https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000451

Race and Social Class as Intersecting Social Categories: An Analysis of Implicit and Explicit Attitudes

Supplemental Materials

S1: Study 1 Additional Methods and Results

Methods

Feeling Thermometer. Participants completed a feeling thermometer (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993) questionnaire for each of the four groups (HSC White, HSC Black, LSC White, LSC Black). The instructions for the feeling thermometer asked participants to imagine that the scale provided is a thermometer with higher numbers indicating warm/positive feelings and lower numbers indicating cold/negative feelings. Participants were then asked to ascribe a number from 1 (cold/negative) to 100 (warm/positive) for each of the groups based on their feelings toward that group.

Results

Implicit Association Test. We conducted post-hoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race (White, non-White), gender (male, female), and social class (low/low-middle, middle, upper-middle, upper). We determined whether the IAT *d*-scores differed across subgroups using one-way ANOVAs (for social class) and *t*-tests (for race and gender). We used these same analyses for all posthoc tests by participant demographic subgroup.

For the HSC-LSC Black IAT, results did not vary by race ($t(65) = .63$, $p = .529$, $d = .15$, 95% CI[-.35, .64]), gender ($t(65) = -1.51$, $p = .136$, $d = .41$, 95% CI[-.96, .14]), or social class ($F(3, 59) = .42$, $p = .740$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the HSC-LSC White IAT, results did not vary by race ($t(65) = .59$, $p = .561$, $d = .16$, 95% CI[-.33, .65]), gender ($t(65) = -.53$, $p = .601$, $d = .16$, 95% CI[-.71, .39]), or social class ($F(3, 59) = .46$, $p = .710$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the HSC White-Black IAT, results did not vary by race ($t(69) = 1.89$, $p = .063$, $d = 1.65$, 95% CI[1.18, 2.13]), gender ($t(69) = .44$, $p = .664$, $d = .11$, 95% CI[-.44, .65]), or social class ($F(3, 61) = .58$, $p = .634$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .10]). For the LSC White-Black IAT,

results did not vary by race ($t(69) = -.05$, $p = .957$, $d = .02$, 95% CI[-.50, .45]), gender ($t(69) = -.83$, $p = .408$, $d = .23$, 95% CI[-.77, .32]), or social class ($F(3, 61) = .64$, $p = .590$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .11]). See Table S1 for means and standard deviations.

Feeling Thermometer. We first entered the participants feeling thermometer scores into a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) mixed measures ANOVA to determine if there were any significant differences in responses by condition. As expected, there was not a significant interaction between race x social class x condition, $F(1, 135) = .55$, $p = .459$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .05]; therefore, we dropped condition from the analyses.

A 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 136) = 31.79$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .19$, 95% CI[.08, .30], a significant main effect of social class, $F(1, 136) = 13.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .09$, 95% CI[.02, .19], and a significant race x social class interaction, $F(1, 136) = 42.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .24$, 95% CI[.12, .35]. Follow-up paired sample *t*-tests revealed that participants more positive feelings toward HSC Black people than HSC White people ($t(137) = -6.75$, $p < .001$, $d = .63$, 95% CI [.39, .86]), more positive feelings toward LSC Black people than LSC White people ($t(136) = 2.12$, $p = .028$, $d = .12$, 95% CI [-.12, .36]), no significant differences in feelings between HSC White people and LSC White people ($t(137) = 1.32$, $p = .189$, $d = .14$, 95% CI [-.10, .38]), and more positive feelings toward HSC Black people than LSC Black people ($t(136) = 6.24$, $p < .001$, $d = .66$, 95% CI [.43, .90]). See Table S2 for means and standard deviations.

We also conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(136) = 2.13$, $p = .035$, $d = .36$, 95% CI [.03,

.70]), however, results did not vary by gender ($t(136) = .69$, $p = .490$, $d = .13$, 95% CI [-.25, .52]) or social class ($F(3, 124) = 1.73$, $p = .165$, $\eta^2_p = .04$, 95% CI[<.01, .11]). For the HSC Black people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(136) = 2.14$, $p = .034$, $d = .37$, 95% CI [.03, .70]), however, results did not vary by gender ($t(136) = -.27$, $p = .786$, $d = .05$, 95% CI [-.33, .44]) or social class ($F(3, 124) = 1.17$, $p = .322$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .08]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race ($t(136) = 1.74$, $p = .085$, $d = .30$, 95% CI [-.04, .63]), gender ($t(136) = -.99$, $p = .323$, $d = .19$, 95% CI [-.19, .58]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = .40$, $p = .756$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]). For the LSC Black people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(136) = 2.09$, $p = .039$, $d = .36$, 95% CI [.02, .69]), however, results did not vary by gender ($t(135) = -.50$, $p = .617$, $d = .10$, 95% CI [-.29, .48]) or social class ($F(3, 124) = .75$, $p = .524$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). See Table S3 for means and standard deviations.

Cultural Stereotypes. We first conducted a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) repeated measures ANOVA on the cultural stereotypes scores to determine if there was a significant difference in scores based on condition. As expected, there was not a significant race x social class x condition interaction, $F(1, 136) = .32$, $p = .574$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]; therefore, we removed condition from the analyses.

We also conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = -1.12$, $p = .264$, $d = .18$, 95% CI [-.15, .52]) or social class ($F(3, 124) = .70$, $p = .555$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]); however, female participants indicated more positive cultural stereotypes than males ($t(136) = -1.99$, $p = .048$, $d = .38$, 95% CI [<.01,

.76]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = -.43$, $p = .671$, $d = .07$, 95% CI [-.27, .41]), gender ($t(136) = -1.55$, $p = .125$, $d = .31$, 95% CI [-.07, .69]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = .29$, $p = .836$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .03]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race ($t(136) = .30$, $p = .671$, $d = .05$, 95% CI [-.29, .39]), gender ($t(136) = -1.22$, $p = .227$, $d = .24$, 95% CI [-.14, .63]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = 1.27$, $p = .289$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = .62$, $p = .534$, $d = .11$, 95% CI [-.22, .45]), gender ($t(136) = 1.37$, $p = .173$, $d = .26$, 95% CI [-.12, .65]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = .40$, $p = .751$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]). See Table S3 for means and standard deviations.

