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# Study 1

## Physiological Questionnaire

We did not collect data from participants who answered yes to any of the following questions: “Do you have a pacemaker?” “Do you believe you might be pregnant?” and “In the past 6 months have you taken medicine that would affect your cardiovascular system (e.g., beta-blockers)?”

## Cardiovascular Response Measurement

To collect impedance cardiography signals, experimenters applied two pairs of mylar tapes to participants’ necks and torsos, which were attached to a Biopac Impedance Cardiograph (Model NICO100C). To collect electrocardiography signals, experimenters applied one electrode on the right side of participants’ chests underneath the collarbone and a second electrode on the left side of participants’ chests underneath the ribcage. The electrodes were connected to a Biopac Electrocardiograph amplifier (Model ECG100C). We obtained continuous measures of blood pressure using a finger cuff placed on participant’s non-dominant hand, which was connected to a Biopac Noninvasive Blood Pressure Amplifier (NIBP100D).

In addition to recording cardiovascular responses when participants were anticipating the interaction with their partner, we recorded cardiovascular responses during participants’ 1-minute introduction, when they were watching the 1-minute confederate video introduction, and when they were completing the 5-minute individual task. These data are included in our shared data file. However, we do not report analyses of these data because our primary interest in the present series of studies is in participants’ experiences of threat when they are anticipating or engaging in a collaborative interaction with their partner (i.e., working on a collaborative task together).

## Additional Dependent Variables

Given little work on cross-class interactions, we included exploratory measures to gain insight into processes that occur during these interactions. Specifically, we asked participants to report their affect and impressions of the individual task. We were also interested in interpersonal outcomes when anticipating a cross-class interaction, and therefore also measured participants’ perceptions of their partner as well as how they would like their partner to perceive them.

***Affect***

To measure affect, participants responded to an 11-item PANAS measure (Watson et al., 1988) on a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Although research often fails to find correspondence between threat as assessed with cardiovascular measures and self-reported affect (e.g., Mendes et al., 2002; Townsend et al., 2010), we were interested in whether participants’ affect might be influenced by being in a cross-class, compared to same-class, interaction. Following previous research, we measured positive affect (excited, inspired, in control, confident; α = .615, *M* = 3.82, *SD* = 0.94), negative affect (nervous, distressed, worried, overwhelmed; α = .793, *M* = 2.49, *SD* = 1.16), and vigilance (alert, attentive, hyper; α = .566, *M* = 3.97, *SD* = 1.00; Townsend et al., 2010).

***Impressions of the Individual Task***

To measure participants’ impressions of the individual task, they completed two items, using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*), *r* = 0.30, *M* = 2.69, *SD* = 0.91. The items were: “How difficult was the last task” (reverse-scored) and “Do you think you performed well on the last task?”

***Perceptions of Partner***

To measure participants’ perceptions of their partner, they completed nine items, using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*), α = .791, *M* = 4.87, *SD* = 0.78. Example items include, “I like my partner,” and, “I am worried about working with my partner” (reverse-scored).

***Importance of Partner’s Respect***

To measure how important participants considered their partner’s respect, they responded to one item using a scale of 1 (*most important to be liked*) to 7 (*most important to be respected*), *M* = 4.56, *SD* = 1.17. The item was: “If you had to choose between being liked and being respected by this person, which would you regard as more important?”

***Desire to be Seen as Smart***

To measure how much participants wanted their partner to perceive them as smart, they completed three items using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The items were: “intelligent,” “capable,” and “competent,” α = .864, *M* = 5.58, *SD* = 1.02.

***Desire to Be Seen as a Good Person***

To measure how much participants wanted their partner to perceive them as a good person, they completed four items using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The items were: “fair,” “kind,” “open-minded,” and “a good person,” α = .842, *M* = 5.47, *SD* = 1.08.

***Manipulation Check Filler Items***

In addition to the manipulation check items reported in the main text, we also included two filler items, which asked about the partner’s gender and year in college.

***Attribution for Partners’ Performance***

To examine whether participants would give generous or harsh attributions for their partners’ low performance, experimenters told participants that their partner only scored better than 32% of other participants in the study. Then, participants reported their perceptions of their partners’ performance on four items, using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). We dropped one item (i.e., “My partner should have tried harder on the test” (reverse-scored), *M* = 2.61, *SD* = 1.31) from the composite and analyzed the item separately because it did not load well with the other three items. Thus, we created a composite with the remaining three items, α = .500, *M* = 5.78, *SD* = 0.86. An example item is, “My partner is capable of doing better on the test.” Experimenters told participants about their partner’s performance at the very end of the study, so not all participants responded to these items due to time constraints. Thus, the degrees of freedom are lower on these dependent variables than our other dependent variables.

## Results and Discussion

***Analysis Plan***

We conducted 2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) as reported in the main text. We included covariates for race, gender, BMI (for cardiovascular data only). As mentioned in the main text, our measure of threat consists of cardiac output (CO) and total peripheral resistance (TPR). Therefore, we also report analyses on CO and TPR below. See Table 1 for summary of statistical results.

