenberg & Melton, 2010; Schulenberg et al., 2011; Schulenberg et al., 2016). In terms of structural validity, exploratory and confirmatory factor-analytic procedures support the grouping of the four items as a single factor (Schulenberg & Melton, 2010; Schulenberg et al., 2011). The PIL-SF has also shown convergent and discriminant validity. In the case of the former, scores are positively and significantly correlated with other meaning in life measures (Schulenberg et al., 2011) and related constructs such as resilience,
self-efficacy, and life satisfaction (Aiena et al., 2016; Drescher et al., 2012; Schulenberg et al., 2016). In the case of the latter, scores are significantly and negatively correlated with depression, boredom proneness, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and alcohol use (Aiena et al., 2016; Schulenberg et al., 2011; Schulenberg et al., 2016; Schnetzer et al., 2013). In this study, the internal consistency coefficient for the scale was .85, suggestive of very good reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire – Presence subscale (MLQ-P; Steger et al., 2006; Appendix G). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire – Presence subscale is a part of the Meaning in Life Questionnaire. The Meaning in Life Questionnaire is a 10-item measure of an individual’s perceived presence of meaning and search for meaning. The subscales of presence of meaning and search for meaning are each comprised of five items that are analyzed as independent composites. The questionnaire uses a 7-point Likert-type response format (1 = Absolutely Untrue and 7 = Absolutely True). Participants are prompted to assess the extent to which each item applies to their lives. Although the whole measure was administered, only MLQ-P scores were utilized in this study as they pertain directly to the perceived presence of meaning in life, and therefore are most germane to the study’s hypotheses. Total scores for the MLQ-P were calculated by summing the individual items. Scores of the subscale range from 5 to 35. Higher scores are indicative of greater perceived presence of meaning.

Promising psychometric properties have been documented in a range of studies, supporting the validity and reliability of MLQ-P scores (Schulenberg, Strack, & Buchanan, 2011; Steger et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2008). In terms of validity of the scale, factor-analytic studies confirm the grouping of the items on the MLQ-P (Steger et al., 2006). The MLQ-P has also garnered support with respect to convergent validity, with positive and significant
correlations with life satisfaction, positive emotions, and personality traits associated with well-being (Steger et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2008; Steger & Kashdan, 2007). As expected, the MLQ-P also correlates positively and significantly with other meaning in life measures, such as the PIL-SF (Schulenberg et al., 2011; Steger et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2008). In terms of discriminant validity, scores are significantly and negatively correlated with depression, negative emotions, and neuroticism (Steger et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2008). Regarding the reliability of MLQ-P scores, internal consistency coefficients range from the low .80s to the low .90s (Park et al., 2010; Schulenberg et al., 2011; Steger et al., 2006; Steger & Kashdan, 2007). Additionally, test-retest reliability assessed over a one-month interval yielded a coefficient of .70 for the MLQ-P subscale, indicating stability of the scale (Steger et al., 2006; Steger & Kashdan, 2007). In this study, the internal consistency coefficient for the scale was .89, indicating very good reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

**Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales (PWBS; Aiken, 2012; Appendix H).** The Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales were constructed as part of Aiken’s dissertation on bias and motivations underlying discrimination. The PWBS is a measure of modern prejudice, a form of racism that reflects feelings of superiority and negative attitudes towards a particular group. This scale integrates items from three well-known measures of prejudice: The Attitudes Towards Blacks Scale (Brigham, 1993), the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986), and the updated Symbolic Racism Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002). The PWBS was designed to create a comprehensive measure of modern prejudice towards White and Black individuals that includes a wide range of contemporary attitudes and stereotypes related to each group. Thus, it contains two parallel forms in which prejudicial attitudes against White and Black people are examined (Aiken, 2012). One form focuses on White individuals while the other form focuses on Black
individuals. Respondents who complete the PWBS may fill out the form focusing on prejudice toward Whites, the form focusing on prejudice toward Blacks, or they may complete both forms. Each form has 12 items with a 7-point Likert-type response format. Response options range from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree”. For this study, both forms were administered and each form yielded a total score based on the sum of the item responses. Scores for each measure range from 12 to 84. Higher total scores are indicative of greater levels of prejudice. An example of an item is: “Blacks are responsible for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States”, with the parallel item being “Whites are responsible for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States”.

In terms of psychometric properties, the scales were designed using a rigorous, multi-group factor-analytic process to assure construct equivalence of the two forms (Aiken, 2012). Results yielded similar psychometric properties for both scales. Exploratory and confirmatory factor-analytic procedures supported a good model fit for both versions. For the form that assesses prejudice toward Blacks, exploratory analysis suggested three underlying dimensions, whereas with respect to its counterpart, which assesses prejudice toward Whites, analyses suggested four dimensions (Aiken, 2012). Nonetheless, interpretation of scores is obtained using the total score and not the scores of sub-dimensions. No further validity support is reported in Aiken’s work. Regarding reliability, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were reported to approximate minimal acceptability (.70 for the prejudice toward Blacks form and .69 for the prejudice toward Whites form).

The PWBS is a recent scale. As such, there is a need to continue to study and expand on its psychometric properties. Although the measure would benefit from additional research, its usefulness lies in the availability of two parallel forms as a means of assessing prejudice toward
Whites and toward Blacks. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient for the Prejudicial Attitudes Against White (PAW) scale was .79 and for the Prejudicial Attitudes Against Black (PAB) scale the internal consistency coefficient was .77. These values are suggestive of respectable reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

The Portrait Values Questionnaire Revised-RR (PVQ-RR; Schwartz et al., 2012; Appendix I). The PVQ-RR is the revised version of the original Portrait Values Questionnaire. The original PVQ was designed to address measurement limitations of the Schwartz Values Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992). The PVQ-RR is comprised of 57 items designed to assess the 19 values proposed by Schwartz in the refined theory of values (Figure 1). The PVQ-RR yields total scores for each of the values composing the three levels of the hierarchal model of values: The 19 values, the 10 original values, and the four higher-order categories (self-transcendence versus self-enhancement and openness versus conservation). As mentioned in the literature review, Schwartz increased the number of values to 19 to provide greater specificity and discrimination for each value (see Schwartz et al., 2012).

Items of the PVQ-RR present verbal portraits of different people. Each verbal portrait describes a goal that is important for the person (e.g., whether it is important to form views independently). The respondent is asked the degree to which he or she identifies with the person described in the verbal portrait. The total score for each of the 19 values is comprised of three items each. Each item employs a 6-point response format, ranging from 1 “not like me at all” to 6 “very much like me”. The survey has two versions, one for males and one for females. An example of an item is: “It is important to him to form his views independently” (with respect to the form for males) or “It is important to her to form her views independently” (with respect to
the form for females). For this study, total scores were obtained for the four higher-order categories by adding the score of the items corresponding to each of the four dimensions.

The scale was piloted in 10 countries with 2,150 adults and 3,909 college students. Structural validity was assessed using confirmatory factor-analytic procedures, which provided support for the model, 57 items, 19 values dimensions, and one broad factor (Schwartz, 2012; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). Confirmatory factor analyses also provided support for the 10 original values as well as the four higher-order values. Using multidimensional scaling analyses, results suggested that each of the 19 values falls in a different dimension, representing a distinct construct. Moreover, as suggested by the model, the values organization corresponded to the circular model proposed by Schwartz with stronger correlations between adjacent values (e.g., values of tradition are dimensionally closer to values such as security and conformity, see Figure 1). Nonetheless, some of the values, such as benevolence and universalism, fall in the opposite location of the proposed dimensional structure in some samples (Schwartz, 2012; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). The authors hypothesized that the unexpected location of the dimensions is related to cultural differences in social norms promoting a different understanding of benevolence and universalism.

The PVQ-RR has also demonstrated predictive and discriminant validity support by showing expected value-behavior correlations (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). For example, significant correlations have been obtained between the value of universalism and reports of behaviors such as supporting efforts of a group that fights injustice. Moreover, the value of personal security is associated with the avoidance of walking alone in the dark. As for reliability, coefficients have been reported for the 19 values, ranging from .66 for achievement to .83 for tradition (Schwartz, 2012; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). Reliabilities were not reported for the
four higher-order values, however. In the present study, internal consistency coefficients were calculated to be .92 for the total scale, .72 for the value of self-transcendence, .61 for the value of self-enhancement, and .74 for the value of conservation. These data indicate that the total scale has very good reliability. Moreover, the subscales have respectable reliability coefficients, with the exception of the value of self-enhancement, which is suggestive of undesirable reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

*The Valued Living Questionnaire (VLQ; Wilson, Sandoz, & Kitchens, 2010; Appendix J)*. The VLQ was constructed for clinical use to assess changes in personal values over the course of treatment. The VLQ is a two-part scale that assesses 10 valued domains. In the first section (importance), respondents rate each value on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being “not at all important” and 10 being “very important”), considering the importance of each valued area over the past week. In the second part (consistency), respondents rate how consistent their actions have been with respect to their values. A 10-point scale is used (1 being “actions have been fully inconsistent with your value” and 10 being “actions have been fully consistent with your value”), considering the action-value congruence for each of the valued areas over the past week. The valued areas assessed by the scale are family relations, marriage, parenting, social relations, employment, education, recreation, spirituality, community life, and physical well-being.

Responses for both parts of the scale yield a total composite score of valued living, which represents the degree to which people are living their lives consistently with the values that they find to be most important. The composite was obtained by calculating the product of the ratings of the importance and consistency domains (e.g., family importance * family consistency), and then computing the mean score for all the products. Higher means indicate greater valued living. The parenting item was removed from the analyses for both importance and consistency given
that in the college student population where the data were collected the value of parenting was not expected to be salient to the majority of respondents.

In terms of psychometric properties, VLQ scores are reportedly reliable (Wilson et al., 2010). Cronbach’s alpha coefficients have been reported to range from .79 to .83 for importance and .58 to .75 for consistency. The total valued living composite has yielded internal consistencies ranging from .65 to .79 (Cotter, 2011; Wilson et al., 2010). Test-retest reliabilities were assessed in two evaluations over a 2-week interval. Test-retest reliability coefficients were reported to range from .61 to .82 for the importance scale and .43 to .67 for the consistency scale. The test-retest coefficient was .75 for the valued living composite (Cotter, 2011; Wilson et al., 2010). For this study, the internal consistency coefficient for the scale was calculated to be .87, indicating very good internal consistency reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

Regarding content validity of the scale, the domains included in the VLQ were derived from the experience of trained clinicians who identified the most common domains of valued living reported by clients (Cotter, 2011; Wilson et al., 2010). As for construct validity, factor analyses confirmed a one-factor model of the scale. VLQ scores correlate significantly and positively, as expected, with psychological flexibility, vitality, mental health, and social functioning (Wilson et al., 2010). Also as expected, VLQ scores correlate significantly and negatively with depression, anxiety, and relationship difficulties, among other measures of maladaptive functioning (Cotter, 2011; Wilson et al., 2010).

*Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPRS; Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Appendix K).* The MCPRS is a 17-item measure of an individual’s effort to hide prejudice. The scale is composed of two factors. The first factor measures preoccupations related to acting in a prejudicial way. It is composed of the 9-item Concern for Acting Prejudiced subscale. The
second factor assesses the inhibition of prejudiced feelings and thoughts in order to avoid social disapproval or conflict. It is composed of the 4-item Restraint to Avoid Dispute subscale. An example of an item from the first factor is: “I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about a person from another race”. An example of an item from the second factor is: “It's important to me that other people not think I'm prejudiced”. Respondents indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each statement. Values range from -3 (corresponding to “strongly disagree”) to 3 (corresponding to “strongly agree”), with 0 indicating a neutral response. Total scores were obtained by adding the scores of individual items. Higher scores for each subscale indicate greater motivation to control prejudice and greater concern and restraint, respectively.