Personal Beliefs. We first conducted a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) repeated measures ANOVA on the personal beliefs scores to determine if there was a significant difference in scores based on condition. As expected, there was not a significant race x social class x condition interaction, $F(1, 136) = .08$, $p = .775$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .02]; therefore, we removed condition from the analyses.

We also conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = -1.15$, $p = .253$, $d = .21$, 95% CI [-.13, .54]), gender ($t(136) = -.84$, $p = .404$, $d = .16$, 95% CI [.22, .54]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = .70$, $p = .555$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = -.15$, $p = .882$, $d = .03$, 95% CI [-.31, .36]), gender ($t(136) = -1.37$, $p = .173$, $d = .28$, 95% CI [-.11, .66]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = .29$, $p = .836$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .03]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race ($t(136) = .01$, $p = .990$, $d < .01$, 95% CI [-.34, .34]),

gender ($t(136) = -1.12$, $p = .267$, $d = .21$, 95% CI [-.17, .60]), or social class ($F(3, 124) = 1.27$, $p = .289$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(136) = .48$, $p = .635$, $d = .08$, 95% CI [-.26, .41]) or social class ($F(3, 124) = .40$, $p = .751$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]); however, females had more positive personal beliefs than males ($t(136) = -2.25$, $p = .026$, $d = .44$, 95% CI [.05, .82]). See Table S3 for means and standard deviations.

Correlational Analyses. For correlational analyses between all measures, see Tables S4 and S5.

S2: Study 2 Additional Methods and Results

Methods

Feeling Thermometer. Participants completed the same feeling thermometer questionnaire (Haddock et al., 1993) as in Study 1.

Results

Affective Misattribution Procedure. We conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by race ($t(133) = 1.63$, $p = .105$, $d = .31$, 95% CI[-.03, .65]), gender ($t(133) = .49$, $p = .627$, $d = .08$, 95% CI[-.33, .49]), or social class ($F(3, 123) = .80$, $p = .496$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by race ($t(133) = -.01$, $p = .991$, $d < .01$, 95% CI[-.34, .34]), gender ($t(133) = -.04$, $p = .972$, $d < .01$, 95% CI[-.41, .41]), or social class ($F(3, 123) = .60$, $p = .616$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). For the LSC White people, White participants had more positive attitudes than non-White participants ($t(133) = 2.00$, $p = .048$, $d = .32$, 95% CI[-.02, .66]); however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(133) = 1.11$, $p = .270$, $d = .22$, 95% CI[-.19, .63]) or social class ($F(3, 123) = 1.19$, $p = .316$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(133) = 1.50$, $p = .135$, $d = .24$, 95% CI[-.10, .65]), gender ($t(133) = -.28$, $p = .777$, $d = -.06$, 95% CI[-.35, .47]), or social class ($F(3, 123) = .36$, $p = .784$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]). See Table S6 for means and standard deviations.

Feeling Thermometer. A 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) repeated measures ANOVA revealed a nonsignificant main effect of race, $F(1, 146) = 62.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .30$, 95% CI[.18, .41], a significant main effect of social class, $F(1, 146) = 2.51$, $p = .115$, $\eta^2_p =$

.02, 95% CI[<.01, .08], and a significant race x social class interaction, $F(1, 146) = 41.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .22$, 95% CI[.11, .33].

Follow-up paired sample *t*-tests revealed that participants had more positive feelings toward LSC White people than HSC White people ($t(146) = -4.13$, $p < .001$, $d = .39$, 95% CI [.16, .62]), no difference in feelings between HSC Black and LSC Black people ($t(146) = 1.60$, $p = .112$, $d = .14$, 95% CI [-.09, .37], more positive feelings toward HSC Black than HSC White people ($t(146) = -8.64$, $p < .001$, $d = .77$, 95% CI [.54, 1.00]), and more positive feelings toward LSC Black people than LSC White people ($t(146) = -4.17$, $p < .001$, $d = .26$, 95% CI [.03, .49]). See Table S2 for means and standard deviations.

We also conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, social class, or gender. In particular, for the HSC White people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(145) = 2.34$, $p = .021$, $d = .39$, 95% CI[.06, .71]), however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(145) = 1.81$, $p = .072$, $d = .36$, 95% CI[-.03, .75]) or social class ($F(3, 134) = .25$, $p = .860$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .03]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(145) = -1.74$, $p = .084$, $d = .29$, 95% CI[-.04, .62]), gender ($t(145) = .52$, $p = .606$, $d = .10$, 95% CI[-.29, .49]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = 1.88$, $p = .136$, $\eta^2_p = .04$, 95% CI[<.01, .11]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race ($t(145) = .74$, $p = .464$, $d = .12$, 95% CI[-.21, .45]), gender ($t(145) = .99$, $p = .323$, $d = .20$, 95% CI[-.19, .59]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = .87$, $p = .459$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participants race ($t(145) = -.62$, $p = .536$, $d = .10$, 95% CI[-.22, .43]), gender ($t(145) = -.81$, $p = .417$, $d = .16$, 95% CI[-.23, .55]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = .27$, $p = .848$, $\eta^2_p = .38$, 95% CI[.24, .47]). See Table S6 for means and standard deviations.

Cultural Stereotypes. We conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(145) = .65$, $p = .517$, $d = .10$, 95% CI[-.23, .43]), gender ($t(145) = .12$, $p = .905$, $d = .03$, 95% CI[-.37, .42]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = .90$, $p = .441$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). For the HSC Black people, White participants had more positive cultural stereotypes than non-White participants ($t(145) = 2.81$, $p = .006$, $d = .47$, 95% CI[.15, .80]), but results did not vary by participant gender ($t(145) = 1.83$, $p = .069$, $d = .37$, 95% CI[-.02, .76]) or social class ($F(3, 134) = 1.29$, $p = .281$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .08]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(144) = -.48$, $p = .633$, $d = .08$, 95% CI[-.25, .41]), gender ($t(144) = .04$, $p = .972$, $d = .01$, 95% CI[-.38, .40]), or social class ($F(3, 133) = 2.06$, $p = .108$, $\eta^2_p = .04$, 95% CI[<.01, .11]). For the LSC Black people, White participants had more positive cultural stereotypes than non-White participants ($t(145) = 2.19$, $p = .030$, $d = .35$, 95% CI[.02, .68]); however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(145) = -.09$, $p = .932$, $d = .02$, 95% CI[-.37, .42]) or social class ($F(3, 134) = .78$, $p = .506$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). See Table S6 for means and standard deviations.