**Table 1**

*Results of ANCOVAs for Additional Dependent Variables (Study 1)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Dependent Variables* | | | | | |
|  | Predictor | *F* | *p* | η*p*2 | 95% CI |
| *Cardiac Output* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 1.37 | .243 | .009 | -0.06, 0.22 |
|  | Race | 1.00 | .319 | .007 | -0.22, 0.07 |
|  | BMI | 0.66 | .419 | .004 | -0.03, 0.01 |
|  | Condition | 2.93 | .089 | .019 | -0.16, 0.18 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 3.63 | .059 | .024 | -0.40, -0.03 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 2.19 | .141 | .015 | -0.06, 0.44 |
| *Total Peripheral Resistance* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.00 | .960 | .000 | -105.47, 100.27 |
|  | Race | 0.31 | .581 | .002 | -83.56, 148.47 |
|  | BMI | 0.78 | .379 | .006 | -20.40, 7.81 |
|  | Condition | 1.58 | .211 | .013 | -147.40, 127.26 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.65 | .421 | .005 | -48.82, 233.23 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 1.11 | .293 | .009 | -298.96, 90.99 |
| *Positive affect* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 4.93 | .027 | .023 | 0.03, 0.55 |
|  | Race | 0.19 | .667 | .001 | -0.24, 0.37 |
|  | Condition | 0.59 | .445 | .003 | -0.66, 0.02 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.22 | .638 | .001 | -0.62, 0.06 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 3.17 | .076 | .015 | -0.05, 0.93 |
| *Negative affect* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.26 | .614 | .001 | -0.41, 0.24 |
|  | Race | 1.08 | .299 | .005 | -0.58, 0.18 |
|  | Condition | 0.18 | .669 | .001 | -0.55, 0.31 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 2.48 | .117 | .011 | -0.87, 0.00 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 1.43 | .233 | .007 | -0.24, 0.99 |
| *Vigilance* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.46 | .498 | .002 | -0.19, 0.38 |
|  | Race | 0.53 | .468 | .002 | -0.21, 0.46 |
|  | Condition | 0.38 | .541 | .002 | -0.70, 0.05 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.47 | .495 | .002 | -0.52, 0.24 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 3.02 | .084 | .014 | -0.06, 1.02 |
| *Impressions of the Individual Task* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 2.40 | .123 | .011 | -0.06, 0.46 |
|  | Race | 0.03 | .870 | <.001 | -0.33, 0.28 |
|  | Condition | 0.17 | .680 | .001 | -0.35, 0.33 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.03 | .854 | <.001 | -0.33, 0.41 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.09 | .761 | <.001 | -0.56, 0.41 |
| *Perceptions of Partner* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 2.42 | .121 | .011 | -0.05, 0.39 |
|  | Race | 5.58 | .019 | .025 | 0.05, 0.56 |
|  | Condition | 0.56 | .454 | .003 | -0.33, 0.24 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.64 | .425 | .003 | -0.17, 0.40 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.09 | .767 | <.001 | -0.47, 0.35 |
| *Importance of Partner’s Respect* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 2.81 | .095 | .013 | -0.05, 0.60 |
|  | Race | 3.06 | .082 | .014 | -0.71, 0.04 |
|  | Condition | 0.18 | .671 | .001 | -0.47, 0.37 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 2.41 | .122 | .011 | -0.78, 0.07 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.55 | .459 | .003 | -0.38, 0.84 |
| *Desire to be Seen as Smart* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 2.48 | .117 | .011 | -0.51, 0.06 |
|  | Race | 1.27 | .262 | .006 | -0.52, 0.14 |
|  | Condition | 0.00 | .995 | <.001 | -0.61, 0.14 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.09 | .769 | <.001 | -0.57, 0.18 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 2.99 | .085 | .014 | -0.07, 1.01 |
| *Desire to be Seen as a Good Person* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.06 | .810 | <.001 | -0.34, 0.27 |
|  | Race | 3.24 | .073 | .015 | -0.68, 0.03 |
|  | Condition | 1.36 | .245 | .006 | -0.58, 0.22 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.00 | .956 | <.001 | -0.42, 0.38 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.01 | .937 | <.001 | -0.55, 0.59 |
| *Attribution for Partners’ Performance* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.03 | .862 | <.001 | -0.32, 0.27 |
|  | Race | 0.51 | .477 | .003 | -0.44, 0.21 |
|  | Condition | 0.03 | .862 | <.001 | -0.43, 0.34 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.48 | .490 | .003 | -0.56, 0.23 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.26 | .613 | .002 | -0.41, 0.69 |
| *My partner should have tried harder on the test* | |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 3.74 | .055 | .024 | -0.87, 0.01 |
|  | Race | 0.02 | .879 | <.001 | -0.45, 0.53 |
|  | Condition | 1.92 | .168 | .013 | -1.01, 0.14 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 2.33 | .129 | .015 | -0.42, 0.77 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.49 | .485 | .003 | -0.53, 1.12 |

*Note.* Degrees of freedom (*df*) for Cardiac output = 1, 149; *df* for Total peripheral resistance = 1, 124; *df* for Affect (positive, negative, vigilance), Impressions of the individual task, Perceptions of partner, Importance of partner’s respect, Desire to be seen as smart, and Desire to be seen as a good person = 1, 214; *df* for Attribution for partners’ performance and “My partner should have tried harder on the test” = 1, 151. BMI = body mass index.

***Cardiac Output***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (150) = 2.93, η*p*2 = .019, *p* = .089, or a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (150) = 3.63, η*p*2 = .024, *p* = .059. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (149) = 2.19, η*p*2 = .015, *p* = .141.

***Total Peripheral Resistance***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on total peripheral resistance, *F*s < 1.58, *p*s > .211.

***Positive Affect***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (215) = 0.59, 95% CI [0.00, 0.03], η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .445, nor a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (215) = 0.64, 95% CI [0.00, 0.03], η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .638. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (214) = 3.17, 95% CI [0.00, 0.06], η*p*2 = .015, *p* = .076.

***Negative Affect***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on negative affect, *F*s < 2.48, *p*s > .117.

***Vigilance***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (215) = 0.38, 95% CI [0.00, 0.03], η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .541, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (215) = 0.47, 95% CI [0.00, 0.03], η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .495. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (214) = 3.02, 95% CI [0.00, 0.06], η*p*2 = .014, *p* = .084.

***Impressions of the Individual Task***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ impressions of the individual task, *F*s < 0.17, *p*s > .680.

***Perceptions of Partner***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ perceptions of their partner, *F*s < 0.64, *p*s > .425.

***Importance of Partner’s Respect***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on importance of partner’s respect, *F*s < 2.41, *p*s > .122.

***Desire to be Seen as Smart***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ desire to be seen as smart by their partner, *F*s < 2.99, *p*s > .085.

***Desire to be Seen as a Good Person***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ desire to be seen as a good person by their partner, *F*s < 1.36, *p*s > .245.

***Attribution for Partners’ Performance***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ attributions for their partner’s poor performance on the individual task, *F*s < 0.48, *p*s > .490, nor on the single item, “My partner should have tried harder on the test,” *F*s < 2.33, *p*s > .129.

## Study 1: Primary Analyses Without Covariates

In this section, we report results of our primary analyses (i.e., those reported in the main text) without covariates. Specifically, for threat and individual task performance we conducted 2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) analysis of variance (ANOVA).

