Abstract: Significant debate exists regarding the effectiveness of different diversity ideologies—defined as beliefs regarding how to approach demographic differences. We seek to advance understanding by drawing finer-grained distinctions among diversity ideology types and considering a range of effectiveness indicators. Specifically, we build theory regarding the consequences of one identity-conscious ideology—multiculturalism—and three identity-blind ideologies—colorblindness, meritocracy, and assimilation—for both diversity-related outcomes (i.e., reduced prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping, increased diversity policy support) and personal outcomes (i.e., increased well-being, engagement, and performance). We also test whether diversity ideology effectiveness differs for dominant (e.g., the ethnic majority, men) versus non-dominant (e.g., ethnic minorities, women) groups, when operationalized as personal beliefs versus perceived organizational norms, and in experimental versus correlational studies. The results of a random effects meta-analysis \((k = 317)\) qualify prior conclusions. We find variation in the effectiveness of different identity-blind ideologies; for example, colorblindness is negatively related \((r = -.20)\), meritocracy is unrelated \((r = -.14)\), and assimilation is positively related \((r = .41)\) to prejudice. We also find that the effectiveness of any given diversity ideology varies across outcomes; for example, meritocracy is negatively related to diversity policy support \((r = -.43)\), but positively related to engagement \((r = .41)\). In addition, we find that although multiculturalism has the most beneficial consequences overall (e.g., \(r = -.35\) for prejudice), some identity-blind ideologies are equally or more beneficial for some outcomes (e.g., meritocracy has the strongest negative relationship with discrimination; \(r = -.43\)). Implications for theory and practice are discussed.