Personal Beliefs. We conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, White participants had more positive personal beliefs than non-White participants ($t(145) = 2.82$, $p = .005$, $d = .46$, 95% CI[.13, .79]); however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(145) = 1.90$, $p = .060$, $d = .37$, 95% CI[-.02, .76]) or social class ($F(3, 134) = .79$, $p = .500$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(145) = .43$, $p = .669$, $d = .07$, 95% CI[-.26, .40]), gender ($t(145) = 1.28$, $p = .202$, $d = .26$, 95% CI[-.13, .65]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = .90$, $p = .446$, $\eta^2_p = .02$ 95% CI[<.01, .07]). For the LSC White

people, White participants had more positive personal beliefs than non-White participants ($t(145) = 2.82$, $p = .005$, $d = .42$, 95% CI[.09, .75]); however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(145) = .36$, $p = .72$, $d = .08$, 95% CI[-.31, .47]) or social class ($F(3, 134) = 1.36$, $p = .258$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .09]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(145) = .96$, $p = .337$, $d = .17$, 95% CI[-.16, .49]), gender ($t(145) = -1.05$, $p = .296$, $d = .21$, 95% CI[-.18, .60]), or social class ($F(3, 134) = .19$, $p = .904$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .02]). See Table S6 for means and standard deviations.

Correlational Analyses. For correlational analyses between all measures by conditions, see Tables S7 and S8.

S3: Study 3 Additional Methods and Results

Methods

Feeling Thermometer. Participants completed the same feeling thermometer questionnaire (Haddock et. al, 1993) as in Study 1.

Results

Implicit Association Test. We conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC-LSC Black IAT, results did not vary by participant race ($t(95) = -.55$, $p = .583$, $d = .12$, 95% CI[-.28, .53]), gender ($t(93) = -.07$, $p = .943$, $d = .03$, 95% CI[-.62, .56]), or social class ($F(3, 91) = .95$, $p = .422$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .10]). For the HSC-LSC White IAT, results did not vary by race ($t(95) = -1.17$, $p = .247$, $d = .23$, 95% CI[-.18, .63]), gender ($t(93) = 1.52$, $p = .133$, $d = .46$, 95% CI[-.13, 1.05]), or social class ($F(3, 91) = .40$, $p = .754$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). For the HSC White-Black IAT, White participants, as compared to non-White participants, had more positive attitudes toward HSC White than HSC Black people ($t(82) = 2.56$, $p = .012$, $d = .59$, 95% CI[.13, 1.04]); however, there was no significant difference based on participant gender ($t(82) = .65$, $p = .516$, $d = .20$, 95% CI[-.42, .82]) or social class ($F(3, 77) = 1.72$, $p = .170$, $\eta^2_p = .06$, 95% CI[<.01, .16]). For the LSC White-Black IAT, White participants, as compared to non-White participants, had more positive attitudes toward LSC White than LSC Black people ($t(83) = 3.57$, $p = .001$, $d = .83$, 95% CI[.37, 1.28]); however, there was no significant difference based on participant gender ($t(83) = -.32$, $p = .751$, $d = .10$, 95% CI[-.52, .72]) or social class ($F(3, 78) = .48$, $p = .697$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). See Table S9 for means and standard deviations.

Affective Misattribution Procedure. We first entered the participants AMP scores into a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social

class) repeated measures ANOVA to determine if there were any significant differences in responses by condition. As expected, there was not a significant interaction between race x social class x condition, $F(1, 172) = .09$, $p = .767$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .03]; therefore, we dropped condition from the analyses.

We also conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, social class, or gender. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(188) = 1.06$, $p = .289$, $d = .18$, 95% CI[-.12, .47]), gender ($t(186) = -1.07$, $p = .286$, $d = .21$, 95% CI[-.22, .64]), or social class ($F(3, 183) = 1.05$, $p = .371$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by race ($t(188) = -.73$, $p = .466$, $d = .10$, 95% CI[-.20, .39]), gender ($t(186) = .62$, $p = .538$, $d = .13$, 95% CI[-.30, .56]), or social class ($F(3, 183) = .35$, $p = .792$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .03]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(188) = .88$, $p = .381$, $d = .13$, 95% CI[-.17, .42]), gender ($t(186) = .19$, $p = .851$, $d = .05$, 95% CI[-.38, .48]), or social class ($F(3, 183) = 1.88$, $p = .135$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI[<.01, .08]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(188) = .04$, $p = .969$, $d < .01$, 95% CI[-.30, .30]), gender ($t(186) = 1.12$, $p = .263$, $d = .24$, 95% CI[-.19, .68]), or social class ($F(3, 183) = 1.39$, $p = .246$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). See Table S10 for means and standard deviations.

Feeling Thermometer. We first entered the participants feeling thermometer scores into a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) mixed measures ANOVA to determine if there were any significant differences in responses by condition. As expected, there was not a significant interaction between race x social class x condition, $F(1, 180) = .61$, $p = .436$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI[<.01, .04]; therefore, we dropped condition from the analyses.

A 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of social class, $F(1, 198) = 111.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .36$, 95% CI[.26, .45], a significant main effect of race, $F(1, 198) = 71.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .27$, 95% CI[.17, .36], and a significant race x social class interaction, $F(1, 198) = 65.69$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .25$, 95% CI[.15, .34].