***Threat***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (128) = 2.47, η*p*2 = .019, *p* = .119, nor of social class background, *F* (128) = 2.19, η*p*2 = .017, *p* = .141. However, the condition by social class background interaction was significant, *F* (1, 127) = 4.63, η*p*2 = .035, *p* = .033. Consistent with our predictions, participants from middle-class backgrounds exhibited greater threat in the working-class partner condition than the middle-class partner condition, *F* (127) = 6.54, η*p*2 = .051, *p* = .010. In contrast, but also consistent with our predictions, participants from working-class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat across conditions, *F* (127) = 0.17, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .680.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds exhibited greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (127) = 6.44, η*p*2 = .048, *p* = .012. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds and participants from working-class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat, *F* (127) = 0.23, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .632.

***Individual Task Performance***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (217) = 0.78, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .377. We found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds performed better on the task than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (217) = 8.29, η*p*2 = .037, *p* = .004. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (216) = 2.94, η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .088.

## Study 1: Primary Analyses Using Composite of Parental Educational Attainment and Family Income as Measure of Social Class Background

In this section, we report the analyses on our primary dependent variables using a composite measure of social class background instead of the generation status measure of social class background reported in the main text. We measured participants’ social class backgrounds using their parents’ educational attainment and family income, which convey one’s access to material resources and cultural knowledge and are commonly used indicators of social class background (e.g., Duncan, et al., 1972; Krieger et al., 1997; Sirin, 2005).

We measured parental educational attainment using six categories in the demographics portion of our survey: (1) Less than high school, (2) High school diploma, (3) Some college, (4) Two-year college degree (e.g., Associates), (5) 4-year college degree (B.A. or B.S.), (6) Professional degree (MD., Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., etc.). Family income was measured using four categories in the demographics portion of our survey: (1) Less than $25,000 (2) $25,001-$50,000 (3) $50,001-$75,000, (4) $75,001-$100,000, (5) $100,001-$125,000, (6) $125,001-$150,000, (7) $150,001-$175,000, (8) $150,001-$175,000, (9) $200,001-$250,000, (10) $250,001-$300,000, (11) Greater than $300,001. We computed participants’ social class backgrounds by standardizing and then averaging their parents’ educational attainment and family income, *M* = 0.00, *SD* = 0.87. To provide more insight into what it means to be high and low on this composite, we examined participants at 1 *SD* above and below the mean of our social class background composite. Scores at 1 *SD* above the mean correspond to having at least one parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of at least $200,000 and scores at 1 *SD* below the mean correspond to having neither parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of less than $100,000.

We conducted moderated regression analyses. On Step 1, we entered our covariates: race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male), BMI (mean-centered) for the cardiovascular measure only, and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores (mean-centered) for individual task performance only. We then entered condition (0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 2, and their interaction on Step 3.

***Threat***

Our moderated regression analysis revealed no significant main effect of condition, *t* (125) = -1.55, *b* = -0.42, 95% CI [-0.97, 0.12], *p* = .124, nor a significant main effect of social class background, *t* (125) = 0.88, *b* = 0.14, 95% CI [-0.18, 0.46], *p* = .382. Importantly, the condition by social class background interaction was significant, *F* (1, 124) = 5.23, *b* = -0.74, 95% CI [-1.37, -0.10], ∆*R*² = .039, *p* = .024. Consistent with our prediction, participants from middle-class backgrounds (those 1 *SD* above the mean of the social class background composite) experienced greater threat in the working-class partner condition than the middle-class partner condition (i.e., a same-class interaction), *b* = -1.07, 95% CI [-1.83, -0.30], *p* = .007. However, participants from working-class backgrounds (those 1 *SD* below the mean of the social class background composite) exhibited similar levels of threat across conditions, *b* = 0.19, 95% CI [-0.56, 0.94], *p* = .622.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds experienced significantly greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *b* = 0.58, 95% CI [0.09, 1.07], *p* = .022. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class and working-class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat, *b* = -0.16, 95% CI [-0.57, 0.25], *p* = .446.

***Individual Task Performance***

We found no significant main effect of condition, *t* (213) = -0.20, *b* = -0.39, 95% CI [-0.43, 0.35], *p* = .842. or social class background, *t* (213) = -0.35, *b* = -0.04, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.20], *p* = .725. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 212) = 3.28, *b* = -0.41, 95% CI [-0.86, 0.04], ∆*R*² = .011, *p* = .071.

# Study 2

## Additional Procedural Details

***Warm-Up Task***

After participants completed their 1-minute introduction, they completed a task framed as a warm-up task before the individual task. Specifically, experimenters gave participants up to 3 minutes to complete a 3-item Cognitive Reflection Task (CRT). See more details about the function of the CRT below.

***Threat Before the Individual Task***

Then, participants completed the demand and resource appraisal scale (Mendes et al., 2007) before the individual task.

## Additional Dependent Variables

In addition to the measures reported in the main text, we also measured participants’ performance on the warm-up task, self-reported threat before the individual task, and subjective status.

***Warm-Up Task***

Participants completed a 3-item CRT (Range 0-3, *M* = 1.12, *SD* = 1.09). The CRT captures the degree to which people are using their System 1 processing (i.e., fast, effortless thinking) versus System 2 processing (i.e., slow, deliberate thinking; Alter et al., 2007) through mental math questions that appear to have an obvious answer when relying on System 1 thinking, but require System 2 thinking to arrive at the correct answer (Frederick, 2005). We included the CRT as a proxy for (dis)fluency from a cross-class versus same-class interaction, such that people who are in a disfluent situation (i.e., a cross-class interaction) are more likely to employ systematic, System 2 thinking compared to people who are in a fluent situation (i.e., a same-class interaction; Lam et al., 2013). We expected participants from middle-class backgrounds to perform better on the CRT when anticipating a cross-class versus same-class interaction.

***Threat Before Individual Task***

To measure threat regarding the upcoming individual task, participants thought about the upcoming individual task and reported their demand and resource appraisals by completing the same 10 items adapted from Mendes and colleagues (2007) using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Five items assessed demand appraisals (e.g., “This task is threatening”), α = .746, *M* = 3.01, *SD* = 0.95. Five items assessed resource appraisals (e.g., “This task is a positive challenge”), α = .750, *M* = 4.92, *SD* = 0.91. Following Mendes et al. (2007), we created a threat ratio of the evaluations of demands and resources by dividing the participants’ ratings of perceived demands by their ratings of perceived resources. Larger values indicate greater threat, *M* = 1.19, *SD* = 0.92.