MCPRS scores have adequate psychometric properties. Internal consistency reliabilities for the total score range from .74 to .81 (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Morrison, Morrison, McDonagh, Regan, & McHugh, 2014). With respect to structural validity, some factor-analytic findings support the two-factor structure of the scale (Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Morrison et al., 2014). Nonetheless, with different samples some studies have failed to document psychometric support for the two-factor model (Banse & Garwonski, 2003; Legault, Green-Demers, Grant, & Chung, 2007). As for other kinds of validity, there are some data that demonstrate that MCPRS scores reliably contribute to the prediction of White individuals’ responses to the Modern Racism Scale and self-reported attitudes towards Black students (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). Furthermore, MCPRS scores have been shown to positively correlate with other measures of motivation to respond without prejudice (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). For this study, the internal consistency coefficient was calculated to be .80 for the total scale, indicating very good internal consistency reliability. As for the MCPRS-Concern (MPRS-C) subscale, the reliability
coefficient was calculated to be .67, indicating minimally acceptable internal consistency. With respect to the MCPRS-Restraint (MCPRS-R) subscale, the reliability coefficient was calculated to be .79, suggestive of respectable internal consistency (DeVellis, 2012).

*The Social Dominance Scale* (SDS; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Bertram, 1994; Appendix L). The Social Dominance Scale is a 16-item measure that assesses the degree of preference for inequality among social groups (Pratto et al., 1994). Respondents are asked to what extent they agree with the statements presented via a 7-point Likert-type response format (1 corresponding to “strongly disagree” and 7 corresponding to “strongly agree”). An example of an item is “Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place”. Item scores are summed to arrive at a total score ranging from 16 to 112. Higher scores suggest respondent endorsement of attitudes consistent with group dominance, rather than intergroup equality.

SDS scores have adequate psychometric properties. Internal consistency reliability coefficients range from .83 to .94 (Heaven & Bucci, 2001; Pratto et al., 1994; Russell & Trigg, 2004). In terms of structural validity, confirmatory factor analyses support a one-dimensional scale. As for convergent and discriminant validity, SDS scores correlate positively and significantly with right-wing authoritarianism (Heaven & Bucci, 2001) and negative attitudes towards minority groups (Duckitt, 2006). SDS scores correlate negatively and significantly with tolerance, concern for others, and altruism (Pratto et al., 1994). For this study, the internal consistency coefficient for the scale was calculated to be .93, which is suggestive of excellent reliability (DeVellis, 2012).

Procedures

The university’s Institutional Review Board approved the study protocol. Participants were recruited through the SONA system. The recruitment script is presented in Appendix C.
Trained undergraduate research assistants in a computer laboratory conducted the study. Each session sat eight participants and lasted one hour. When the participants arrived for their scheduled appointment, the experimenter assigned each of them to a computer. To assure that participants were not looking at each other’s responses, they were seated one chair apart. Five minutes past the scheduled session time the experimenter proceeded to read the instructions (see Appendix E). The consent form was presented electronically via Qualtrics (see Appendix D). Afterwards, participants were prompted to respond to the battery of self-report measures and demographic questions, also presented via Qualtrics. The questionnaires were presented among several other measures that were included in a larger study entitled, “meaning and social values”. During data collection, which began in the spring 2015 semester, the order in which the questionnaires were presented was constant for each participant. First, the measures of meaning were presented, followed by the measures of values, and then the measures of prejudice. In the data collection that occurred in the subsequent fall 2015 semester, the order of the questionnaires was reversed to assess for priming effects of the measures of meaning and values on the measures of prejudice. Thus, measures of prejudice were presented first, followed by the measures of values, and then the measures of meaning. Upon completion of the session, participants were dismissed and awarded an hour of course credit or extra credit for their participation.

After data collection, statistical analyses were performed using SPSS statistical software. Data were imported from the Qualtrics database for use with SPSS. Missing data were examined and participants with unusual levels of missing data were removed from further analyses. Total scores were computed for every measure included in the study. For the PVQ-RR, composite scores were obtained only for the four higher-order categories. Univariate outliers were
identified through standardized scores. Any score three standard deviations above or below the mean was considered for exclusion (Kline, 2010). Multivariate outliers were identified through Mahalanobis distance using SPSS statistical software. Mahalanobis distance is a measure of how much a participant’s score on self-report measures differs from the average of all cases (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2013). Using Mahalanobis distance, a score that exceeds three standard deviations from the mean is considered an extreme value and therefore identified as a multivariate outlier (Meyers et al., 2013). After data cleaning and removal of outliers, descriptive statistics were calculated for all of the measures, as well as for the demographic variables. For the self-report measures, the reliability coefficients for obtained scores were also calculated and analyzed. Moreover, normality of data expressed by skewness and kurtosis was examined. Then, $t$ tests for independent samples were conducted to examine whether there were significant differences between the means of the participant scores from the spring semester in comparison to participant scores from the fall semester.

To initially assess the relationships among the variables of interest, correlational analyses were conducted using the composite scores obtained for each of the measures. Upon examination of the correlational results, testing of the models proceeded using the two different measures of meaning, the PIL-SF and the MLQ-P. Standard path-analytic approaches described by Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008) were used to test the models, with the macro PROCESS program designed by Hayes being used in conjunction with SPSS (Hayes, 2013). The PROCESS program computes different models of moderation and mediation, including moderated mediation, using bootstrapping procedures (Hayes, 2013). With bootstrapping, a sample distribution is created based on the responses of the participants instead of the general population. Thus, bootstrapping creates a sample that does not depend on the general assumptions of normality of data. Through
bootstrapping the sampling distribution of the indirect effect is generated and used to construct a percentile-based confidence interval (95% CI). As suggested by the authors, when using the Preacher and Hayes procedure, 5,000 bias-corrected bootstrap samples were employed for each model (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

The models were then tested including the SDS and MCPRS as covariates using the PROCESS program. Prior to this, a moderation analysis was conducted to examine if the SDS and MCPRS related distinctively at different conditions of the main variables and that way test assumptions of homogeneity of variance among scores. To analyze scores by relevant demographic variables, one-way ANOVAs assessed whether significant differences existed between the means of prejudicial scores among the variables of race, sex, and political affiliation. Then, the main model was tested for Whites and Blacks, separately. Additional exploratory analyses were conducted to examine the relationships among prejudice and other variables included in the study. Bivariate correlations were calculated for continuous variables such as age, and scores of the SDS, MCPRS, and the other subscales of the PVQ-RR (Meyers et al., 2013).
III. RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

To begin the preliminary analyses, total scores for each of the measures were computed. From the initial sample, 37 participants (21 participants from the spring semester and 16 participants from the fall semester) were excluded from the analyses because they did not respond appropriately to a filler question (e.g., participants were asked to select the answer “d” of question 15 from the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale to demonstrate they were paying attention). Additionally, five other participants were excluded due to incomplete PVQ-RR data. Univariate outliers were identified through z-scores. Any individual total score with a z-score above three or below negative three was considered an extreme value (Kline, 2010). This method revealed 18 univariate outliers. Furthermore, five multivariate outliers were identified through Mahalanobis distance using the chi-square distribution with an alpha level of .001 and two degrees of freedom. Two of these five multivariate outliers were previously selected as univariate outliers. In combination, there were a total of 21 outliers that were excluded from analyses. Overall, a total of 63 participants were excluded after data cleaning and removal of outliers for a final sample of 362 students. The sample size changed for each analysis due to listwise deletion, which eliminated missing values for each specific statistical procedure. After data cleaning, internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for each measure. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for total scores ranged from the low .70s to the low .90s, suggestive of respectable to very good internal consistency reliability for the measures administered (see Table 3; DeVellis, 2012). With respect to the subscales, alpha coefficient
tended to be lower, and in some cases the values were undesirable, ranging from the low .60s to the high .70s. Lower reliabilities for the subscales were expected given the reduced number of items.

After calculating reliability coefficients, the means, standard deviations, medians, minimum values, and maximum values were calculated. These data are also presented in Table 3. Normality of data was assessed by examining skewness and kurtosis values. Data were considered significantly abnormally distributed if the skewness and kurtosis values were outside the -3 to 3 range (Table 4). None of the measures were outside of the range of normal distribution. This interpretation was confirmed using normal Q-Q plots as a graphic measure of normality. Descriptive statistics were analyzed using the overall sample except for scores on the Prejudice Against Blacks and Whites scales (PAB, PAW), in which case in addition to the overall sample scores were examined separately for each racial group.

The PIL-SF and the MLQ-P indicated that presence of meaning in life scores were negatively and significantly skewed for both measures, suggesting that the sample overall reported high levels of perceived meaning in life. These data were consistent with previous samples of college students. On the measures of prejudice against Blacks and Whites the mean and the range of scores for the overall sample was greater for the PAB than the PAW. Moreover, PAB scores showed more variability than scores reported for the PAW. Overall, descriptive scores for both the PAB and the PAW were symmetrically distributed as skewness and kurtosis values for these measures were non-significant. In terms of differences between PAW and PAB scores based on racial identification, students that identified as White (n = 266) or Asian (n = 20) reported higher scores for prejudice against Blacks when compared to prejudice against Whites.
Students that identified as Black \((n = 57)\), Hispanic \((n = 10)\), or Multiracial \((n = 7)\) endorsed higher scores for the PAW when compared to the PAB (see Table 5).

With respect to the measures of values, the PVQ-RR was negatively and significantly skewed, suggesting an asymmetrical distribution with fewer total scores at the lower end of the scale (Table 4). The mean, median, and range indicated that the majority of the students reported agreement with most of the descriptors of the different values assessed (self-transcendence, enhancement, openness to change, and conservation) (Table 3). For the VLQ, descriptive statistics revealed that scores were symmetrically distributed, with approximately half of the students reporting low scores on value-behavior consistency and the other half reporting high scores on value-behavior consistency. Lastly, MCPRS scores were significantly and negatively skewed, with more students reporting a desire to hide prejudicial reactions and concern for being perceived as prejudiced. Conversely, SDS scores were significantly and positively skewed, with a larger proportion of the participants reporting low levels of social dominance orientation.

In summary, each measure was considered to be normally distributed (approximately). Specifically, the majority of participants reported perceiving their lives as being meaningful and endorsed multiple social values. Some of the students endorsed high consistency with their valued areas, while others reported lower commitment with these values. In terms of prejudice, White and Asian participants were significantly more prejudiced against Blacks than against Whites, whereas Black, Hispanic, and Multiracial students were significantly more prejudiced against Whites than Blacks. On average, participants expressed an overall concern to hide prejudicial reactions and the majority of the students reported being in favor of group equality. After calculating descriptive data for each of the measures administered, the main hypotheses of the study were analyzed.
Primary Analyses

To test the hypotheses of the study a total prejudice (PWAB) score was calculated for the overall sample configured by the sum of PAW and PAB individual total scores. The PAW and the PAB measures were designed as analogous versions of a measure of prejudice against White and Black individuals, and thus, use the same scale of measurement. Participants responded to both the PAW and the PAB scales, regardless of their race. PWAB total scores are considered a measure of general racial prejudice (i.e., overall prejudice or generalized prejudice). Higher scores indicate greater prejudicial attitudes. Prior to testing the hypotheses of the study, a t test analysis for independent samples was conducted to determine whether there were statistically significant mean differences between the data collected during the spring semester and the data collected during the fall semester. This analysis aimed to determine whether there was an administration effect given that in the two data collection points the measures were presented to respondents in different orders. The t test analysis yielded no statistically significant differences across each of the scales, with the exception of the self-enhancement subscale of the PVQ-RR (Table 6). Given that there were no statistically significant mean differences in terms of the variables of interest for the main hypotheses, the data from each semester were combined and subsequently analyzed as an overall sample.