Follow-up paired sample *t*-tests revealed that participants have more positive feelings toward HSC White people than LSC White people ($t(198) = 5.68$, $p < .001$, $d = .51$, 95% CI [.31, .71]), more positive feelings toward HSC Black people than LSC Black people ($t(198) = 14.40$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.24$, 95% CI [1.05, 1.44], more positive feelings toward HSC Black people than HSC White people ($t(198) = -9.77$, $p < .001$, $d = .83$, 95% CI [.64, 1.03]), and more positive feelings toward LSC Black people than LSC White people ($t(198) = -3.20$, $p = .002$, $d = .15$, 95% CI [-.04, .35]). See Table S2 for means and standard deviations.

We also conducted posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(197) = 2.25$, $p = .025$, $d = .33$, 95% CI[.04, .61]) and results varied by participant social class ($F(3, 190) = 2.72$, $p = .046$, $\eta^2_p = .04$, 95% CI[<.01, .10]); however, results did not vary by participant gender ($t(195) = .11$, $p = .912$, $d = .02$, 95% CI[-.38, .42]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race ($t(197) = -.45$, $p = .652$, $d = .07$, 95% CI[-.22, .35]), gender ($t(195) = -.67$, $p = .502$, $d = .14$, 95% CI[-.27, .54]), or social class ($F(3, 190) = 1.56$, $p = .202$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI[<.01, .07]). For the LSC White people, White participants had more positive feelings than non-White participants ($t(197) = 2.89$, $p = .004$, $d = .42$, 95% CI[.13, .71]), but results did not vary by participant gender ($t(195) = -.82$, $p = .414$, $d = .17$, 95% CI[-.24, .57]) or social class ($F(3, 190) = 1.02$, $p = .385$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95%

CI[<.01, .05]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = 1.35, p = .179, d = .20, 95% CI[-.09, .48]), gender (t(195) = .31, p = .760, d = .06, 95% CI[-.34, .46]), or social class (F(3, 190) = 1.30, p = .275, η^2_p = .02, 95% CI[<.01, .06]). See Table S10 for means and standard deviations.

Cultural Stereotypes. We first conducted a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) repeated measures ANOVA on the cultural stereotypes scores to determine if there was a significant difference in scores based on condition. As expected, there was not a significant race x social class x condition interaction, F(1, 180) = 2.39, p = .124, η^2_p = .01, 95% CI[<.01, .06]; therefore, we removed condition from the analyses.

We also conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = -.28, p = .781, d = .03, 95% CI[-.25, .32]) or gender (t(195) = -.67, p = .503, d = .14, 95% CI[-.26, .54]); however, results varied by social class (F(3, 190) = 2.72, p = .046, η^2_p = .04, 95% CI[<.01, .10]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = .78, p = .435, d = .11, 95% CI[-.18, .39]), gender (t(195) = -.50, p = .617, d = .11, 95% CI[-.30, .51]), or social class (F(3, 190) = 1.06, p = .366, η^2_p <.01, 95% CI[<.01, .05]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race (t(197) = .53, p = .594, d = .08, 95% CI[-.21, .36]), gender (t(195) = -1.24, p = .218, d = .24, 95% CI[-.16, .65]), or social class (F(3, 190) = .20, p = .895, η^2_p <.01, 95% CI[<.01, .02]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = .12, p = .908, d = .01, 95% CI[-.28, .30]) or gender (t(195) = .87, p = .385, d = .18, 95% CI[-.22, .58]); however, results varied by social class (F(3,

190) = 2.98, p = .033, η^2_p = .04, 95% CI[<.01, .10]). See Table S10 for means and standard deviations.

Personal Beliefs. We first conducted a 2 (race: Black, White) x 2 (social class: HSC, LSC) x 2 (condition: compare race, compare social class) repeated measures ANOVA on the personal beliefs scores to determine if there was a significant difference in scores based on condition. As expected, there was not a significant race x social class x condition interaction, F(1, 190) = .26, p = .208, η^2_p < .01, 95% CI[<.01, .03]; therefore, we removed condition from the analyses.

We also conducted several posthoc analyses to examine if the results varied by participant race, gender, or social class. In particular, for the HSC White people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = 1.82, p = .070, d = .27, 95% CI[-.02, .55]) or gender (t(195) = -.19, p = .853, d = .04, 95% CI[-.36, .44]); however, results varied by social class (F(3, 190) = 3.60, p = .015, η^2_p = .05, 95% CI[<.01, .12]). For the HSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = .42, p = .675, d = .06, 95% CI[-.22, .35]) or gender (t(195) = -.82, p = .416, d = .17, 95% CI[-.23, .57]); however, results varied by social class (F(3, 190) = 2.75, p = .044, η^2_p = .04, 95% CI[<.01, .10]). For the LSC White people, results did not vary by race (t(197) = 1.48, p = .141, d = .22, 95% CI[-.07, .50]), gender (t(195) = .28, p = .781, d = .06, 95% CI[-.34, .46]), or social class (F(3, 190) = .23, p = .875, η^2_p <.01, 95% CI[<.01, .02]). For the LSC Black people, results did not vary by participant race (t(197) = .36, p = .722, d = .05, 95% CI[-.24, .33]), gender (t(195) = -.35, p = .724, d = .07, 95% CI[-.33, .47]), or social class (F(3, 190) = .49, p = .688, η^2_p = .01, 95% CI[<.01, .03]). See Table S10 for means and standard deviations.

Correlational Analyses. For correlational analyses between all measures by conditions, see Tables S11-S14.

References

Haddock, G., Zanna, M.P., Esses, V.M. (1993) Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(6), 1105-1118.