***Additional Filler Item for Overprivileged Concerns***

We included lack of intelligence as a filler item when we measured participants’ overprivileged concerns to reduce demand effects. The item was: “I worry that my partner may think that I am not intelligent.”

***Manipulation Check Filler Items***

As in Study 1, in addition to the manipulation items reported in the main text, we also included two filler items, which asked about their partner’s gender and year in college.

## Results and Discussion

***Analysis Plan***

We conducted a2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) ANCOVA controlling for race and gender as in Study 1. As mentioned in the main text, our self-report measure of threat is a ratio computed by dividing participants’ demand appraisals by resource appraisals. Therefore, we also report analyses on demand and resource appraisal below. See Table 2 for statistical results.

Table 2

*Results of ANCOVAs for Additional Dependent Variables (Study 2)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Predictor | *F* | *p* | η*p*2 |
| *Demand Appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 3.05 | .082 | .010 |
|  | Race | 0.86 | .353 | .003 |
|  | Condition | 1.69 | .195 | .006 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.13 | .715 | <.001 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.48 | .490 | .002 |
| *Resource Appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 5.33 | .022 | .018 |
|  | Race | 3.12 | .078 | .010 |
|  | Condition | 0.60 | .439 | .002 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 2.19 | .140 | .007 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.84 | .361 | .003 |
| *Warm-up Task* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 3.35 | .068 | .011 |
|  | Race | 0.09 | .770 | <.001 |
|  | Condition | 0.39 | .532 | .001 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 7.72 | .006 | .025 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.59 | .444 | .002 |
| *Threat Before Individual Task* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 9.12 | .003 | .030 |
|  | Race | 12.90 | <.001 | .042 |
|  | Condition | 0.04 | .852 | <.001 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.24 | .626 | .001 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.34 | .560 | .001 |

*Note.* Degrees of freedom (*df*) for Demand and Resource appraisal = 1, 296; *df* for Warm-up task = 1, 297; *df* for Threat before individual task = 1, 295; *df* for Subjective status = 1, 295.

***Demand Appraisal***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on demand appraisal, *F*s < 1.69, *p*s > .195.

***Resource Appraisal***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on resource appraisal, *F*s < 2.19, *p*s > .140.

***Warm-Up Task***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (298) = 0.39, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .532. We found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds performed better than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (298) = 7.72, η*p*2 = .025, *p* = .006. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (297) = 0.59, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .444.

***Threat Before Individual Task***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on participants’ threat before the individual task, *F*s < 0.34, *p*s > .560.

## Study 2: Primary Analyses Without Covariates

We report the 2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) ANOVAs on our primary dependent variables in the main text without covariates.

***Threat***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (298) = 2.06, η*p*2 = .007, *p* = .153, nor a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (298) = 1.48, η*p*2 = .005, *p* = .224. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 296) = 2.41, η*p*2 = .008, *p* = .122. However, we conducted simple effects analyses to examine our hypotheses. Further analysis of the simple effects revealed that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat in the working-class partner condition than the middle-class partner condition, *F* (296) = 4.33, η*p*2 = .014, *p* = .038. In contrast, but also consistent with our prediction, participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat across conditions, *F* (296) = 0.01, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .933.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported marginally greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (297) = 3.84, η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .051. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds and participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat, *F* (297) = 0.06, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .814.

***Individual Task Performance***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (300) = 0.00, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .962. We found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class background performed better than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (300) = 7.36, η*p*2 = .024, *p* = .007. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 299) = 1.86, η*p*2 = .006, *p* = .174.

***Status Concerns***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (298) = 1.28, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .259. We found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (298) = 8.04, η*p*2 = .026, *p* = .005. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 297) = 0.28, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .866.

***Overprivileged Concerns***

We found a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the working-class partner condition reported greater overprivileged concerns than those in the middle-class partner condition, *F* (289) = 21.63, η*p*2 = .070, *p* < .001. We also found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (289) = 39.17, η*p*2 = .120, *p* < .001. However, we did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 288) = 1.91, η*p*2 = .007, *p* = .168.

***Experience in Cross-Class Contexts***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (299) = 0.18, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .673. We found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (299) = 33.42, η*p*2 = .101, *p* < .001. The interaction was not significant, *F* (298) = 1.35, η*p*2 = .005, *p* = .246.

## Study 2: Primary Analyses Using Composite of Parental Educational Attainment and Family Income as Measure of Social Class Background

We report our analyses on our primary dependent variables using a composite measure of social class background based on parental educational attainment and family income given that we manipulated partners’ social class background using both parental educational attainment and family income. We measured participants’ social class backgrounds using their parents’ educational attainment and family income. We measured parental educational attainment using six categories in the demographics portion of our survey: (1) Less than high school, (2) High school diploma, (3) Some college, (4) Two-year college degree (e.g., Associates), (5) 4-year college degree (B.A. or B.S.), (6) Professional degree (MD., Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., etc.). Family income was measured using four categories in the introduction questionnaire because we did not include a family income measure in the demographic portion of our survey: (1) Less than $100,000 (2) $100,000-$200,000 (3) $200,000-$300,000, (4) Over $300,000. We computed participants’ social class backgrounds by standardizing and then averaging their parents’ educational attainment and family income, *M* = 0.00, *SD* = 0.85. Scores at 1 *SD* above the mean correspond to having at least one parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of at least $200,000 and scores at 1 *SD* below the mean correspond to having neither parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of less than $100,000.

We conducted moderated regression analyses. On Step 1, we entered our covariates: race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male). We then entered condition (0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 2, and their interaction on Step 3. We included our standard covariates (i.e., race and gender) for all analyses and also included self-reported SAT or ACT scores for analyses of individual task performance. Following the College Board Concordance Guide (2018), we converted ACT scores into SAT scores. We assigned these scores to participants who only reported their ACT scores and assigned participants their best score if they reported both. As mentioned in our preregistration, we included this covariate to control for individual ability.[[1]](#footnote-1)

***Threat***

Our moderated regression analysis revealed no significant main effect of condition, *t* (296) = -1.45, *b* = -0.06, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.02], *p* = .147, and no significant main effect of social class background, *t* (296) = 0.51, *b* = 0.01, 95% CI [-0.04, 0.58], *p* = .616. Importantly, we found a significant interaction, *F* (1, 295) = 5.72, *b* = -0.11, 95% CI [-0.20, -0.02], ∆*R*² = .018, *p* = .017. Participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat in the working-class partner condition than in the middle-class partner condition, *b* = -0.15, 95% CI [-0.26, -0.04], *p* = .007. In contrast, participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat across both conditions, *b* = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.15], *p* = .510.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *b* = 0.07, 95% CI [0.00, 0.14], *p* = .039. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class and working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat, *b* = -0.04, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.02], *p* = .212.