Bivariate correlations were calculated before examining the proposed models for the overall sample. Table 7 displays the Pearson correlations (excluding cases pairwise) for the interrelationships of the variables of interest. It was expected that perceived presence of meaning in life, measured by the PIL-SF and the MLQ-P, was going to correlate significantly and negatively with the overall measure of prejudice (the PWAB). This initial relationship was found for the MLQ-P, but not for the PIL-SF. MLQ-P scores correlated negatively and significantly
with the overall measure of prejudice \((r = -.13, p < .05)\), a small correlation (Meyers et al., 2013), indicating that higher levels of meaning in life are associated with lower levels of prejudicial attitudes. In terms of the PIL-SF, although the direction of the correlation with levels of prejudice was also negative, the relationship was not statistically significant \((r = -.08, p = .09)\). Consistent with preliminary predictions perceived meaning in life was positively and significantly associated with value-behavior consistency, small correlations for both the MLQ-P \((r = .34, p < .01)\) and the PIL-SF \((r = .38, p < .01)\). Thus, higher levels of perceived meaning in life were significantly associated with higher levels of value-behavior consistency. Contrary to initial assumptions, value-behavior consistency did not significantly and negatively correlate with prejudicial attitudes \((- .06, p = .25)\).

With regard to self-transcendence, as expected bivariate correlations revealed that self-transcendence scores correlated positively and significantly with both measures of meaning \((\text{MLQ-P } r = .30, p < .01; \text{PIL-SF } r = .27, p < .01)\) and value-behavior consistency \((r = .25, p < .01)\). Individuals reporting higher levels of the self-transcendence value also reported higher levels of perceived meaning in life and greater value-behavior consistency. Moreover, self-transcendence value scores correlated negatively and significantly with generalized prejudicial attitude scores from the Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales \((\text{PWAB } r = -.20, p < .01)\). Thus, based on the whole sample individuals reporting higher levels of the self-transcendence value reported lower levels of prejudicial attitudes.

In summary, the results indicated that perceived meaning in life (as measured by the MLQ-P, but not the PIL-SF) was negatively and significantly correlated with overall scores of prejudice. Both measures of meaning significantly and positively correlated with value-behavior consistency and self-transcendence; and self-transcendence was negatively and significantly
correlated with prejudice. Unexpectedly, value-behavior consistency was not significantly related to prejudicial attitudes. Even though some of the relationships implied in the hypotheses of model 1 were not confirmed, as established in the procedures, the hypotheses of model 1 were tested further for the overall sample using the macro PROCESS program designed by Hayes and adapted to SPSS.

Model 1: Hypotheses 1a-1e of model 1 were examined using model number 4 of the PROCESS program with 5,000 bias-corrected bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013). This model uses path analyses via regressions to estimate the significance and effect of each predictor variable on scores of generalized prejudice, and denotes unstandardized value beta coefficients as well as confidence intervals for each path. Significance of the path is denoted when the range of coefficients between the lower limit and the upper limit of the confidence interval does not include a zero (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The hypotheses were tested for the MLQ-P (Table 8) and the PIL-SF (Table 9). However, since the PIL-SF did not yield a statistically significant relationship with the overall prejudice scores, only the results for the MLQ-P are described here. The statistical significance of path $c_1$ (total effect) was denoted confirming hypothesis 1a. Perceived meaning significantly and negatively predicted overall prejudice scores, accounting for 2.1% of the variance ($F(1, 316) = 6.79, p < .01, R^2 = .02, B = -.02, SE = .01$). A one-unit increase in meaning predicted a -.02 decrease in prejudice scores. Together, meaning and value-behavior consistency accounted for 2.1% of the variance in prejudice scores ($F(2, 315) = 3.42, p = .03, R^2 = .02$). The obtained results also confirmed the statistical significance of path $a_1$ as stated in hypothesis 1b. Perceived meaning significantly predicted value-behavior consistency, accounting for 12.2% of the variance in VLQ scores ($F(1, 307) = 43.70, p < .01, R^2 = .12, B = 1.1, SE = .16$). However, path $b$, value-behavior consistency predicting overall prejudice scores,
was not confirmed. Thus, hypothesis 1c was refuted ($p = .79$). When holding scores on the value-behavior consistency scale constant (path $c'$), meaning was still a significant and negative predictor of prejudice scores ($B = -.02, SE = .01, 95\% CI [-.04 - -.001]$). Lastly, because the bootstrapped confidence interval included zero, hypothesis 1d, which presumed that there would be a partial mediation of value-behavior consistency between meaning and prejudicial attitudes, was not confirmed. When self-transcendence was included in the model as a moderator (model number 8 in the PROCESS program), none of the predicted paths were statistically significant, and thus, hypothesis 1e was also rejected (see Table 8). In conclusion, hypotheses 1c, 1d, and 1e were refuted and the main relationships proposed in model 1 did not emerge. Although perceived meaning in life (as assessed by the MLQ-P) was a statistically significant predictor of prejudice, value-behavior consistency was not a statistically significant mediator and self-transcendence was not a statistically significant moderator with respect to the relationship between meaning in life and prejudicial attitudes.

**Model 2:** Given that the relationships proposed for model 1 did not emerge, the hypotheses for model 2 were tested. Initially, in model 2 a multiple mediation was proposed in which value-behavior consistency and self-transcendence would be statistically significant mediators of the relationship between meaning and prejudice. Since hypothesis 1d was rejected, and value-behavior consistency did not significantly mediate this relationship, in model 2 only a single mediation was tested with the value of self-transcendence as the mediator variable (see revised model presented in Figure 4). To test the hypotheses of the single mediation model number 4 of the PROCESS program was used. Self-transcendence was entered as the mediator variable, meaning in life as the independent variable, and generalized prejudice as the outcome variable (see Table 10 for analyses with the MLQ-P and Table 11 for analyses with the PIL-SF).
When using the MLQ-P, results confirmed the statistical significance of path $a$ and thus hypothesis 2a. MLQ-P scores significantly predicted self-transcendence scores, accounting for 10.61% of the variance ($F(1, 341) = 40.47, p < .01, R^2 = .10, B = .31, SE = 1.3$). A one-unit increase in MLQ-P scores predicted a .31 increase in the value of self-transcendence. The statistical significance of path $c$ (total effect) was also denoted. MLQ-P scores significantly and negatively predicted overall prejudicial attitude scores, accounting for 2.0% of the variance ($F(1, 341) = 6.93, p < .01, R^2 = .02, B = -.02, SE = .01$). A one-unit increase in MLQ-P scores predicted a .02 decrease in overall prejudice scores. Thus, path $b$ as stated in hypothesis 2b was also confirmed. Self-transcendence scores significantly predicted lower levels of overall prejudice. For every unit increase in self-transcendence scores a .03 decrease in prejudicial attitude scores was predicted ($B = -.03, SE = .01$). Together, MLQ-P scores and self-transcendence scores accounted for 5% of the variance in overall prejudice scores ($F(2, 340) = 8.59, p < .01, R^2 = .05$).

When controlling for self-transcendence to test the direct effect of meaning on prejudicial attitudes (path $c'$), MLQ-P scores were no longer a statistically significant predictor of lower prejudice scores ($B = -.01, SE = .01, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.03 \text{ -- \ .00}]$). A total mediation of self-transcendence was thus supported as predicted in hypothesis 2c ($B = -.01, SE = .00, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.01 \text{ -- \ .00}]$) (see Table 10).

Using PIL-SF scores in lieu of MLQ-P scores yielded a similar pattern of findings (Table 11). Although PIL-SF scores were not a statistically significant predictor of overall prejudice scores ($F(1, 339) = 3.24, p = .07, R^2 = .01, B = -.02, SE = .01$), a statistically significant indirect effect of meaning on prejudice via self-transcendence was denoted ($B = -.01, SE = .00, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.02 \text{ -- \ .01}]$). Thus, although hypothesis 2a was not supported when using the PIL-SF, an indirect effect of meaning on prejudice via self-transcendence was confirmed.
Controlling for Covariates: Prior to evaluating the obtained model controlling for social dominance orientation and motivation to control prejudicial reactions, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was tested by using these variables as moderators of the model. These analyses were only conducted with the MLQ-P, since the PIL-SF was not a statistically significant predictor of prejudice. Using model 8 of the PROCESS program, a moderated mediation was conducted separately with these two variables. Results indicated that social dominance orientation was a statistically significant moderator between meaning in life and self-transcendence. However, it was not a statistically significant moderator between meaning and prejudice (Table 12). Specifically, higher social dominance orientation scores significantly lessened the relationship between meaning in life and self-transcendence (Figure 5). Motivation to control prejudicial reactions was not a statistically significant moderator for any of the significant paths (see also Table 12). Since social dominance orientation violated the homogeneity of variances assumption by being a moderator between two of the variables, only MCPRS scores were included as a covariate in the model. When MCPRS scores were entered as a covariate using model 4 of the PROCESS program, self-transcendence continued to be a statistically significant mediator between meaning and overall levels of prejudice (Table 13). Together, perceived meaning and motivation to control prejudicial reactions explained 14.74% of self-transcendence scores and 3.3% of overall prejudice scores.

Analyses by Demographics

Additionally, prejudicial attitude scores based on race, sex, and political affiliation were examined using one-way ANOVAs to confirm previous research findings that suggested differences among these variables with respect to racial prejudice. The sample was composed of a large majority of White individuals (76%), and was also predominantly female (77.6%) and
Republican (52.5%). Other race, sex, and political groups were not as equally represented. One-
way ANOVAs revealed statistically significant differences between the means of the self-
identified racial groups ($F(4, 348) = 3.70, p < .01$), but not between the means in terms of sex
($F(1, 351) = 2.16, p = .14$) or political affiliation ($F(5, 347) = 1.30, p = .26$) (Tables 14, 15, and
16, respectively). Within the category of race, overall prejudice scores were higher among self-
identified Asian participants, followed by Hispanic/Latino individuals, multiracial individuals,
and White individuals. Black students reported the lowest mean score in terms of overall
prejudicial attitudes. However, because the sample size for each race, sex, and political
affiliation group was not equal or approximately equal, meaningful conclusions cannot be
established based solely on these results.

Further analyses were conducted to test the main model separately in White ($n = 266$) and
Black ($n = 57$) individuals. The model was only tested in these two racial groups because the
measures of prejudice were related specifically to White and Black individuals and the literature
reviewed for this investigation focused primarily on the study of prejudice between these groups.
Even though the sample size for Black individuals was below the number recommended for
mediational analyses (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007; Prayer & Hayes, 2004), and also significantly
different than the size of the sample of White individuals, the model was tested to obtain a
preliminary view of the potential generalization of the model to this racial group. However, for
the reasons noted, the mediational results of the Black participants are considered to be
exploratory, with interpretations tentative in nature.

Evaluation of Model 2 for White and Black Participants

First, $t$ test analyses for independent samples were conducted to compare the mean
scores between White and Black participants in order to determine if, in addition to differences
in prejudice scores, there were statistically significant mean differences with respect to MLQ-P, PIL-SF, PVQ-ST, SDS, and MCPRS scores (Table 17). Results indicated that there were significant mean differences between Black and White participants on the PAB, PAW, and SDS. Specifically, and as expected, White individuals reported significantly more prejudice against Blacks when compared to Blacks, and vice versa. Black individuals reported more prejudice against Whites than did White individuals. White individuals also displayed greater social dominance orientation scores. No significant mean differences were found between White and Black individuals in terms of meaning, self-transcendence, overall prejudice, and motivation to control prejudiced reactions. In other words, White and Black individuals reported comparable scores on these indices.

Given that the main objective of the study was to explore the relationship between meaning in life, the value of self-transcendence, and prejudice, a mediational analysis was conducted to determine whether the value of self-transcendence was also a statistically significant mediator in the relationship between perceived meaning and prejudice, considering White and Black individuals separately. To test the single mediations, model number 4 of the PROCESS program was used. For White students, PWAB and Prejudice Against Blacks (PAB) scores were entered as the dependent variables in two separate single-mediation models. For Black students, PWAB and Prejudice Against Whites (PAW) scores were used as the dependent measures. For each of the single mediation models, the measure of meaning was included as the independent variable and the PVQ-ST was entered as the mediator variable. Analyses were conducted separately for both the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF.