Table S1. Study 1: Means (and Standard Deviations) for IAT Scores by Demographic Sub-Groups

	n	HSC-LSC Black IAT	HSC-LSC White IAT	*n*	HSC White-Black IAT	LSC White-Black IAT
Race						
White	38	.78 (.45)[a]	.81 (.38)[a]	36	.14 (.39)[a]	.39 (.38)[a]
Non-White	29	.72 (.36)[a]	.75 (.37)[a]	35	-.06 (.50)[a]	.40 (.42)[a]
Gender						
Male	18	.63 (.49)[a]	.74 (.42)[a]	18	.08 (.35)[a]	.33 (.36)[a]
Female	49	.80 (.38)[a]	.80 (.36)[a]	53	.03 (.49)[a]	.42 (.41)[a]
Social Class						
Low/Low Middle	17	.67 (.31)[a]	.74 (.31)[a]	19	.06 (.44)[a]	.43 (.36)[a]
Middle	15	.83 (.36)[a]	.75 (.29)[a]	18	-.04 (.55)[a]	.48 (.44)[a]
Upper-Middle	20	.73 (.29)[a]	.80 (.41)[a]	14	-.09 (.40)[a]	.32 (.44)[a]

Upper	11	.77 (.70)[a]	.89 (.47)[a]	14	.11 (.43)[a]	.32 (.40)[a]

Notes. Superscript comparisons are within variable and within subgroup; Values that share the same superscript did not differ from each other (t-test $p > .05$), values with different superscripts differed from each other (t-test $p < .05$).

Table S2. Feeling Thermometer Means (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD*)

	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
	M (*SD*)	*M* (*SD*)	*M* (*SD*)
HSC White	59.99 (25.56)	49.35 (24.12)	59.81 (24.24)
HSC Black	73.82 (17.92)	67.21 (22.13)	77.18 (16.79)
LSC White	56.41 (25.56)	58.29 (21.86)	47.47 (24.16)
LSC Black	59.47 (24.78)	64.10 (23.07)	51.22 (24.25)

Notes. Study 1: n = 138; Study 2: n = 147; Study 3: n = 199.

Table S3. Study 1: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Explicit Measure Scores by Demographic Sub-Groups

		Feeling Thermometer					Cultural Stereotypes					Personal Beliefs			
	n	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black
Race															
White	74	64.24[a]	76.77[a]	59.68[a]	63.50[a]	74	5.49[a]	5.51[a]	3.59[a]	3.26[a]	74	5.02[a]	5.60[a]	3.78[a]	4.01[a]
		(23.75)	(16.16)	(22.46)	(22.58)		(.85)	(.80)	(.78)	(.83)		(.79)	(.73)	(.73)	(.84)
Non-White	64	55.06[b]	70.33[b]	52.63[a]	54.75[b]	64	5.65[a]	5.57[a]	3.55[a]	3.16[a]	64	5.19[a]	5.62[a]	3.78[a]	3.94[a]
		(26.85)	(19.19)	(25.25)	(26.55)		(.89)	(.90)	(.89)	(.92)		(.86)	(.87)	(.96)	(.98)
Gender															
Male	36	62.53[a]	73.08[a]	53.00[a]	57.69[a]	36	5.32[a]	5.35[a]	3.72[a]	3.38[a]	36	5.00[a]	5.45[a]	3.65[a]	3.69[a]
		(21.65)	(18.76)	(22.27)	(25.66)		(.85)	(.89)	(.86)	(.84)		(.68)	(.85)	(.85)	(1.00)
Female	102	59.09[a]	74.03[a]	57.61[a]	60.11[a]	102	5.65[b]	5.61[a]	3.52[a]	3.15[a]	102	5.13[a]	5.67[a]	3.83[a]	4.08[b]
		(26.85)	(17.61)	(24.53)	(24.56)		(.87)	(.82)	(.81)	(.88)		(.86)	(.77)	(.84)	(.85)
Social Class															
Low/Low-Middle	36	52.67[a]	69.64[a]	54.33[a]	56.33[a]	36	5.72[a]	5.63[a]	3.74[a]	3.30[a]	36	5.13[a]	5.70[a]	3.74[a]	3.93[a]
		(23.16)	(17.76)	(24.65)	(25.09)		(.84)	(.89)	(.90)	(.91)		(.77)	(.78)	(.74)	(.86)
Middle	33	66.21[b]	75.55[a]	54.64[a]	56.00[a]	33	5.65[a]	5.52[a]	3.63	3.08[a]	33	5.40[ab]	5.71[a]	3.81[a]	3.88[a]
		(25.10)	(19.07)	(24.48)	(23.04)		(.81)	(.83)	(1.05)	(.93)		(.85)	(.76)	(1.11)	(1.14)

Upper-Middle	34	61.85[ab] (27.08)	77.32[a] (16.60)	59.18[a] (22.53)	61.71[a] (25.22)	34	5.54[a] (.85)	5.52[a] (.78)	3.36[a] (.66)	3.13[a] (.89)	34	5.08[ab] (.81)	5.62[a] (.79)	3.79[a] (.73)	3.94[a] (.80)
Upper	25	61.36[ab] (26.91)	74.32[a] (18.67)	58.80[a] (22.05)	63.84[a] (26.05)	25	5.42[a] (.93)	5.43[a] (.87)	3.58[a] (.84)	3.20[a] (.68)	25	4.81[b] (.71)	5.45[a] (.83)	3.69[a] (.80)	4.16[a] (.89)

Notes. Superscript comparisons are within variable and within subgroup; Values that share the same superscript did not differ from each other (t-test $p > .05$), values with different superscripts differed from each other (t-test $p < .05$).