***Individual Task Performance***

We did not find any significant effects for participants’ performance on the individual task: main effect of condition, *t* (239) = 0.88, *b* = 0.18, 95% CI [-0.22, 0.57], *p* = .381, main effect of social class background, *t* (239) = 0.62, *b* = 0.08, 95% CI [-0.16, 0.31], *p* = .535, or interaction, *F* (1, 238) = 1.04, *b* = 0.24, 95% CI [-0.22, 0.69], ∆*R*² = .004, *p* = .309.

***Status Concerns***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition for participants’ concerns about maintaining their status, *t* (296) = 1.43, *b* = 0.13, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.32], *p* = .155. We found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater status concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *t* (296) = 3.69, *b* = 0.21, 95% CI [0.10, 0.32], *p* < .001. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 295) = 0.06, *b* = 0.03, 95% CI [-0.19, 0.24], ∆*R*² = .000, *p* = .812.

***Overprivileged Concerns***

We found a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the working-class partner condition reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants in the middle-class partner condition, *t* (287) = -4.58, *b* = -0.80, 95% CI [-1.14, -0.45], *p* < .001. We also found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *t* (287) = 8.87, *b* = 0.92, 95% CI [0.72, 1.13], *p* < .001. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 286) = 0.99, *b* = -0.20, 95% CI [-0.60, 0.20], ∆*R*² = .002, *p* = .320.

***Experience in Cross-Class Contexts***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (297) = -0.55, *b* = -0.10, 95% CI [-0.44, -0.25], *p* = .583. We found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported less experience in cross-class contexts than participants from working-class backgrounds, *t* (297) = -4.62, *b* = -0.48, 95% CI [-0.68, -0.28], *p* < .001. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 296) = 0.79, *b* = -0.18, 95% CI [-0.58, 0.22], ∆*R*² = .002, *p* = .376.

## Study 2: Preregistered Moderated Mediation Analyses

***Analysis Plan***

Following our preregistered analyses, we conducted moderated mediation analyses for status concerns, overprivileged concerns, and experience in cross-class contexts (Hayes, 2013; PROCESS macro for SPSS 23, model 8, 10,000 bootstrapped samples). As mentioned in the main text, we predicted that these outcomes might partially explain experiences of threat among participants from *middle-*class backgrounds. See Table 3 for a summary of the moderated mediation results.

***Status Concerns***

Among participants from middle-class backgrounds, the conditional indirect effect of condition on threat through status concerns was not significant, *b* = -0.01, *SE*boot = .01, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.01].

***Overprivileged Concerns***

Similarly, among participants from middle-class backgrounds, the conditional indirect effect of condition on threat through overprivileged concerns was not significant, *b* = -0.01, *SE*boot = .01, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.02].

***Experience in Cross-Class Contexts***

Among participants from middle-class backgrounds, the conditional indirect effect of condition on threat through experience in cross-class contexts was not significant, *b* = 0.00, *SE*boot = .01, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.01].

We also conducted separate mediation analyses on experience in cross-class contexts for participants from middle-class backgrounds and participants from working-class backgrounds (Hayes, 2013; PROCESS macro for SPSS 23, model 4, 10,000 bootstrapped samples). Specifically, we entered condition as the independent variable, experience in cross-class contexts as the mediator, and threat as the dependent variable. Among participants from middle-class backgrounds, the indirect effect of condition on threat through experience in cross-class contexts was not significant, *b* = 0.00, *SE*boot = .01, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.01]. Similarly, among participants from working-class backgrounds, the indirect effect of condition on threat through experience in cross-class contexts was also not significant, *b* = 0.00, *SE*boot = .01, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.01].

Table 3

*Results of Moderated Mediation Analyses with Status Concerns, Overprivileged Concerns, Experience in Cross-Class Contexts as Mediators Between Condition and Threat, Moderated by Participant Social Class Background (Study 2)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Mediator* | | | 95% CI | |
|  | *b* | *SEboot* | Lower | Upper |
| *Status Concerns* | -0.005 | .017 | -0.045 | 0.025 |
| *Overprivileged Concerns* | -0.002 | .008 | -0.021 | 0.014 |
| *Experience in Cross-Class Contexts* | 0.003 | .007 | -0.009 | 0.020 |

*Note.* Indirect effect of condition through potential mediators on threat, moderated by participants’ social class background. Hayes’s PROCESS macro (Model 8) with 10,000 bootstrapped samples.

# Study 3

## Procedure

Participants were randomly assigned a middle-class partner (*n* = 138) or working-class partner (*n* = 142) with whom to interact using ChatPlat software, an online chat platform that allows participants to chat with another partner (or confederate; Brooks & Schweitzer, 2011). Participants were paired up with another participant (i.e., a confederate matched for gender). The chat administrator, who was also the confederate, instructed the participants to indicate their first name and the date in the chat. Participants then began the survey.

***Manipulation and Introductions.***

Participants filled out the introduction questionnaire and then saw their partner’s responses to this questionnaire, which included the partner’s social class background as in Studies 1 and 2. Then, participants typed in their introduction essays and had 1 minute to read their partner’s introduction essay.

***Filler Individual Task.***

As in Studies 1 and 2, participants learned that performance on the individual task would impact their overall team score, which would determine whether the team would win two $50 gift cards. Subsequently, participants completed the filler individual task for 2 minutes. We included the individual task to be consistent with Studies 1 and 2.

***Collaborative Task Anticipation and Potential Mediators***

After, participants reported their demand and resource appraisals with respect to working with their partner on the anticipated collaborative task as in Study 2 (e.g., Mendes et al., 2007). To gain insight into why people from middle-class backgrounds might experience greater threat when they anticipate a cross-class versus same-class interaction, participants reported their overprivileged concerns and how typical their partner was to them.