Mediational Model 2 Among White Participants: Together the MLQ-P and the PVQ-ST significantly predicted PWAB scores, accounting for 4.5% of the variance in overall prejudicial
attitudes \( F(2, 251) = 5.94, p < .01 \) (Table 18). A negative direct effect for the MLQ-P on generalized prejudicial attitudes was found \( (B = -.03, SE = .01, 95\% CI [-.05 -- .01]) \). No main effect of PVQ-ST on PWAB scores was indicated. Moreover, bootstrap estimation with 5000 bootstrap samples revealed a significant indirect effect of the value of self-transcendence \( (B = -.01, SE = .003, 95\% CI [-.01 -- .001]) \). Only a partial mediation was denoted as MLQ-P scores continued to have a direct effect on PWAB scores when the effects of self-transcendence were removed. With respect to the PIL-SF (Table 19), meaning and self-transcendence scores accounted for 3.1\% of the variance in PWAB scores. Self-transcendence significantly predicted lower overall prejudice \( (B = -.03, SE = .01, 95\% CI [-.05 -- .002]) \) and functioned as a significant mediator between the PIL-SF and overall prejudicial attitudes \( (B = -.01, SE = .00, 95\% CI [-.02 -- .002]) \). However, no direct main effect of PIL-SF scores on the PWAB was found. In other words, when using the PIL-SF, the relationship between meaning and overall prejudice scores was indirectly associated via the effects of self-transcendence on prejudicial attitudes.

The mediational model was also tested looking only at prejudicial attitudes against Blacks among White students (see Table 20 for analyses with the MLQ-P and Table 21 for analyses with the PIL-SF). Similarly, results yielded a model in which self-transcendence was found to be a significant mediator between scores of meaning and PAB for both measures of perceived meaning \( (\text{MLQ-P } B = -.17, SE = .05, 95\% CI [-.27 -- .09]; \text{PIL-SF } B = -.18, SE = .06, 95\% CI [-.32 -- .08]) \). More specifically, data revealed that perceived meaning in life predicted higher self-transcendence scores, which in turn predicted lower levels of prejudice against Blacks. Surprisingly, in this case the MLQ-P had a significant and positive direct effect on PAB scores, indicating that higher MLQ-P scores predicted greater prejudicial attitudes against Blacks.
When the effects of self-transcendence were not removed from the model (total effect), however, MLQ-P scores were not a significant predictor of prejudice ($B = .12, SE = .11, 95\% CI [-.09 -.33])$. In other words, the positive direct effect of MLQ-P scores on PAB scores was not significant when self-transcendence was taken into account in the regression path. The PIL-SF did not have a significant direct effect on prejudice scores as denoted in the range of the bootstrap confidence intervals which contained zero. However, the $p$ value of the path was .06 indicating that the regression approached significance.

**Mediational Model 2 Among Black Participants:** The same statistical analyses were conducted among Black participants to test the mediational effect of self-transcendence in the relationship between perceived meaning (measured by both the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF) and prejudice scores. Table 22 (for the MLQ-P) and Table 23 (for the PIL-SF) present the results for the single mediation models among Black students with PWAB scores as the dependent measure. The only significant path denoted for these models was in terms of MLQ-P scores predicting higher levels of self-transcendence ($B = .35, SE = .14, 95\% CI [.07 .63])$. The path of the PIL-SF predicting scores of self-transcendence had a confidence interval that included zero, and thus was not significant, but approached significance with a $p$ value of .05. Moreover, meaning and self-transcendence did not significantly predict PWAB scores among Black participants, and thus no total or mediation effect was found.

Similarly, when PAW scores were entered as the outcome measure (see Tables 24 and 25 for results using MLQ-P and PIL-SF scores, respectively), the only significant regression was perceived meaning, measured by both the MLQ-P ($B = .32, SE = .15, 95\% CI [.02 .61])$ and the PIL-SF ($B = .50, SE = .21, 95\% CI [.07 .93])$, predicting higher self-transcendence scores. No other main effects were found in the models. In conclusion, among Black students meaning and
self-transcendence were not significantly associated with generalized prejudice or prejudice against Whites.

Additional Exploratory Analyses

Finally, bivariate correlations were calculated for the rest of the variables included in the study to determine if the primary measures of interest had predictive validity with other constructs as indicated in the literature review (see Table 26). Results indicated that higher overall prejudice scores (PWAB) were significantly associated with higher scores on the value of self-enhancement (PVQ-SE $r = .11, p < .05$) and social dominance orientation (SDS $r = .21, p < .01$), as predicted. In addition, overall prejudice scores were significantly associated with lower overall scores on the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions questionnaire ($r = -.12, p < .05$) and both of the measure’s subscales (MCPRS-Concern $r = -.15, p < .01$; MCPRS-Restrain $r = -.13, p < .05$). Unexpectedly, lower scores on the value of conservation (PVQ-C) were significantly associated with higher overall prejudice scores ($r = -.15, p < .01$). With regard to the measures of meaning, the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF, higher perceived meaning in life was significantly related to higher openness to change scores (MLQ-P $r = .19, p < .01$; PIL-SF $r = .20, p < .01$) and higher conservation scores (MLQ-P $r = .33, p < .01$; PIL-SF $r = .31, p < .01$). The meaning measures were not significantly related to self-enhancement (MLQ-P $r = .02, p = .75$; PIL-SF $r = .03, p = .56$). Moreover, the MLQ-P, but not the PIL-SF, yielded scores that correlate significantly and positively with MCPRS total scores (MLQ-P $r = .11, p < .05$; PIL-SF $r = .03, p = .55$) and MCPRS-Concern subscale scores (MLQ-P $r = .14, p < .01$; PIL-SF $r = .08, p = .13$). Alternatively, the PIL-SF correlated negatively and significantly with MCPRS-Restrain subscale scores ($r = -.12, p < .05$), indicating that higher levels of meaning are associated with less motivation to refrain from being openly prejudicial because of social
judgment. This correlation was not statistically significant when based on MLQ-P scores ($r = -0.08, p = .12$).
IV. DISCUSSION

A primary aim of this study was to test a model in which the value of self-transcendence and value-behavior consistency were examined with respect to the relationship between meaning in life and prejudice. Results yielded a model in which self-transcendence, but not value-behavior consistency, completely mediated the relationship between greater perceived meaning in life and lower reported levels of overall prejudice. Based on the whole sample, in the obtained model perceived presence of meaning (as measured with the MLQ-P) predicted higher scores on the value of self-transcendence and lower overall prejudice scores against White and Black individuals. Self-transcendence had a significant main effect on prejudice scores, and it was through this effect that meaning in life predicted lower levels of prejudice. Contrary to the main hypothesis, when meaning was measured using the PIL-SF, perceived meaning did not directly predict or significantly correlate with prejudice scores. However, the indirect effect of self-transcendence on prejudice through PIL-SF scores was also found to be significant.

When examining the potential effects of covariates on the main model, it was found that the mediation continued to be significant even when accounting for the influence of motivation to control prejudicial reactions. Results also suggested that social dominance orientation was a significant moderator of the relationship between meaning in life and self-transcendence. This latter finding evidenced that higher levels of social dominance orientation weakened the relationship between perceived meaning in life and the value of self-transcendence. Finally, in terms of differences in prejudice scores based on demographic criteria, no statistically significant differences were found in prejudice scores based on sex or political affiliation. With regard to
race, main differences in prejudice scores were found when analyzing all of the groups in the study (individuals identifying as White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, multiracial, and other).

However, given the unequal sample sizes across the different groups and the sample being represented by a majority of White students, no meaningful conclusions could be drawn with respect to racial group differences as to prejudicial attitudes. Furthermore, analysis of the obtained mediation model among White and Black students revealed that self-transcendence functions as a significant mediator of meaning and scores of prejudice among White students but not among Black students. The mediation finding was true for the relationship between meaning and White individuals’ overall prejudice scores and for the independent scores of White participants’ prejudice against Black individuals.

In summary, the study yielded mixed findings in terms of the models and hypotheses proposed, confirming some of the initial hypotheses but indicating different results in some of the expected relationships. To gain a better understanding of the present findings, each of the results are discussed in light of the proposed models, the literature review, and implications for applied practice. Finally, the limitations and directions for research are mentioned, followed by general conclusions.

*Model 1:* The first proposed model posited that under high levels of the value of self-transcendence, the relationship between meaning in life and prejudice would be significantly mediated by value-behavior consistency. It was asserted that this relationship would be lessened or non-existent for participants with lower levels of the value of self-transcendence. For the model to be true it was hypothesized that perceived meaning in life, as measured by both the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF, would be a significant predictor of greater levels of value-behavior consistency and lower levels of overall prejudicial attitudes. Furthermore, it was expected that
value-behavior consistency was going to be a significant predictor of lower prejudicial attitude scores.

The positive and significant relationship between meaning in life and value-behavior consistency was confirmed. Individuals reporting greater levels of perceived meaning indicated that they tend to act in ways that are more consistent with their values, an association that has also been supported by previous research and theories of meaning (Martos & Kopp, 2012; Reker & Woo, 2011; To et al., 2014). Value-driven behavior is conceptualized as a core component of meaning and one of the primary sources of a meaningful life (Eakman, 2013; Frankl, 1994).

Also, as predicted for the overall sample, individuals with greater levels of perceived meaning in life (as measured by the MLQ-P) reported lower levels of prejudicial attitudes against Blacks and Whites. To our knowledge, no other published study has tested the relationship between meaning and racial prejudice against White and Black individuals. Nonetheless, this finding is in line with conceptualizations of meaning that view purpose in life as an influential factor that can ultimately foster less biased interactions via the positive effects of perceiving a meaningful life (Burrow & Hill, 2013; Burrow, O’Dell, & Hill, 2009; Burrow et al., 2014; Florez et al., 2016).

Contrary to initial assumptions, when perceived meaning in life was measured using the PIL-SF the correlation between meaning and prejudicial attitudes did not reach statistical significance. Even though both measures of meaning yielded similar internal consistency reliabilities and the association between the PIL-SF and prejudice was in the same direction as the one found between the MLQ-P and prejudice, the PIL-SF was not significantly related to overall prejudice scores. This different result obtained on the basis of whether the PIL-SF or the MLQ-P is used suggests that these two measures of presence of meaning, although similar, may be tapping into related but subtle distinct dimensions of perceived meaning. Schulenberg and
colleagues (2011) documented a correlation of .64 between these two scales and posited that the PIL-SF and the MLQ-P are likely to complement each other (as opposed to being interchangeable measures of perceived meaning). Unfortunately, apart from that study no other investigation could be found that included both measures of meaning. In this study, the PIL-SF and the MLQ-P also correlated at .64, a moderate association, sharing 41% of the variance. Given that the correlation between these measures reveals unshared variance between them supports the hypothesis that although convergent to some degree the scales also distinctively assess different meaning-related factors. Moreover, there were several instances in which the PIL-SF and the MLQ-P functioned differently in association with variables of prejudice as noted in the results section.

Based on qualitative analyses, minor differences between the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF are found in the wording of the items and in the content assessed. When directly comparing these scales, the main difference noted by this author was that the MLQ-P uses items that assess a subjective and more general sense of meaning (i.e., I understand my life’s meaning), while the PIL-SF is more specific in examining respondents’ views of their goal establishment and accomplishment (i.e., in achieving life goals, I have…). Based on these subtle differences, these results suggest that for the overall sample a general sense of a meaningful life might have a stronger association with prejudicial attitudes than the individuals’ perception of their identification and achievement of meaningful goals as measured by the PIL-SF. However, as stated above the specific variations and predictive differences between these measures of meaning have not been compared or empirically tested to draw valid conclusions.