Table S4. Study 1: Correlations between IATs and Explicit Measures

	Condition 1 (Compare Social Class)		Condition 2 (Compare Race)	
	HSC-LSC Black IAT	HSC-LSC White IAT	HSC White-Black IAT	LSC White-Black IAT
FT: HSC White	.26*	.09	.12	.07
FT: HSC Black	.10	.04	-.16	-.03
FT: LSC White	.07	.28*	.06	.09
FT: LSC Black	-.11	.20	.10	.04
CS: HSC White	.07	-.08	-.11	-.01
CS: HSC Black	.06	-.06	.05	.06
CS: LSC White	.11	.04	-.14	-.04
CS: LSC Black	-.15	-.08	.02	.03
PB: HSC White	.12	-.10	.08	.05
PB: HSC Black	.05	-.18	-.04	.02

PB: LSC White	-.07	.10	<.01	.04
PB: LSC Black	-.14	-.06	.08	.06

*Notes. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01; condition 1: n = 67, condition 2: n = 71*

Table S5. Study 1: Correlations Between Explicit Measures

	FT: HSC White (1)	FT: HSC Black (2)	FT: LSC White (3)	FT: LSC Black (4)	CS: HSC White (5)	CS: HSC Black (6)	CS: LSC White (7)	CS: LSC Black (8)	PB: HSC White (9)	PB: HSC Black (10)	PB: LSC White (11)	PB: LSC Black (12)
1	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	.43***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	.17*	.26**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4	-.15	.24**	.83***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	.03	.29***	-.02	-.06	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	.11	.15	.05	.02	.47***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	<.01	.09	-.01	<.01	-.08	-.19*	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	<.01	-.14	-.04	<-.01	-.55***	-.07	.49***	--	--	--	--	--
9	.31***	.21*	-.01	-.21*	.54***	.51***	.09	-.10	--	--	--	--
10	.07	.35***	.01	-.03	.67***	.54***	.03	-.23**	.70***	--	--	--
11	-.17*	-.04	.27**	.30***	-.07	-.13	.37***	.33***	-.16	-.09	--	--
12	-.19*	<-.01	.16	.26**	<.01	-.03	.23**	.22*	-.16	.06	.74***	--

*Notes. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001; n = 138*

Table S6. Study 2: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Explicit Measure Scores by Demographic Sub-Groups

	AMP					Feeling Thermometer					Cultural Stereotypes					Personal Beliefs				
	n	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black
Race																				
White	73	-.04[a]	-.02[a]	-.14[a]	-.10[a]	80	53.55[a]	64.33[a]	59.50[a]	63.01[a]	80	5.27[a]	5.53[a]	3.56[a]	3.32[a]	80	4.96[a]	5.42[a]	4.09[a]	4.21[a]
		(.22)	(.25)	(.27)	(.32)		(21.96)	(20.49)	(19.92)	(20.07)		(.68)	(.68)	(.75)	(.73)		(.65)	(.81)	(.81)	(.86)
Non-White	62	-.12[a]	-.02[a]	-.24[b]	-.18[b]	67	44.34[b]	70.66[a]	56.84[a]	65.39[a]	67	5.19[a]	5.15[b]	3.63[a]	3.04[b]	67	4.64[b]	5.36[a]	3.73[b]	4.06[a]
		(.30)	(.22)	(.35)	(.35)		(25.76)	(23.64)	(24.04)	(26.31)		(.89)	(.93)	(1.05)	(.87)		(.74)	(.93)	(.91)	(.96)
Gender																				
Male	30	-.06[a]	-.02[a]	-.13[a]	-.15[a]	33	56.00[a]	68.97[a]	61.61[a]	61.21[a]	33	5.25[a]	5.59[a]	3.60[a]	3.18[a]	33	5.02[a]	5.56[a]	3.98[a]	4.00[a]
		(.27)	(.28)	(.32)	(.35)		(25.21)	(20.30)	(23.69)	(27.54)		(.75)	(.67)	(1.02)	(.83)		(.73)	(.85)	(1.03)	(.93)
Female	10 5	-.08[a]	-.02[a]	-.20[a]	-.13[a]	114	47.43[a]	66.70[a]	57.32[a]	64.93[a]	114	5.23[a]	5.29[a]	3.59[a]	3.20[a]	114	4.76[a]	5.34[a]	3.91[a]	4.19[a]
		(.26)	(.22)	(.31)	(.33)		(23.57)	(22.69)	(21.31)	(21.67)		(.79)	(.85)	(.86)	(.80)		(.69)	(.86)	(.83)	(.90)
Social Class																				
Low/ Low-Middle	34	-.10[a]	-.04[a]	-.24[a]	-.17[a]	39	50.97[a]	74.18[a]	60.82[a]	66.69[a]	39	5.35[a]	5.17[a]	3.85[a]	3.22[a]	39	4.97[a]	5.51[a]	4.14[a]	4.22[a]
		(.33)	(.24)	(.38)	(.38)		(24.24)	(20.99)	(22.36)	(24.51)		(.92)	(1.03)	(.95)	(.82)		(.79)	(.84)	(1.01)	(1.18)

Middle	34	-.09[a]	-.05[a]	-.22[a]	-.17[a]	35	47.43[a]	63.23[ab]	59.97[a]	62.54[a]	35	5.32[a]	5.39[a]	3.57[ab]	3.28[a]	35	4.87[a]	5.19[a]	3.78[a]	4.16[a]
		(.24)	(.23)	(.30)	(.35)		(26.84)	(23.07)	(23.02)	(24.93)		(.64)	(.71)	(.91)	(.84)		(.64)	(.94)	(.74)	(.78)
Upper-Middle	33	-.07[a]	.01[a]	-.17[a]	-.11[a]	36	50.69[a]	65.00[ab]	53.22[a]	62.94[a]	36	5.15[a]	5.41[a]	3.34[b]	3.03[a]	36	4.73[a]	5.45[a]	3.84[a]	4.07[a]
		(.25)	(.24)	(.30)	(.30)		(20.46)	(22.89)	(21.82)	(20.55)		(.67)	(.73)	(.74)	(.71)		(.62)	(.77)	(.76)	(.84)
Upper	26	-.01[a]	.02[a]	-.10[a]	-.10[a]	28	52.50[a]	64.68[b]	58.82[a]	62.82[a]	28	5.09[a]	5.56[a]	3.60[ab]	3.28[a]	28	4.78[a]	5.41[a]	4.01[a]	4.09[a]
		(.17)	(.20)	(.25)	(.31)		(25.82)	(20.82)	(21.18)	(22.41)		(.81)	(.70)	(.91)	(.82)		(.79)	(.90)	(.81)	(.77)

Notes. Superscript comparisons are within variable and within subgroup; Values that share the same superscript did not differ from each other (t-test $p > .05$), values with different superscripts differed from each other (t-test $p < .05$).