***Collaborative Task and Post-Task Questionnaires****.*

For the collaborative task, participants were paired up with the confederate on ChatPlat and instructed to take turns linking adjacent letters to form words. Participants were given 3 minutes to work with their partner on the collaborative task and were instructed to take the first turn.After completing the task, participants indicated their demand and resource appraisals with respect to working with their partner on the collaborative task. Participants also indicated the extent to which they and their partner have a shared identity after graduation. Finally, participants indicated the purpose of the study and whether they were suspicious before reading the debrief statement.

## Additional Dependent Variables

***Potential Mediator: Overprivileged Concerns***

To measure overprivileged concerns, participants responded to the question, “How concerned are you that your partner will think the following, due to your social class background” on 5 items using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), α = .921, *M* = 3.16, *SD* = 1.42. The items were: “I am privileged,” “I am spoiled,” “I have had unearned advantages,” “I have not had to overcome any real challenges,” and “My life has been easy.”

***Potential Mediator: Typicality of Partner***

To examine how typical their interaction partner is to them, participants responded to 4 items using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), α = .625, *M* = 4.71, *SD* = 0.93. The items were: “I have a lot of experience interacting with people like my partner,” “My partner reminds me of some of my friends,” “My partner is someone who is unique,” and “My partner is different from most of the people I typically interact with” (reverse-scored).

***Performance on Collaborative Task***

We measured performance on the collaborative task as the number of responses the participant entered in the chat (Range 0 – 14), *M* = 4.42, *SD* = 2.74.

***Post-Task Threat***

To measure threat regarding the collaborative interaction that participants had with their partner, they completed the same 10 items adapted from Mendes and colleagues (2007) on a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), *M* = 0.66, *SD* = 0.59.

***Future Shared Identity***

To examine perceptions of a shared identity with their partner in the future, participants responded to the 9 items using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), α = .727, *M* = 4.36, *SD* = 0.75. An example item is: “After graduating college, I would consider my partner and I to be members of the same group.”

## Results

***Analysis Plan***

As reported in the main text, we conducted 2×2 ANCOVA as described in Studies 1 and 2. We included our standard covariates (i.e., race and gender) for all analyses. In addition to these standard covariates, we also included year in school. We also report analyses on demand and resource appraisal composites that make up our self-report measure of threat below. See Table 4 for summary of statistical results.

Table 4

*Results of ANCOVAs for Dependent Variables (Study 3)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *F* | *p* | η*p*2 |
| *Demand appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.05 | .827 | <.001 |
|  | Race | 0.03 | .868 | <.001 |
|  | Year in School | 0.28 | .601 | .001 |
|  | Condition | 7.38 | .007 | .026 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 2.68 | .103 | .010 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 3.18 | .076 | .012 |
| *Resource appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.36 | .551 | .001 |
|  | Race | 1.17 | .281 | .004 |
|  | Year in School | 0.01 | .906 | <.001 |
|  | Condition | 1.46 | .229 | .005 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 1.98 | .161 | .007 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 1.88 | .171 | .007 |
| *Overprivileged concerns* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.95 | .330 | .003 |
|  | Race | 0.01 | .943 | <.001 |
|  | Year in School | 2.70 | .102 | .010 |
|  | Condition | 0.87 | .352 | .003 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 39.13 | <.001 | .125 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 11.38 | .001 | .040 |
| *Typicality of partner* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 6.38 | .012 | .023 |
|  | Race | 1.52 | .219 | .006 |
|  | Year in School | 0.26 | .611 | .001 |
|  | Condition | 0.39 | .533 | .001 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.56 | .454 | .002 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 10.33 | .001 | .036 |
| *Performance on collaborative task* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 1.02 | .313 | .004 |
|  | Race | 1.42 | .235 | .005 |
|  | Year in School | 0.20 | .653 | .001 |
|  | Condition | 0.01 | .926 | <.001 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.47 | .492 | .002 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.30 | .587 | .001 |
| *Post-task threat* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 1.78 | .184 | .007 |
|  | Race | 3.57 | .060 | .013 |
|  | Year in School | 1.32 | .252 | .005 |
|  | Condition | 1.04 | .309 | .004 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.34 | .563 | .001 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.00 | .950 | <.001 |
| *Future shared identity* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 11.36 | .001 | .040 |
|  | Race | 1.87 | .172 | .007 |
|  | Year in School | 3.11 | .079 | .011 |
|  | Condition | 11.20 | .001 | .040 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 4.48 | .035 | .016 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.11 | .738 | <.001 |

*Note.* Degrees of freedom (*df*) for Demand appraisal, Resource appraisal, Overprivileged concerns, and Typicality of partner = 1, 273; *df* for Performance on collaborative task = 1, 270; *df* for Post-task threat = 1, 271; *df* for Future shared identity = 1, 272.

***Demand Appraisals***

We found a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the working-class partner condition reported greater demands than participants in the middle-class partner condition, *F* (274) = 7.38, η*p*2 = .026, *p* = .007. We did not find a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (274) = 2.68, η*p*2 = .010, *p* = .103. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 273) = 3.18, η*p*2 = .012, *p* = .076.

***Resource Appraisals***

We did not find significant main or interactive effects on resource appraisals, *F*s < 1.98, *p*s > .161.

***Overprivileged Concerns***

We did not find significant main effect of condition, *F* (274) = 0.87, η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .352. We found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (274) = 39.13, η*p*2 = .125, *p* < .001. We found a significant interaction, *F* (1, 273) = 11.38, η*p*2 = .040, *p* = .001. Specifically, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns in the working-class partner condition (*M* = 3.88, *SD* = 1.38) than in the middle-class partner condition (*M* = 3.17, *SD* = 1.36), *F* (273) = 12.92, 95% CI [3.60, 4.13], η*p*2 = .045, *p* < .001. In contrast, participants from working-class backgrounds reported greater overprivileged concerns across both conditions, *F* (273) = 2.30, 95% CI [1.93, 2.66], η*p*2 = .008, *p* = .131.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds (*M* = 3.88, *SD* = 1.38) reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds (*M* = 2.27, *SD* = 1.05), *F* (273) = 46.38, 95% CI [-2.03, -1.12], η*p*2 = .145, *p* < .001. When assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds (*M* = 3.17, *SD* = 1.36) reported greater overprivileged concerns than participants from working-class backgrounds (*M* = 2.69, *SD* = 1.24), *F* (273) = 7.33, 95% CI [-0.93, -0.03], η*p*2 = .016, *p* = .038.