Another finding that refuted the preliminary hypothesis was the lack of significant association between value-behavior consistency and generalized prejudice, which further
resulted in the rejection of the initial mediational model proposed. To our knowledge, this is the first investigation that: (1) has examined the relationship between value-behavior consistency and racial prejudice; and (2) has used a measure of personal values (The Valued Living Questionnaire) rather than a measure of social values. These results suggest that the tendency to be consistent in personal areas of values (e.g., family, friends, and education) might not generalize to other unrelated valued areas such as social values and does not give information about the individual’s belief system or the content associated with a given value. This interpretation is supported by theoretical conceptualizations of values that emphasize that each value is unique in its behavioral and attitudinal correlates and that the endorsement of one value is independent of the endorsement of another value (Caprara et al., 2006; Piurko et al., 2011; Schwartz, 2007). Considering that in this investigation the measure of value-behavior consistency was not specific to examining social values pertinent to the area of racial prejudice, firm conclusions about the relationship between value-behavior consistency as a predictor of racial prejudice cannot be established. Thus, for future studies it is vital to design an instrument that speaks specifically to the behavioral consistency of interpersonal values and thus functions as a logical correlate of racial prejudice. One possibility for developing such a measure is to take the values identified by Schwartz (e.g., self-transcendence, conservation, security, openness to others) and adjust them to the VLQ format to measure agreement between these values and behavioral commitment to them over the past week.

The last hypothesis of the initial model referred to the premise that participants’ levels of self-transcendence would moderate the relationship between perceived meaning and prejudicial attitudes (a relationship that was initially proposed to be mediated by value-behavior consistency). Supported by previous research, the value of self-transcendence was found to be
positively and significantly associated with meaning (Della Fave et al., 2014; Reker & Woo, 2011) and negatively and significantly associated with generalized prejudice (Feather & McKee, 2008, 2012). Moreover, individuals that scored higher on the value of self-transcendence also indicated a greater consistency between their valued areas and their behaviors over the previous week. These findings revealed that individuals endorsing higher levels of self-transcendence are more likely to report greater levels of meaning, greater consistency between values and behaviors, and lower generalized prejudicial attitudes. However, self-transcendence did not function as a moderator of either of the relationships of the model. Although past studies have examined the moderator role of the value of self-transcendence on different social constructs (Roccas, 2003), to our knowledge, to date the present study is the first to examine self-transcendence as a potential moderator of the relationship between perceived meaning and prejudicial attitudes.

One explanation of the lack of a moderation effect is that for this sample self-transcendence was associated with perceived meaning in a linear way (e.g., greater meaning scores tend to be associated with higher reported levels of self-transcendence). In a linear relationship, individuals reporting greater levels of meaning are also more likely to report higher levels of self-transcendence, which in turn lowers the likelihood of encountering variations in the meaning scores based on the value of self-transcendence (e.g., greater meaning scores associated with lower levels of self-transcendence). In other words, increments or decrements in meaning result in parallel increments or decrements in self-transcendence scores, resulting in fewer possibilities of finding a moderation effect. This same linear association between the value of self-transcendence and prejudice might explain why a main moderation effect was not found between these variables.
Model 2: The second proposed model posited that if self-transcendence did not emerge as a significant moderator, it would function as a mediator of the relationship between perceived meaning in life and prejudice. Since value-behavior consistency was not found to be a significant mediator or predictor of prejudice, it was removed from the second model. Results confirmed all of the hypotheses proposed in model 2, except the assertion that the PIL-SF would predict lower generalized prejudicial scores. Perceived meaning in life was associated with higher levels of the value of self-transcendence and lower prejudicial attitudes, and the main effect of self-transcendence in scores of prejudice explained the link between meaning and lower prejudicial attitudes. This finding also applied to scores on the PIL-SF. Even though the PIL-SF did not directly predict lower prejudice scores, through its relationship with self-transcendence, it was associated with lower generalized prejudice scores. Although meaning and self-transcendence only explained a small amount of variance in prejudice scores, together these variables accounted for more variance than when entered separately.

These findings are consistent with the literature that underscores the important role of the value of self-transcendence in reducing prejudicial attitudes (Feather & McKee, 2008; Strelan, Feather, & McKee, 2011). There is empirical support showing that individuals that are concerned for the well-being and welfare of others endorse less racism and discriminatory behaviors (Feather & McKee, 2008; Feather, Woodyatt, & McKee, 2012; Greenhalgh & Watt, 2015). More importantly, these results support Frankl’s conceptualization of meaning that asserts that a meaningful life is associated with transcending beyond our personal interests (Frankl, 1994), and that self-transcendence combined with meaning is associated with other positive outcomes, such as better relationships, quality of life, and overall psychosocial functioning (Haugan, Moksnes, & Løhre, 2016; Haugan, Rannestad, Hammervold, Garåsen, & Espnes, 2014; Kim, Hayward, &
Reed, 2014). Further, findings support Florez et al.’s (2016) literature review that pointed out values as an explanatory mechanism in the relationship between meaning and prejudice.

Controlling for variables: As posited in the preliminary hypotheses, when controlling for motivation to control prejudiced reactions self-transcendence continued to mediate the relationship between meaning and prejudice. Although previous research has demonstrated that motivation to hide racial prejudicial attitudes predicts endorsement of racial prejudice (Chen, Moons, Gather, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2014; Glaser & Knowles, 2008), no past study was found that examined the predictive role that both meaning and self-transcendence play beyond the motivation to control prejudicial reactions. The current study revealed that the significant mediational role of self-transcendence in the relationship between meaning and prejudice remained even when taking into account the effect of social desirability associated with internal and external efforts to hide prejudice. This finding suggests that meaning and self-transcendence influence overall prejudiced attitudes regardless of the motivation to hide racist beliefs.

With regard to social dominance orientation, data analyses revealed that social dominance was associated with lower levels of self-transcendence and was not related to whether a person perceived life more or less meaningful. The negative relationship between self-transcendence and social dominance orientation is in alignment with theoretical and empirical data supporting that self-transcendence and social dominance orientation represent opposite values in the continuum in Schwartz’s model of values (Cieciuch et al., 2014; Guimond et al., 2003; Livi et al., 2014). While the value of self-transcendence refers to concern for the welfare of others, social dominance orientation refers to values that are more individualistic and reject group equality. From this framework, it makes sense that when an individual endorses stronger beliefs favoring group inequality, he or she is more likely to hold values of power, dominance,
and self-enhancement, which conflict with the value of self-transcendence (Duckitt & Sibley, 2010; Pratto et al., 1994). With respect to the link between meaning and social dominance orientation, the non-significant association between these constructs (whether using the MLQ-P or the PIL-SF) differs from past research documenting a negative significant link between perceived meaning and SDS scores among White college students (Florez et al., 2013). These mixed findings suggest that the relationship between meaning and social dominance orientation is multifaceted and perhaps conditional to some other variable such as political affiliation, other traditional values, or even race.

Further, results denoted that higher levels of social dominance orientation weakened the relationship between perceived meaning and self-transcendence, and thus functioned as a moderator in this association. This finding is consistent with the conceptualization of social dominance orientation being opposite to self-transcendence. Based on this knowledge, among students with high levels of social dominance orientation, ultimately, meaning would not have a great impact on self-transcendence, since self-transcendence stands in contrast to social dominance. This explanation is somewhat consistent with Florez’s thesis work (2014) that found that only for individuals endorsing lower levels of automatic stereotyping, but not higher levels of automatic stereotyping, meaning was significantly associated with fewer implicit biases against Black people. In Florez’s discussion (2014), it was suggested that the relationship between meaning and intergroup bias was dependent on values. For instance, for people with egalitarian values meaning would be associated with less intergroup bias, but for individuals that believe in group inequality meaning would not have a positive effect. Considering that among individuals that support social dominance meaning is less likely to be linked to concern over the welfare of others, it appears that the association between meaning and self-transcendence varies
depending on the person’s value system (Frankl, 1959/1984; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Van Tongeren & Green, 2010; Williams, 2012).

Analyses by Demographics

Results of mean differences on the basis of race, sex, and political affiliation indicated that for this sample there were only significant differences among the means of racial groups. Although the sample size in terms of race, sex, and political affiliation was not equal or approximately equal to establish meaningful conclusions, some speculations based on the literature review were made to interpret these results. For instance, the finding that different racial groups endorsed distinct levels of racial prejudice is in alignment with the literature review. Individuals tend to have greater positive bias towards their own race and endorse greater negative bias towards different races (Pendry, 2013; Spears & Tausch, 2013; Uhlmann & Nosek, 2012). Based on this knowledge, and as revealed in this study, White individuals are more likely than Black individuals to be more prejudiced against Blacks, and vice versa, Black individuals are more likely to be more prejudiced against Whites. Interestingly, results indicated that Latino and multiracial individuals were more prejudiced against White individuals than against Black individuals, and that Asians were more prejudiced against Black individuals than against White individuals. These differences in prejudicial scores against Black and Whites among Latino, multiracial, and Asian individuals could be explained by the shared reality theory, which posits that when individuals perceive to share common experiences and perspectives with another group, they tend to be less negative about that group (Conley, Rabinowitz, & Matsick, 2016). For this sample, the view of being more similar, ethnically and culturally, to either White or Black people could account for the fact that Asian students were less prejudiced with regard to White individuals, whereas Hispanic and multiracial students were less prejudiced with respect to Black.
individuals (e.g., Asian students perceiving themselves being closer to White people in terms of values, ethnicity, or race than to Black people).

No significant mean differences were found for sex or political affiliation despite previous studies showing that men endorse stronger explicit prejudicial attitudes than women (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2003; Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markman, & Snyder, 2006). Similarly, although investigations have consistently documented that Republicans report significantly more generalized prejudicial attitudes than any other political affiliation (Echebarria-Echabe & Guede, 2007; Sears & Henry, 2003; Terrizzi, Shook, & Ventis, 2010), this was not true in this study. A possible explanation is that among college students and younger generations, traditional values and beliefs, which are attributed to being male and being Republican, have changed over time and have become more open in terms of accepting others’ differences and values (Chambers et al., 2012). This change in values and tolerance of others might keep men and Republicans from reporting more prejudice. Moreover, some students might have identified as Republican due to family tradition without actual internalization of the beliefs of this political group to their identity. The lack of significant differences on the basis of sex and political affiliation could also be explained by the unequal subsample sizes for each group resulting in a non-representative sample of the population for males and other political affiliations. Ultimately, given the large subsample size differences between racial, sex, and political affiliation groups represented in this study, explanations about differences among groups are not conclusive and need to be empirically examined with equivalent or approximately equivalent sample sizes.

Analysis of the Main Model for White and Black Participants

Analyses of the model for White and Black individuals yielded that presence of meaning and self-transcendence were significant predictors of lower overall prejudice scores among White but not Black individuals. Similarly, only in White participants self-transcendence was a
significant mediator between perceived meaning and lower overall prejudicial attitudes. Among Black students, neither meaning nor self-transcendence influenced overall prejudice scores or scores reflecting prejudice against White individuals. Surprisingly, analyses also revealed that when looking at White individuals’ prejudice against Black people, greater presence of meaning (measured by the MLQ-P but not the PIL-SF) directly predicted greater prejudicial attitudes towards Black individuals. This relationship, however, was only significant when the variance explained by the effects of self-transcendence was removed.

These findings suggested that: (1) the role that meaning and self-transcendence play in terms of racial prejudice varies depending on the individual’s race, (2) the obtained model in this study applies primarily to White students and should not be generalized to other racial groups, and (3) among White college students, when perceived meaning is not combined with self-transcendence it might be associated with more racial prejudice against Black individuals. The consideration that the model did not apply to Black individuals may be due to the small number of respondents, as a larger sample size is recommended for mediation analyses. However, it is not surprising that processes of prejudice would function differently in White individuals, who have been traditionally favored with more positive stereotypes, and Black individuals, who have historically been a target of prejudice. Although there are few studies comparing prejudicial attitudes of Black people against White people to processes of prejudicial attitudes of White people against Black people, preliminary research supports the argument that predictors of racial prejudice are different for Black and White individuals (Craig & Richeson, 2014a, 2014b; Dixon et al., 2010; Foley, 1977; Irizarry, 2012). For instance, research has shown that under certain circumstances interventions based on the contact hypothesis can reduce prejudice in White individuals, but actually increase bias against White people among Black individuals (Hagan,
Shedd, & Payne, 2005; Ross & Turner, 2005). In terms of our findings, it is logical to think that while for White individuals self-transcendence could imply caring about those who are less privileged (e.g., minority groups), for Black individuals, self-transcendence may result in greater efforts to serve disadvantaged individuals in their in-group without influencing prejudice against groups that are perceived to need less help. No previous study could be found on the role that self-transcendence plays in prejudicial attitudes of Black people against White people to further support this hypothesis. This issue further highlights the importance of studying predictors of prejudice among Black people and other minority groups.