Table S7. Study 2: Correlations between AMP Scores and Explicit Measures

	HSC White AMP Score	HSC Black AMP Score	LSC White AMP Score	LSC Black AMP Score
FT: HSC White	.17*	-.10	.15	.03
FT: HSC Black	<.01	.05	.03	.11
FT: LSC White	.05	-.03	.90	.02
FT: LSC Black	-.03	.06	.03	.14
CS: HSC White	-.04	-.10	-.03	-.02
CS: HSC Black	.04	.08	.03	-.01
CS: LSC White	.15	.08	.18*	.16
CS: LSC Black	.15	.90	.10	.04
PB: HSC White	.11	.01	.07	.03
PB: HSC Black	.04	.07	-.01	.04
PB: LSC White	.20*	.09	.16	.14

PB: LSC Black	-.07	.09	-.02	.16

*Note. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01; n =135.*

Table S8. Study 2: Correlations Between Explicit Measures

	FT: HSC White (1)	FT: HSC Black (2)	FT: LSC White (3)	FT: LSC Black (4)	CS: HSC White (5)	CS: HSC Black (6)	CS: LSC White (7)	CS: LSC Black (8)	PB: HSC White (9)	PB: HSC Black (10)	PB: LSC White (11)	PB: LSC Black (12)
1	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	.42***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	.35***	.30***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	.13	.45***	.72***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	.15	.30***	.05	.02	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	.17*	.18*	-.01	-.03	.14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	.05	.09	.21*	.17*	.26**	-.23**	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	.12	-.17*	.06	.04	-.42***	.14	.34***	--	--	--	--	--

9	.40***	.28**	.14	-.04	.54***	.31***	.23**	.01	--	--	--	--
10	.06	.36***	-.06	.05	.48***	.35***	<.01	-.27**	.45***	--	--	--
11	.07	-.03	.38***	.24**	.27**	-.14	.54***	.16	.32***	-.01	--	--
12	-.07	-.04	.17*	.29***	.10	-.02	.22**	.27**	<-.01	.15	.51***	--

*Note. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001; n = 147.*

Table S9. Study 3: Means (and Standard Deviations) for IAT Scores by Demographic Sub-Groups

	n	HSC-LSC Black IAT	HSC-LSC White IAT	*n*	HSC White-Black IAT	LSC White-Black IAT
Race						
White	56	.53 (.34)[a]	.35 (.30)[a]	55	.24 (.50)[a]	.53 (.24)[a]
Non-White	41	.57 (.30)[a]	.43 (.42)[a]	29	-.04 (.43)[b]	.31 (.31)[b]
Gender						

Male	13	.55 (.36)[a]	.53 (.39)[a]	12	.23 (.53)[a]	.43 (.30)[a]
Female	82	.56 (.31)[a]	.37 (.34)[a]	72	.13 (.49)[a]	.46 (.29)[a]
Social Class						
Low/Low Middle	23	.61 (.37)[a]	.38 (.38)[a]	21	.03 (.54)[a]	.40 (.31)[a]
Middle	37	.50 (.27)[a]	.38 (.35)[a]	26	.14 (.42)[ab]	.48 (.27)[a]
Upper-Middle	19	.62 (.33)[a]	.36 (.37)[a]	21	.35 (.41)[b]	.49 (.24)[a]
Upper	16	.49 (.32)[a]	.48 (.27)[a]	13	.11 (.56)[ab]	.43 (.35)[a]

Notes. Superscript comparisons are within variable and within subgroup; Values that share the same superscript did not differ from each other (t-test $p > .05$), values with different superscripts differed from each other (t-test $p < .05$).

Table S10. Study 3: Means (and Standard Deviations) for Explicit Measure Scores by Demographic Sub-Groups

	AMP					Feeling Thermometer					Cultural Stereotypes					Personal Beliefs				
	n	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black	*n*	HSC White	HSC Black	LSC White	LSC Black
Race																				
White	119	-.04[a]	-.05[a]	-.24[a]	-.24[a]	121	62.89[a]	76.74[a]	51.36[a]	53.07[a]	121	5.22[a]	5.35[a]	3.38[a]	3.15[a]	121	4.85[a]	5.47[a]	3.93[a]	4.16[a]
		(.28)	(.33)	(.39)	(.41)		(22.76)	(15.94)	(22.73)	(23.08)		(.84)	(.87)	(.87)	(.87)		(.73)	(.75)	(.80)	(.88)
Non-White	71	-.09[a]	-.02[a]	-.29[a]	-.24[a]	78	55.04[b]	77.85[a]	41.42[b]	48.33[a]	78	5.25[a]	5.25[a]	3.31[a]	3.14[a]	78	4.65[a]	5.42[a]	3.75[a]	4.12[a]
		(.29)	(.28)	(.41)	(.44)		(25.81)	(18.13)	(25.20)	(25.83)		(.91)	(1.03)	(.93)	(1.04)		(.78)	(.81)	(.86)	(.82)
Gender																				
Male	24	-.12[a]	-.01[a]	-.25[a]	-.16[a]	28	60.46[a]	75.43[a]	44.21[a]	52.75[a]	28	5.14[a]	5.23[a]	3.16[a]	3.29[a]	28	4.76[a]	5.35[a]	3.90[a]	4.09[a]
		(.32)	(.33)	(.37)	(.41)		(24.48)	(15.00)	(23.70)	(25.26)		(.66)	(1.02)	(.90)	(1.09)		(.68)	(.73)	(.89)	(.94)
Female	164	-.06[a]	-.05[a]	-.27[a]	-.26[a]	169	59.92[a]	77.73[a]	48.24[a]	51.24[a]	169	5.26[a]	5.33[a]	3.38[a]	3.12[a]	169	4.79[a]	5.48[a]	3.85[a]	4.15[a]
		(.28)	(.30)	(.39)	(.41)		(24.33)	(17.01)	(24.18)	(24.02)		(.90)	(.93)	(.90)	(.91)		(.77)	(.78)	(.82)	(.85)
Social Class																				
Low/ Low-Middle	47	-.02[a]	-.02[a]	-.16[a]	-.14[a]	49	53.41[a]	73.04[a]	44.53[a]	49.12[a]	49	4.96[a]	5.12[a]	3.40[a]	3.40[a]	49	4.51[a]	5.20[a]	3.92[a]	4.24[a]
		(.33)	(.34)	(.44)	(.45)		(25.15)	(18.98)	(25.62)	(27.08)		(.83)	(.91)	(.89)	(1.00)		(.75)	(.77)	(.86)	(.88)