***Typicality of Partner***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (274) = 0.39, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .533, nor a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (274) = 0.56, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .454. We did find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 273) = 10.33, η*p*2 = .036, *p* = .001. Specifically, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported that their partner is less typical in the working-class partner condition (*M* = 4.25, *SD* = 0.75) than in the middle-class partner condition (*M* = 4.50, *SD* = 0.77), *F* (273) = 4.66, 95% CI [4.07, 4.40], η*p*2 = .017, *p* = .032. Participants from working-class backgrounds reported that their partner is more typical in the working-class partner condition (*M* = 4.60, *SD* = 0.68) than in the middle-class partner condition (*M* = 4.22, *SD* = 1.01), *F* (273) = 5.71, 95% CI [4.40, 4.85], η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .018.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds (*M* = 4.25, *SD* = 0.75) reported that the partner was less typical than participants from working-class backgrounds (*M* = 4.60, *SD* = 0.67), *F* (273) = 7.78, 95% CI [0.12, 0.67], η*p*2 = .028, *p* = .006. In contrast, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds (*M* = 4.50, *SD* = 0.77) reported that the partner was marginally more typical than participants from working-class backgrounds (*M* = 4.22, *SD* = 1.01), *F* (273) = 2.99, 95% CI [-0.52, 0.03], η*p*2 = .011, *p* = .085.

***Performance on Collaborative Task***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (271) = 0.01, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .926, a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (271) = 0.47, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .492, nor a significant interaction, *F* (270) = 0.30, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .587.

***Post-Task Threat***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (272) = 1.04, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .309, a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (272) = 0.34, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .563, nor a significant interaction, *F* (271) = 0.00, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .950.

***Future Shared Identity***

We found a significant main effect of condition, such that participants in the working-class partner condition reported feeling greater future shared identity with their partners than those in the middle-class partner condition, *F* (273) = 11.20, η*p*2 = .040, *p* = .001. We also found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, such participants from middle-class backgrounds reported feeling greater future shared identity with their partners than those from working-class backgrounds, *F* (273) = 4.48, η*p*2 = .016, *p* = .035. However, we did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 272) = 0.11, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .738.

## Study 3: Analysis on Threat Without Covariates

We report the 2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) ANOVA on our threat measure without covariates.

We find a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the middle-class partner condition reported greater threat than those in the working-class partner condition, *F* (277) = 8.45, η*p*2 = .030, *p* = .004. We did not find a significant main effect of social class background, *F* (277) = 1.21, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .272. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (276) = 4.96, η*p*2 = .018, *p* = .027. However, we conduct further simple effects analyses to examine our hypotheses. Participants from middle-class backgrounds reported similar threat across conditions, *F* (276) = 0.32, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .570. In contrast, participants from working-class backgrounds reported greater levels of threat in the middle-class partner condition than in the working-class partner condition, *F* (276) = 10.26, η*p*2 = .036, *p* = .002.

When assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (276) = 5.53, η*p*2 = .020, *p* = .019. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds and participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat, *F* (276) = 0.64, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .426.

## Study 3: Primary Analysis on Threat Using Composite of Parental Educational Attainment and Family Income as Measure of Social Class Background

We report the analysis on threat using a composite measure of social class background based on parental educational attainment and family income. Like Studies 1 and 2, we measured participants’ social class backgrounds using their parents’ educational attainment and family income. We measured parental educational attainment using six categories in the introduction questionnaire portion of our survey: (1) Less than high school, (2) High school diploma, (3) Some college, (4) Two-year college degree (e.g., Associates), (5) 4-year college degree (B.A. or B.S.), (6) Professional degree (MD., Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., etc.). Family income was measured using four categories in the introduction questionnaire portion of our survey: (1) Less than $100,000 (2) $100,000-$200,000 (3) $200,000-$300,000, (4) Over $300,000. We computed participants’ social class backgrounds by standardizing and then averaging their parents’ educational attainment and family income, *M* = 0.00, *SD* = 0.83. Scores at 1 *SD* above the mean correspond to having at least one parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of at least $200,000 and scores at 1 *SD* below the mean correspond to having neither parent who had a 4-year degree and an average family income of less than $100,000.

We conducted moderated regression analyses. On Step 1, we entered our covariates: race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male), and year-in-school (mean-centered). We then entered condition (0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 2, and their interaction on Step 3.

***Threat***

Our moderated regression analysis revealed a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the middle-class partner condition reported greater threat than participants in the working-class partner condition, *t* (274) = 2.31, *b* = 0.09, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.17], *p* = .022. We also found a significant main effect of social class background such that participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *t* (274) = 2.54, *b* = 0.09, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.15], *p* = .012. We also found a significant interaction, *F* (1, 273) = 6.81, *b* = -0.13, 95% CI [-0.22, -0.03], ∆*R*² = .024, *p* = .010. Participants from middle-class backgrounds reported similar threat in the working-class partner condition and the middle-class partner condition, *b* = -0.01, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.10], *p* = .826. Participants from working-class backgrounds reported greater levels of threat in the middle-class partner condition than the working-class partner condition, *b* = -0.83, 95% CI [0.09, 0.31], *p* = .001.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *b* = 0.09, 95% CI [0.02, 0.15], *p* = .012. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class and working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat, *b* = -0.04, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.03], *p* = .240.

# Study 4

## Demand and Resource Appraisal ANCOVA Results

We report analyses on demand appraisal and resource appraisal which make up our self-report measure of threat below.

***Analysis Plan***

We conducted 2 (participant social class background: working-class vs. middle-class) × 2 (partner’s social class background (perceived): working-class vs. middle-class) ANCOVA as reported in the main text. We included covariates for race, gender, and age. See Table 5 for summary of statistical results.

Table 5

*Results of ANCOVAs for Demand and Resource Appraisal (Study 4)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *F* | *p* | η*p*2 |
| *Demand appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 0.55 | .458 | .001 |
|  | Race | 0.77 | .381 | .002 |
|  | Age | 0.86 | .355 | .002 |
|  | Partner’s Social Class Background | 1.44 | .230 | .004 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 1.14 | .287 | .003 |
|  | Partner × Participant Social Class Background | 9.71 | .002 | .025 |
| *Resource appraisal* | |  |  |  |
|  | Gender | 2.13 | .145 | .006 |
|  | Race | 0.74 | .389 | .002 |
|  | Age | 0.78 | .378 | .002 |
|  | Partner’s Social Class Background | 0.65 | .422 | .002 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.50 | .480 | .001 |
|  | Partner × Participant Social Class Background | 5.34 | .021 | .014 |

*Note*. *df* for Demand appraisal, and Resource appraisal = 1, 380.