When analyzing the models separately for White students, it was found that meaning in life had a direct positive effect on prejudice against Blacks. This finding suggests that the value of self-transcendence could actually play a protective role against greater prejudice against Black individuals among White individuals. A positive relationship between meaning and prejudice against Black people is supported by some conceptualizations of racism that argue that some of the functions of racial prejudice are to maintain a sense of superiority, in-group uniqueness, and a positive sense of identity towards the in-group and group norms (Aberson, Healy, & Romero, 2000; Effron & Knowles, 2015; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Hunter et al., 2011). From this point of view, prejudicial attitudes against Black individuals may be a way to sustain a sense of superiority through a positive in-group image that ultimately contributes to the individual’s perceived meaning (which is largely based in positive identity and positive affect) (Hicks & King, 2009a, 2009b; Hicks et al., 2010; Schlegel, Hicks, King, & Arndt, 2011). Thus, without an internal motivation to look beyond personal interests and strive to protect the welfare of others, for some individuals a greater sense of meaning and positive identity could be rooted in greater prejudicial beliefs towards out-group members. An alternative explanation is that this positive
association between meaning in life and relative scores of prejudice is associated with students’ endorsement of values of security, power, and self-enhancement, which are linked to greater prejudice (Feather & McKee, 2008; Livi et al., 2014; Schwartz et al., 2010). In this case, students that score higher in values associated with social prejudice might derive meaning from these values and consequently display greater racial prejudice. Once again, given that to our knowledge this is the first study examining the association between meaning, self-transcendence, and racial prejudice, these hypotheses cannot be contrasted with previous empirical investigations and thus need to be tested in future studies.

*Additional Exploratory Analyses:* Results from additional analyses validated predictions of past investigations demonstrating that individuals with greater prejudicial attitudes are more likely to endorse the value of self-enhancement (prioritizing personal interests regardless of the welfare of others) (Duckitt & Sibley, 2010) and to believe in social dominance (Feather & McKee, 2008; Schwartz et al., 2010). Students with higher prejudice scores were also less likely to be concerned about being socially punished from expressing racist beliefs or being restrained by social norms of equality (Chen, Moons, Gather, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2014; Glaser & Knowles, 2008). Contrary to previous research (Brewer, 2003; Schwartz, Caprara, & Vecchione, 2010), participants endorsing the value of conservation (conforming to traditional values) reported fewer prejudicial attitudes. This latter finding might be partly explained by a cohort effect in which values of tradition and conformity to norms represent different ideas than the ones endorsed by past generations who were more accepting of racist attitudes. Thus, in younger generations, which were represented in this sample, the value of conservation might reflect increased efforts to decrease racial prejudice that in turn are associated with lower prejudicial beliefs for individuals that want to conform to the norms. This hypothesis is supported by
investigations showing changes in traditional values across generations (Heath, 2014; Heritage, Breen, & Roberts, 2016; Sabatier & Lannegrand-Willems, 2005).

In terms of meaning, additional analyses revealed that individuals are more likely to perceive greater meaning when endorsing values of conservation, openness to change, and self-transcendence, than when endorsing individualistic values (i.e., self-enhancement). This result is in agreement with empirical data and theories of meaning that posit that perceived meaning in life is lower in individuals oriented to serving personal interests (Reker, 2000; Reker & Woo, 2011; Schnell, 2009). Lastly, results from correlational analyses indicated that only the MLQ-P was significantly associated with more preoccupations related to acting in a prejudicial way based on internal motivations, whereas only the PIL-SF was associated with a lower likelihood to restrain prejudicial beliefs based on external motivations. These results give support to the previously hypothesized distinctiveness between these two measures, and lend credence to the argument that perceived meaning in life influences people’s motivations to express racial prejudice. Meaning’s effect on individuals’ motivation to hide prejudicial attitudes could be explained by the meaning maintenance model (Cesario, Plaks, & Higgins, 2006; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Sheldon, 2012). This model posits that people are constantly engaging in efforts to sustain meaning via attenuating situations that contradict their meaning and threats to their positive self-image (Cesario, Plaks, & Higgins, 2006; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Sheldon, 2012). From this theory, efforts to combat threats to meaning could be associated with controlling racial bias to avoid cognitive dissonance rather than to avoid social judgment.

Limitations and Directions for Research: The conclusions from this study must be tempered by a number of limiting factors. Based on the cross-sectional and correlational nature of the present study, no ultimate causal assumptions may be made as to the relationship between
perceived meaning, value-behavior consistency, self-transcendence, and racial prejudice. Increasingly rigorous experimental and longitudinal designs are necessary to validate whether meaning in life, value-behavior consistency, and self-transcendence are causative factors of generalized and relative prejudice. It is also important to note that although a significant model of the mediation of self-transcendence between meaning and prejudice was obtained, effect sizes were rather small, limiting the predictive power of the conclusions. It is recommended that new research attempts to replicate this model to strengthen the findings of the study. Moreover, given that this is a novel area of study, the hypotheses suggested explaining unexpected findings and relationships, although theoretically sound, have not been tested and thus cannot be confirmed through these data.

Another important limitation is associated with the demographics of the participants. The homogeneous nature of the sample does not allow for generalization of results to other populations outside of White college students attending a medium-sized university located in the southern United States. Even though initially the study was designed to include participants from multiple racial groups, the non-equivalent representation across the groups included in this study impedes the drawing of meaningful statistical comparisons for group differences in prejudicial scores. The same limitation applies to sex and political affiliation. Future research on the role of meaning and values in predicting lower prejudice should also be expanded to include people of different races/ethnicities, ages, cultures, and nations. Forthcoming investigations would also benefit from including measures of prejudice towards members of other minority groups commonly affected by negative stereotypes (women, gay and lesbian individuals, individuals with mental and physical disabilities, and members of other racial-ethnic groups). Such research
would enhance understanding as to whether and how meaning and self-transcendence influence processes of social judgment across various contexts and in various populations.

Other limitations relate to the questionnaires used in the study. As stated before, the instrument chosen to assess the construct of value-behavior consistency measures personal values but not social values (e.g., self-transcendence, security or self-enhancement). In future studies, a direct measure of value-behavior consistency of social values should be incorporated to validate the hypothesis that value-behavior consistency is associated with prejudice scores. Similarly, considering that the Prejudice Against Blacks and Whites Scales is a fairly new measure of prejudice, the psychometrics of the measure have not been studied rigorously and interpretive guidelines have not been established. In addition, the validity of the scale and the derived generalized and relative prejudice scores have not been documented. Furthermore, because White and Black individuals were asked to judge their own group to obtain a measure of generalized prejudice, the results associated with the overall prejudice score for these groups could potentially be biased considering that groups tend to be more positive about their in-group when compared to judgments about out-groups. For future studies, direct measures of a generalized tendency to endorse racial prejudicial attitudes that do not include the individual’s in-group should be included to further support these findings. For instance, in a future study White participants could be presented only with the Prejudice Against Blacks scale and Black participants could be presented only with the Prejudice Against Whites scales.

The subjective nature of self-report questionnaires used to measure perceived meaning in life is also a limitation given that these measures do not account for participants’ interpretation of the concepts of meaning or wording of the items (Park & George, 2013). In other words, given that both the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF examine the perception of meaning at a specific moment
versus assessing objective indicators (e.g., actual completion of valued goals, recognition of what makes their life meaningful) it cannot be concluded whether reports of perceived meaning are indeed reflective of actions and beliefs that theoretically constitute a meaningful life (Park & George, 2013). It is recommended that future studies include measures that examine well-known predictors and indicators of meaning to illustrate in greater depth the associations between concrete correlates of perceived meaning and prejudice. For example, it would be worthwhile to include other measures tapping into meaning-related constructs such as existential vacuum, search for meaning, psychological flexibility, and altruistic behavior (Florez et al., 2016).

Furthermore, given that in this study the MLQ-P and the PIL-SF related differently to scores of prejudice, while still sharing a significant amount of variance, suggests that each scale is uniquely contributing to the measurement of perceived meaning in life. Based on this knowledge, additional analyses in which these two instruments of meaning are combined in a general score of meaning and examined with respect to values and prejudice can enhance the explanatory power of the construct of meaning in life by measuring more comprehensively different meaning-related aspects.

Finally, a more in-depth analysis of the current data that goes beyond the scope of the study might provide a better understanding of the relationship between these variables. For instance, testing the mediational role of conservation and openness to change in the association between meaning and self-transcendence might yield useful information about the relationship between meaning and values. In addition, further analyses of prejudicial reactions against respondents’ own racial group (White or Black) could better inform us about the nature of the relationship between meaning and processes of self-image and intragroup bias.
In spite of these limitations, these findings have important implications for the study of meaning, values, and prejudice. Findings confirmed that when individuals perceive they have a meaningful life they are more likely to care, appreciate, and protect others’ welfare, which in turn may result in fewer negative biased interactions. These data also highlight the fundamental and promising role of the value of self-transcendence in promoting less racial prejudice and greater acceptance of diverse groups among White college students. Through the value of self-transcendence, intergroup anxiety and threats to personal identity associated with exposure to out-group members might be buffered, resulting in less of a need to endorse negative biases towards other groups while also conferring a sense of meaning.

This latter finding can eventually inform interventions to reduce racial prejudice by targeting meaning coupled with self-transcendence to promote positive intergroup interactions. Such interventions could focus on reinforcing the values of helping and appreciating others as sources of meaning. Moreover, given that sustaining meaning in life can potentially motivate prejudicial behavior (Cesario, Plaks, & Higgins, 2006; Proulx & Heine, 2008; Sheldon, 2012), interventions to reduce prejudice might benefit from focusing on teaching individuals ways to sustain meaning not rooted in feeling superior to others. It would be worth examining whether psychological flexibility, the ability to continue to commit to values and goals even in the face of negative internal experiences, could possibly strengthen the link between meaning and lower levels of prejudice, by teaching individuals how to manage negative emotions and thoughts associated with intergroup anxiety.