Middle	64	-.11[a]	-.05[a]	-.33[b]	-.30[a]	68	58.29[ab]	79.57[b]	50.85[a]	55.09[a]	68	5.40[b]	5.33[a]	3.35[a]	2.90[b]	68	4.78[ab]	5.51[b]	3.81[a]	4.16[a]
		(.27)	(.32)	(.37)	(.40)		(25.31)	(15.96)	(23.33)	(23.13)		(.99)	(1.00)	(.88)	(.95)		(.74)	(.79)	(.83)	(.84)
Upper-Middle	42	-.08[a]	-.07[a]	-.30[ab]	-.27[a]	43	65.42[b]	78.09[ab]	45.42[a]	48.35[a]	43	5.34[b]	5.47[a]	3.26[a]	3.11[ab]	43	5.00[b]	5.63[b]	3.82[a]	4.06[a]
		(.26)	(.28)	(.36)	(.40)		(20.49)	(14.79)	(22.30)	(20.99)		(.76)	(.85)	(.88)	(.82)		(.72)	(.72)	(.69)	(.80)
Upper	34	-.02[a]	-.01[a]	-.24[ab]	-.26[a]	34	65.65[b]	77.76[ab]	43.91[a]	46.59[a]	34	5.24[ab]	5.31[a]	3.38[a]	3.19[ab]	34	4.91[b]	5.47[ab]	3.91[a]	4.03[a]
		(.27)	(.28)	(.41)	(.41)		(23.24)	(15.94)	(23.97)	(24.29)		(.74)	(.91)	(.97)	(.84)		(.78)	(.76)	(.96)	(.97)

Notes. Superscript comparisons are within variable and within subgroup; Values that share the same superscript did not differ from each other (t-test $p > .05$), values with different superscripts differed from each other (t-test $p < .05$).

Table S11. Study 3: Correlations between IATs and AMP Scores

	Condition 1 (Compare Social Class)		Condition 2 (Compare Race)	
	HSC-LSC Black IAT	HSC-LSC White IAT	HSC White-Black IAT	LSC White-Black IAT
HSC White AMP Score	-.04	.15	-.12	.07
HSC Black AMP Score	-.11	.11	-.25*	-.03
LSC White AMP Score	-.14	-.04	-.02	.18
LSC Black AMP Score	-.19	-.07	-.06	.10

*Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$; condition 1: $n = 93$, condition 2: $n = 81$*

Table S12. Study 3: Correlations between IATs and Explicit Measures

	Condition 1 (Compare Social Class)		Condition 2 (Compare Race)	
	HSC-LSC Black IAT	HSC-LSC White IAT	HSC White-Black IAT	LSC White-Black IAT
FT: HSC White	.08	.09	-.06	.23*
FT: HSC Black	.24*	.07	-.06	<.01
FT: LSC White	-.12	-.11	-.25*	.04
FT: LSC Black	-.10	-.22*	-.25*	-.06
CS: HSC White	.08	.08	.04	.01
CS: HSC Black	.04	.07	-.02	.02
CS: LSC White	-.01	-.21*	-.06	.03
CS: LSC Black	-.07	-.08	-.22*	<.01

PB: HSC White	.02	.07	.07	.11
PB: HSC Black	.16	.06	.14	.03
PB: LSC White	-.18	-.03	-.11	.17
PB: LSC Black	-.12	-.10	-.19	-.02

*Note. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$; condition 1: n = 97, condition 2: n = 84*

Table S13. Study 3: Correlations between AMP Scores and Explicit Measures

	HSC White AMP Score	HSC Black AMP Score	LSC White AMP Score	LSC Black AMP Score
FT: HSC White	.22**	-.02	.05	-.10
FT: HSC Black	.06	.14*	-.05	-.01
FT: LSC White	.10	.05	.10	.12
FT: LSC Black	.11	.17*	.11	.19**
CS: HSC White	-.04	.06	-.16*	-.12
CS: HSC Black	-.01	.09	-.12	-.11
CS: LSC White	.13	-.01	.12	.07
CS: LSC Black	.18*	.08	.19**	.15*
PB: HSC White	<-.01	-.09	-.13	-.20**
PB: HSC Black	-.06	.07	-.13	-.11
PB: LSC White	.10	.12	.12	.17*

PB: LSC Black	.07	.26***	.11	.23**

*Note. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01; n =190.*

Table S14. Study 3: Correlations Between Explicit Measures

	FT: HSC White (1)	FT: HSC Black (2)	FT: LSC White (3)	FT: LSC Black (4)	CS: HSC White (5)	CS: HSC Black (6)	CS: LSC White (7)	CS: LSC Black (8)	PB: HSC White (9)	PB: HSC Black (10)	PB: LSC White (11)	PB: LSC Black (12)
1	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	.30***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	.20**	.16*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	-.02	.27***	.77***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	.17*	.18*	-.04	-.11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	.20**	.20**	.05	.03	.40***	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	.06	-.03	.16*	.11	-.09	-.04	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	.11	-.04	.16*	.14	-.38***	-.03	.48***	--	--	--	--	--
9	.46***	.10	.07	-.09	.55***	.40***	.08	-.01	--	--	--	--

10	.05	.34***	.02	.10	.47***	.60***	-.05	-.23**	.51***	--	--	--
11	.06	.30	.47***	.38***	.01	-.05	.46***	.29***	.12	-.01	--	--
12	-.12	.12	.36***	.46***	-.03	.11	.26***	.21**	-.10	.15*	.64***	--

*Note. FT = Feeling Thermometer, CS = Cultural Stereotype, PB = Personal Beliefs; * p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001; n = 199.*