***Demand Appraisals***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition or social class background. We found a significant interaction. Specifically, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater demand appraisals in the working-class partner condition than in the middle-class partner condition, *F* (380) = 12.95, η*p*2 = .033, *p* < .001. In contrast, participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of demand appraisals across conditions, *F* (380) = 1.44, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .231.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, those from middle-class backgrounds reported greater demand appraisals than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (380) = 9.19, η*p*2 = .024, *p* = .003. Finally, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class and working-class backgrounds reported similar demand appraisals, *F* (380) = 1.98, η*p*2 = .005, *p* = .160.

***Resource Appraisals***

We did not find a significant main effect of condition or social class background. We found a significant interaction. Specifically, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported lower resource appraisals in the working-class partner condition than in the middle-class partner condition, *F* (380) = 6.74, η*p*2 = .017, *p* = .010. In contrast, participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of resource appraisals across conditions, *F* (380) = 0.89, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .345.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, those from middle-class and working-class backgrounds reported similar resource appraisals, *F* (380) = 1.34, η*p*2 = .004, *p* = .247. Finally, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported lower resource appraisals than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (380) = 4.33, η*p*2 = .011, *p* = .038.

## Study 4: Analysis on Threat Without Covariates

We report the 2 (condition: 0 = working-class partner, 1 = middle-class partner) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) ANOVA on our threat measure without covariates.

We did not find a significant main effect of partner’s social class background, *F* (384) = 3.83, η*p*2 = .010, *p* = .051. We did not find a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (384) = 0.83, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .364. We found a significant interaction, *F* (1, 383) = 6.28, η*p*2 = .016, *p* = .013. Participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat in the working-class partner condition than the middle-class partner condition, *F* (383) = 13.78, η*p*2 = .035, *p* < .001. In contrast, but also consistent with our prediction, participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat across conditions, *F* (383) = 0.12, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .731.

In addition, when assigned a working-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds reported greater threat than participants from working-class backgrounds, *F* (383) = 6.08, η*p*2 = .016, *p* = .014. However, when assigned a middle-class partner, participants from middle-class backgrounds and participants from working-class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat, *F* (383) = 1.23, η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .264.

## Study 4: Preregistered Analyses Using Partner’s Parental Educational Attainment as Measure of Social Class Background

As mentioned in the main text, our preregistration stated that the measure of partner’s social class background would be based on the partner’s reported parental educational attainment and that our alternate measure would be based on the participants’ perception of the educational attainment of the partner’s parents. We report our analyses using the participant’s perception of the educational attainment of their partner’s parents as a measure of partner’s social class background in main text. Here, we report the analyses using the partner’s reported parental educational attainment as the measure of social class background in the analysis.

***Measure***

**Partner’s Social Class Background.** As stated in our preregistration, we also used the partner’s actual parental educational attainment as the measure of social class background instead of the participants’ guess regarding the partner’s parental educational attainment. We classify partners who indicated that neither parent had a 4-year degree as partners from working-class backgrounds and classify those who indicated that at least one parent had a 4-year degree as partners from middle-class backgrounds.

***Results***

**Analysis Plan.** We conducted a2 (partner’s social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) × 2 (participants’ social class background: 0 = working-class, 1 = middle-class) ANCOVA controlling for race and gender.

**Threat.** We did not find a significant main effect of partner’s social class background, *F* (381) = 0.01, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .847, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (381) = 0.03, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .758. We also did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 380) = 1.16, η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .283.

# Preregistration Summary (Studies 2-4)

We summarize our preregistered hypotheses, deviations from the preregistration, and whether the predictions were confirmed. Preregistrations can be found using the OSF links below for each study:

Study 2: https://osf.io/9f2ws/?view\_only=5b8ee52cf69446e7856fee062086a3f5

Study 3: https://osf.io/dets6/?view\_only=1e60655660b7476e8e8eee8b842968e9

Study 4: https://osf.io/xhz78/?view\_only=9680605d6e9643b89cba7bc454ee25aa

**Preregistered analyses and results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hypotheses  (Preregistration) | Hypotheses (Main text) | Description | Confirmed? |
| Study 2 | H1 | H1 | Increased threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from middle-class backgrounds | Yes |
| H1 |  | Better performance in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from middle-class backgrounds | No |
| H2 | H2 | Similar threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from working-class backgrounds | Yes |
| H2 - Tentative |  | Better or no difference in performance in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from working-class backgrounds | No |
| H3 - Potential Mechanisms |  | Potential mechanism: “concerns about status” and “experience with cross-class contexts” among participants from middle-class backgrounds Condition 🡪 Status concerns 🡪 Threat  Condition 🡪 Overprivileged concerns 🡪 Threat  Condition 🡪 Experience with Cross-Class Contexts 🡪 Threat | No |
| Study 3 | Threat Among Middle-Class | H1 | Increased threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from middle-class backgrounds | No |
| Threat Among Working-Class | H2 | Similar threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from working-class backgrounds | No |
| Potential  Mechanisms |  | Potential mechanism: “concerns about appearing privileged” and “typicality of partner” among participants from middle-class backgrounds Condition 🡪 Concerns about appearing privileged 🡪 Threat  Condition 🡪 Typicality of partner 🡪 Threat | No |
| Study 4 | H1 | H1b | Among participants in working-class partner condition:  Participants from middle-class backgrounds more threatened than participants from working-class backgrounds | Yes |
| H2 - Tentative |  | Increased threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from working-class backgrounds | No |
| H3 - Tentative | H1 | Increased threat in cross-class versus same-class interactions among participants from middle-class backgrounds | Yes |

*Notes:* All results reported used the specifications from the preregistration.

**Deviation**

1. Sample size difference:   
   Despite recruiting participants who indicated that neither parent had a 4-year college degree over three semesters and stopping data collection only after this pool of participants was exhausted, we were not able to meet the preregistered estimated sample size for Study 3 (Final sample size was *N* = 280 instead of *N* = 400). We were also not able to meet the preregistered estimated sample sizes for Study 4 (Final sample size was *N* = 392 instead of *N* = 400).
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