In conclusion, findings from this study support the strong and promising theoretical argument to continue investigating the relationship between meaning, values, and intergroup relationships (Florez et al., 2013). This avenue of empirical inquiry has significant implications
for the science of meaning as well as for future interventions to reduce prejudice and discrimination. Lastly, this study underscores the importance of investigating processes and predictors of racial prejudice among Black individuals and other minority groups to ultimately design culturally competent interventions to reduce bias towards out-group members and improve relationships with White individuals.
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APPENDIX A: TABLES
Table 1

**Definitions of Schwartz’s 10 Universal Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>Valuing independence of opinions and when making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Appreciation for novelty, excitement, and challenge in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pursuit for pleasure and gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Obtaining personal success and competence that is determined by social standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Valuing dominance, control, social status, and prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Appreciation of social and personal stability, safety, and harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Compliance with social norms and expectations and rejection of situations that are likely to disrupt social order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Commitment to traditional values, norms, and religious beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Preoccupation for the enhancement of the welfare of friends, relatives, and members of one’s own group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Tolerance and acceptance for all people and for nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Definitions of Schwartz’s 19 Universal Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence-Dependability</td>
<td>Being a reliable and trustworthy member of the in-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence-Caring</td>
<td>Devotion to the welfare of in-group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism-Tolerance</td>
<td>Acceptance and understanding of those who are different from oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism-Concern</td>
<td>Commitment to equality, justice, and protection for all people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism-Nature</td>
<td>Preservation of the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Recognizing one’s insignificance in the larger scheme of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity-Interpersonal</td>
<td>Avoidance of upsetting or harming other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity-Rules</td>
<td>Compliance with rules, laws, and formal obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Maintaining and preserving cultural, family, or religious traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security-Societal</td>
<td>Safety and stability in the wider society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security-Personal</td>
<td>Safety in one’s immediate environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Security and power through maintaining one’s public image and avoiding humiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-Resources</td>
<td>Power through control of material and social resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-Dominance</td>
<td>Power through exercising control over people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Obtaining personal success and competence that is determined by social standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pursuit for pleasure and gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Appreciation for novelty, excitement, and challenge in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction-Action</td>
<td>The freedom to determine one’s own actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction-Thought</td>
<td>The freedom to cultivate one’s own ideas and abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for the Measures Administered (Valid N = 362)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>43.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>43.29</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-RR</td>
<td>261.21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-E</td>
<td>36.53</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-OC</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-C</td>
<td>66.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ</td>
<td>53.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-C</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-R</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PVQ-RR = Portrait Values Questionnaire Revised-RR, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, PVQ-E = Enhancement, PVQ-OC = Openness to Change, PVQ-C = Conservation, VLQ = Valued Living Questionnaire (the parenting item was not included), MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale, MCPRS-C = Concern, MCPRS-R = Restraint, SDS = Social Dominance Scale; SD = Standard deviation.
Table 4

*Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics and Standard Errors (Valid N = 362)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-RR</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-E</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-OC</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-C</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-C</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-R</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PVQ-RR = Portrait Values Questionnaire Revised-RR, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, PVQ-E = Enhancement, PVQ-OC = Openness to Change, PVQ-C = Conservation, VLQ = Valued Living Questionnaire, MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale, MCPRS-C = Concern, MCPRS-R = Restraint, SDS = Social Dominance Scale; *SD* = Standard deviation.
### Table 5

*One-Sample t tests for Mean Differences Between PAB and PAW Scores by Racial Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>73.26</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>77.75</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>30.16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.14</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, *n* = number of participants, *df* = degrees of freedom.
Table 6

*Independent Samples t tests for Mean Differences Between Spring Semester Participants (n = 152) and Fall Semester Participants (n = 208)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWAB</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-E</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-OC</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-C</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-C</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-R</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Bivariate Correlations Among the Main Study Variables (Valid N = 362)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIL-SF</th>
<th>PAB</th>
<th>PAW</th>
<th>PWAB</th>
<th>VLQ</th>
<th>PVQ-ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWAB</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, VLQ = Valued Living Questionnaire. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).
Table 8

Statistics for the Mediation Model 1 Using MLQ-P Scores (Valid N = 318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting VLQ</td>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.77 to 1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>( c_1 )</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04 to -.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ predicting PWAB</td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01 to .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>( c' )</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04 to -.001</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PWAB via VLQ</td>
<td>( ab )</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01 to .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1 (MLQ-P x PVQ-ST) on VLQ</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05 to .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1 (MLQ-P x PVQ-ST) on PWAB</td>
<td>( c_2' )</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04 to .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, VLQ = Valued Living Questionnaire, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Statistics for the Mediation Model 1 Using PIL-SF Scores (Valid N = 308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting VLQ</td>
<td>a1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>c1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLQ predicting PWAB</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PWAB via VLQ</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1 (PIL-SF x PVQ-ST) on VLQ</td>
<td>a2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1 (PIL-SF x PVQ-ST) on PWAB</td>
<td>c2’</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, VLQ = Valued Living Questionnaire, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 10

*Statistics for the Mediation Model 2 Using MLQ-P Scores (Valid N = 343)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 11

Statistics for the Mediation Model 2 Using PIL-SF Scores (Valid N = 341)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 12

*Interactions Testing for Social Dominance Orientation and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions as Moderators of the Main Model (Valid N = 308)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1 (MLQ-P x SDS) on PVQ-ST</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2 (MLQ-P x SDS) on PWAB</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 3 (MLQ-P x MCPRS) on PVQ-ST</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 4 (MLQ-P x MCPRS) on PWAB</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, SDS = Social Dominance Scale, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale.
Table 13

Statistics for the Mediation Model 2 Using the MCPRS as a Covariate (Valid N = 343)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS on PWAB</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale.
Table 14

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Overall Prejudice Scores by Race and Descriptives of Mean Scores (Valid N = 353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1153.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>288.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27158.63</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>78.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28311.96</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = degrees of freedom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>88.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87.20</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>79.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>78.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>86.06</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>84.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83.29</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>80.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Std. = Standard.
Table 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Overall Prejudice Scores by Sex and Descriptives of Mean Scores (N = 353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>173.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173.36</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>28138.59</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>80.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28311.96</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. df = degrees of freedom.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>85.64</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>84.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87.32</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>85.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Std. = Standard.*
Table 16

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Overall Prejudice Scores by Political Affiliation and Descriptives of Mean Scores (Valid N = 353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>521.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27790.70</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>80.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28311.96</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = degrees of freedom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84.09</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>82.12</td>
<td>86.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>86.15</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>84.87</td>
<td>87.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian Party</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>90.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>105.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87.70</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>85.31</td>
<td>90.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>131.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>86.01</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>85.07</td>
<td>86.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Std. = Standard.
Table 17

Independent Samples t tests for Mean Differences Between White and Black Participants with Respect to the Main Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>87.54</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>-10.03</td>
<td>85.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-12.70</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>89.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWAB</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>74.34</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>-5.18</td>
<td>91.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-11.89</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-C</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-R</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Equal variances between groups were not assumed.
MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, SDS = Social Dominance Scale, MCPRS-C = Concern, MCPRS-R = Restraint, MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale.
Table 18

Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 Among White Participants Using MLQ-P Scores

(Valid N = 254)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.*
Table 19

*Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 Among White Participants Using PIL-SF Scores*

(Valid N =252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI LL</th>
<th>95% CI UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 20

Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 for Prejudice Against Blacks Scores Among White Participants Using MLQ-P Scores (Valid N = 255)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PAB</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.*
Table 21

*Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 for Prejudice Against Blacks Scores Among White Participants Using PIL-SF Scores (Valid N = 253)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$95%$ CI LL</th>
<th>$95%$ CI UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PAB</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PAB = Prejudice Against Blacks, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.*
Table 22

Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 Among Black Participants Using MLQ-P Scores

(Valid N = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 23

*Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 Among Black Participants Using PIL-SF Scores*  
(Valid N = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.004 -.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PWAB (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.10 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PWAB</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.07 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PWAB (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.09 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PWAB via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.05 .004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 24

*Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 for Prejudice Against Whites Scores Among Black Participants Using MLQ-P Scores (Valid N = 56)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P predicting PAW (Total effect)</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PAW</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P on PAW (Direct effect)</td>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of MLQ-P on PAW via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>$ab$</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.
Table 25

Statistics for the Single Mediation Model 2 for Prejudice Against Whites Scores Among Black Participants Using PIL-SF Scores (Valid N = 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PVQ-ST</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF predicting PAW (Total effect)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-ST predicting PAW</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF on PAW (Direct effect)</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of PIL-SF on PAW via PVQ-ST</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PAW = Prejudice Against Whites, PVQ-ST = Self-Transcendence.*
Table 26

Bivariate Correlations Including the MCPRS, the SDS, and the Additional Subscales from the PVQ (Valid N = 362)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLQ-P</th>
<th>PIL-SF</th>
<th>PVQ-SE</th>
<th>PVQ-OC</th>
<th>PVQ-C</th>
<th>SDS</th>
<th>MCPRS</th>
<th>MCPRS-C</th>
<th>MCPRS-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWAB</td>
<td>- .13 *</td>
<td>.11 *</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15 **</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
<td>-.12 *</td>
<td>-.15 **</td>
<td>-.13 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-P</td>
<td>.64 **</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19 **</td>
<td>.33 **</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11 *</td>
<td>.14 *</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL-SF</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20 **</td>
<td>.31 **</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-SE</td>
<td>.31 **</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
<td>.25 **</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-OC</td>
<td>.29 **</td>
<td>-.12 *</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.31 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVQ-C</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34 **</td>
<td>.39 **</td>
<td>.18 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>-.25 **</td>
<td>-.31 **</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS</td>
<td>.95 **</td>
<td>.43 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRS-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PWAB = Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales, MLQ-P = Meaning in Life Questionnaire-Presence subscale, PIL-SF = Purpose in Life test-Short Form, PVQ-E = Enhancement, PVQ-OC = Openness to Change, PVQ-C = Conservation, SDS = Social Dominance Scale, MCPRS-C = Concern, MCPRS-R = Restraint, MCPRS = Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).
APPENDIX B: FIGURES
Figure 1. The motivational circle of values according to the refined theory of basic values. Adapted from “Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia” by S. Schwartz & T. Butenko, 2014, European Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 31, p. 800. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Figure 2. First conceptual model and statistical diagram on a moderated mediation between meaning, values, and prejudice.
Figure 3. Second conceptual and statistical model, a multiple mediation between meaning, values, and prejudicial attitudes.
Figure 4. Revised conceptual and statistical model 2, a single mediation between meaning, the value of self-transcendence, and prejudicial attitudes.
Figure 5. Relationship between perceived meaning in life and self-transcendence at different levels of social dominance orientation.
APPENDIX C: ADVERTISEMENT
SONA Advertisement

Title: Meaning in Life and Social Values

Researchers: Stefan Schulenberg, PhD and Andrea Florez, MA

Credits: 1

Duration: 60 minutes

Inclusion Criteria: To participate in the study you have to be a student at the University of Mississippi, 18 years old or older.

Description:

The present research examines the relationship between meaning, individual values, social judgments, and racial attitudes. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete questionnaires pertaining to various social issues, racial prejudice, sense of purpose, and values. Most participants will complete the questionnaires in 60 minutes or less. You will receive 1 hour of experimental credit in your psychology course for your participation.
APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent Form

Introduction
The present research examines the relationship between meaning, individual values, social judgments, and racial attitudes. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete questionnaires pertaining to various social issues, racial prejudice, sense of purpose, and values. Most participants will complete the questionnaires in 60 minutes or less. You will receive 1 hour of experimental credit in your psychology course for your participation.

Risks and Benefits
There are no anticipated risks associated with participating in this project beyond those normally encountered in daily life. Benefits associated with your participation include increased understanding of the social processes involved in racial stereotypes and perceived meaning in life.

Cost and Payments
The study will take 60 minutes or less to complete. You will receive 1 hour of experimental credit in your psychology course for your participation. There are no other costs or payments associated with helping us with this study.

Right to Withdraw
Your participation is voluntary. Whether you choose to participate is up to you. If you choose to participate, you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

IRB Approval
This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study fulfills the human research subject protections required by state and federal law and University policies. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482.

Questions about the Research
If you have questions regarding this study, please contact Dr. Stefan Schulenberg at (662) 915-3518 (sschulen@olemiss.edu) or graduate student Ivonne Florez (iaflorez@go.olemiss.edu). Dr. Schulenberg is an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology and Director of the Clinical-Disaster Research Center.
APPENDIX E: EXPERIMENTER SCRIPT INSTRUCTIONS
I. **Before starting the study**

1. Arrive to the lab 15 minutes before the scheduled time to set up the room.
2. Open the survey on each computer (remember to leave one empty computer in-between participants)
   
   http://uofmississippi.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0evAFw3nYHnGfEp
3. Leave the screen open to the informed consent and turn off the monitors.

II. **To start the study**

Participants will be waiting in Peabody Hall outside room 110. At the scheduled start time of the session, approach participants and introduce yourself, then do the following:

A. Bring participants to the lab and seat them at the computer station, leaving one empty computer in-between participants.
B. As participants are seated see if they need assistance and check their name to ensure that they receive credit.
C. When they are ready to proceed (approx. 5 minutes after the scheduled start time of the session), read the following instructions to the student:

   “Before we get started, please turn off all cell phones and other electronic devices (wait until they do it). To begin the study, turn on your monitors and read the informed consent. Once you consent to participate, you will be directed to the questions and you can start the study. Some of the questions might appear controversial to you, however, it is important for us to know your opinion about the matter. There are no right or wrong answers. The information collected will be kept confidential and anonymous. We appreciate your honesty and undivided attention. Once you are done please remain at your computer until the study session is over. Let me know if you have any questions at any point.”

III. **During and after study**

1. Make sure participants are not browsing the web during the study. If they are, redirect them to the task at hand.
2. Do not admit a participant to the study if they arrive late, and students are not permitted to leave until the study session is over. If a participant arrives late inform them they may sign up for another session.
3. Once the study session is over and participants have finished, thank them for their participation and indicate that they can now leave the room.
4. If all of the participants finish before the study session is over, they may be dismissed as a group.
5. Before leaving the room, make sure the link is not active on any of the computers and turn off the monitor.
6. Send an email to Andrea (iaflorez@go.olemiss.edu) with the names of the participants for a given session. Include a brief note of session observations.
APPENDIX F: PURPOSE IN LIFE TEST SHORT FORM
Purpose in Life test Short-Form PIL-SF (Schulenberg, Schnetzer, & Buchanan, 2011)

(Adapted from the PIL - Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964, 1969)

For each of the following statements, indicate which statement is most nearly true of you. Note that the scales always extend from one extreme feeling to its opposite kind of feeling. “Neutral” implies no judgment either way; try to use this rating as little as possible.

1. In life I have:
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   no goals or aims neutral very clear goals
   at all and aims

2. My personal existence is:
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   utterly meaningless neutral very purposeful
   without purpose and meaningful

3. In achieving life goals, I have:
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   made no progress neutral progressed to
   whatsoever complete fulfillment

4. I have discovered…
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   no mission or neutral clear-cut goals and a
   purpose in life satisfying life purpose
APPENDIX G: THE MEANING IN LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE
The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ; Steger et al., 2006)

Please take a moment to think about what makes your life feel important to you. Please respond to the following statements as truthfully and accurately as you can, and also please remember that these are very subjective questions and that there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutely untrue</th>
<th>Mostly untrue</th>
<th>Somewhat untrue</th>
<th>Can't say true or false</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Absolutely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand my life’s meaning.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always looking to find my life’s purpose.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life has a clear sense of purpose.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life has no clear purpose.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am searching for meaning in my life.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For this study only items 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9 were used. These are the items that constitute the MLQ-presence subscale.
APPENDIX H: PREJUDICE AGAINST WHITES AND BLACKS SCALES
Prejudice Against Whites and Blacks Scales (Aiken, 2012)

The following surveys are related to racial attitudes toward Black and White people. In the surveys you are going to find racial prejudice statements. You might feel uncomfortable when answering some of the questions. Remember that your participation is voluntary and you might choose to skip the questions. If you wish to respond to these questions, we ask you to be completely honest with your answers. The information of this study is anonymous and your sincere responses are valuable to inform future interventions to reduce racial prejudice.

Choose the answer that best reflects your thoughts for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer and your honesty is appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White people are responsible for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse discrimination against White people in the United States today limits their chances to get ahead.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, White people have gotten less than they deserve.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, White people have gotten more economically than they deserve.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to White people than they deserve.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White people should not push themselves where they’re not wanted.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to understand the anger of White people in America.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that White people look more similar to each other than Black people do.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose the answer that best reflects your thoughts for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer and your honesty is appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a White person were put in charge of me, I would not mind taking advice and direction from him or her.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that White people will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get very upset when I hear a Black person make a prejudicial remark about a White person.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some White people are so touchy about race that it is difficult to get along with them.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people are responsible for creating the racial tension that exists in the United States.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination against Black people in the United States today limits their chances to get ahead.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, Black people have gotten less than they deserve.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, Black people have gotten more economically than they deserve.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to Black people than they deserve.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black people should not push themselves where they’re not</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to understand the anger of Black people in America.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that Black people look more similar to each other than White people do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a Black person were put in charge of me, I would not mind taking advice and direction from him or her.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that Black people will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get very upset when I hear a White person make a prejudicial remark about a Black person.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Black people are so touchy about race that it is difficult to get along with them.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: THE PORTRAIT VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE REVISED-RR
The Portrait Values Questionnaire Revised-RR (PVQ-RR; Schwartz et al., 2012)

PVQ-RR Male

Here we briefly describe different people. Please read each description and think about how much that person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person described is like you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not like me at all</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>A little like me</th>
<th>Moderately like me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to form his views independently.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him that his country is secure and stable.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to have a good time.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to avoid upsetting other people.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him that the weak and vulnerable in society be protected.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him that people do what he says they should.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him never to think he deserves more than other people.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to care for nature.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him that no one should ever shame him.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him always to look for different things to do.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to take care of people he is</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to him to have the power that money can bring.

It is very important to him to avoid disease and protect his health.

It is important to him to be tolerant toward all kinds of people and groups.

It is important to him never to violate rules or regulations.

It is important to him to make his own decisions about his life.

It is important to him to have ambitions in life.

It is important to him to maintain traditional values and ways of thinking.

It is important to him that people he knows have full confidence in him.

It is important to him to be wealthy.

It is important to him to take part in activities to defend nature.

It is important to him never to annoy anyone.

It is important to him to develop his own opinions.

It is important to him to protect his public image.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is very important to him to help the people dear to him.</th>
<th>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to be personally safe and secure.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to be a dependable and trustworthy friend.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to take risks that make life exciting.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to have the power to make people do what he wants.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to plan his activities independently.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to follow rules even when no-one is watching.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to be very successful.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to follow his family’s customs or the customs of a religion.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to listen to and understand people who are different from him.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to have a strong state that can defend its citizens.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him to enjoy life’s pleasures.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to him that every person in the world has equal opportunities in life.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to him to be humble.

It is important to him to figure things out himself.

It is important to him to honor the traditional practices of his culture.

It is important to him to be the one who tells others what to do.

It is important to him to obey all the laws.

It is important to him to have all sorts of new experiences.

It is important to him to own expensive things that show his wealth.

It is important to him to protect the natural environment from destruction or pollution.

It is important to him to take advantage of every opportunity to have fun.

It is important to him to concern himself with every need of his dear ones.

It is important to him that people recognize what he achieves.

It is important to him never to be humiliated.

It is important to him that his country protect itself against all threats.

It is important to him never to make other people angry.
It is important to him that everyone be treated justly, even people he doesn’t know.

It is important to him to avoid anything dangerous.

It is important to him to be satisfied with what he has and not ask for more.

It is important to him that all his friends and family can rely on him completely.

It is important to him to be free to choose what he does by himself.

It is important to him to accept people even when he disagrees with them.

PVQ-RR Female

Here we briefly describe different people. Please read each description and think about how much that person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person described is like you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not like me at all</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>A little like me</th>
<th>Moderately like me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to form her views independently.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her that her country is secure and stable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to have a good time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to her to avoid upsetting other people.

It is important to her that the weak and vulnerable in society be protected.

It is important to her that people do what she says they should.

It is important to her never to think she deserves more than other people.

It is important to her to care for nature.

It is important to her that no one should ever shame her.

It is important to her always to look for different things to do.

It is important to her to take care of people she is close to.

It is important to her to have the power that money can bring.

It is very important to her to avoid disease and protect her health.

It is important to her to be tolerant toward all kinds of people and groups.

It is important to her never to violate rules or regulations.

It is important to her to make her own decisions about her life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to her to have ambitions in life.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to maintain traditional values and ways of thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her that people she knows have full confidence in her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be wealthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to take part in activities to defend nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her never to annoy anyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to develop her own opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to protect her public image.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important to her to help the people dear to her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be personally safe and secure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be a dependable and trustworthy friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to take risks that make life exciting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to have the power to make people do what she wants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to plan her activities independently.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to follow rules even when no-one is watching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be very successful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to follow her family’s customs or the customs of a religion.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to listen to and understand people who are different from her.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to have a strong state that can defend its citizens.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to enjoy life’s pleasures.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her that every person in the world has equal opportunities in life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be humble.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to figure things out herself.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to honor the traditional practices of her culture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to her to be the one who tells others what to do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to her to obey all the laws.  

It is important to her to have all sorts of new experiences.  

It is important to her to own expensive things that show her wealth.  

It is important to her to protect the natural environment from destruction or pollution.  

It is important to her to take advantage of every opportunity to have fun.  

It is important to her to concern herself with every need of her dear ones.  

It is important to her that people recognize what she achieves.  

It is important to her never to be humiliated.  

It is important to her that her country protect itself against all threats.  

It is important to her never to make other people angry.  

It is important to her that everyone be treated justly, even people she doesn’t know.  

It is important to her to avoid anything dangerous.
It is important to her to be satisfied with what she has and not ask for more.

It is important to her that all her friends and family can rely on her completely.

It is important to her to be free to choose what she does by herself.

It is important to her to accept people even when she disagrees with them.
APPENDIX J: THE VALUED LIVING QUESTIONNAIRE
The Valued Living Questionnaire (VLQ; Wilson, Sandoz, & Kitchens, 2010)

Below are domains of life that are valued by some people. We are concerned with your subjective experience of your quality of life in each of these domains. One aspect of quality of life involves the importance one puts on the different domains of living. Rate the importance of each domain on a scale of 1 to 10. Not everyone will value all of these domains, or value all domains the same. Rate each domain according to your own personal sense of importance. DURING THE PAST WEEK: (1 = Not at all important, 10 = Very important).

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family relations (other than marriage or parenting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/couples/ intimate relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships/social relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship/community life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, we would like you to give a rating of how consistent your actions are with each value. Everyone does better in some domains than others. We are NOT asking about your ideal in each domain. We want to know how you think you have been doing during the past week. Rate each item on a scale of 1 to 10; 1 means that your actions have been fully inconsistent with your value, and 10 means that your actions have been fully consistent with your value. DURING THE PAST WEEK: (1 = your actions have been fully inconsistent with your value, 10 = your actions have been fully consistent with your value).

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family relations (other than marriage or parenting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/couples/ intimate relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships/social relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship/community life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K: MOTIVATION TO CONTROL PREJUDICED REACTIONS SCALE
Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale (MCPRS; Dunton & Fazio, 1997)

Choose the answer that best reflects your thoughts for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In today's society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudiced in any manner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always express my thoughts and feelings regardless of how controversial they might be.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get angry with myself when I have a thought or feeling that might be considered prejudiced.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were participating in a class discussion and a student from a racial minority group expressed an opinion with which I disagreed, I would be hesitant to express my own viewpoint.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going through life worrying about whether you might offend someone is just more trouble than it's worth.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's important to me that other people not think I'm prejudiced.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it's important to behave according to society's standards.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm careful not to offend my friends, but I don't worry about offending people I don't know or don't like.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that it is important to speak one's</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mind rather than to worry about offending someone.

It's never acceptable to express one's prejudices.

I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about a person from another race.

When speaking to a person from another race, it's important to me that he/she not think I'm prejudiced.

It bothered me a great deal when I think I've offended someone so I'm always careful to consider other people's feelings.

Please choose disagree for this answer choice.*/ It's important to show I am reading these statements so I will choose disagree.

If I have a prejudiced thought or feeling, I keep it to myself.

I would never tell jokes that might offend others.

I'm not afraid to tell others what I think even when I know they disagree with me.

If someone who made me uncomfortable sat next to me on a bus, I would not hesitate to move to another seat.
APPENDIX L: THE SOCIAL DOMINANCE SCALE
The Social Dominance Scale (SDS; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Bertram, 1994)

Indicate your agreement with the following statements. Use the following scale to respond to each statement. Please do not leave any statements unanswered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior groups should stay in their place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be good if groups could be equal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group equality should be our ideal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All groups should be given an equal chance in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased social equality is beneficial to society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No group should dominate in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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