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**Study 1**

**Screening Questionnaire**

To assess whether participants met our inclusion criteria, they completed a screening questionnaire, which contained questions about their medical history and activities before entering the laboratory. Participants responded to all items using a yes (1) or no (0) scale. Those who answered “no” to the following three items met the physiological inclusion criteria and were allowed to participate: “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)?” Participants also indicated their height and weight, which we used to calculate their body mass index (BMI, a covariate in our primary analyses). The questionnaire also contained additional questions, including: whether participants had a heart murmur, were currently breastfeeding, or, in the last 6 months, whether they had mononucleosis, malaria, or surgical procedures requiring anesthesia, or were diagnosed with clinical anxiety or depression.

**Cardiovascular Response Measurement**

We used Biopac Systems to non-invasively record cardiovascular responses and followed guidelines established by the Society for Psychophysiological Research (e.g., Sherwood et al., 1990). We used impedance cardiography, electrocardiography, and blood pressure measures to collect cardiac output and total peripheral resistance. 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 applied 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 participants’ non-dominant hands. The finger cuff was connected to a Biopac Noninvasive Blood Pressure Amplifier (NIBP100D). We used psychophysiology analysis software by Mindware Technologies (Lafayette, OH) and Acqknowledge (Biopac; Goleta, CA) to prepare the cardiovascular responses for data analysis.

**Additional Dependent Variables**

Given little work on cross-class interactions, we measured non-threat related outcomes to gain insight into processes that occur during these interactions. Specifically, we examined people’s impressions of this task in the context of contributing to an overall team score with their partner. We were also interested in interpersonal outcomes when anticipating a cross-class interaction, and therefore examined people’s perceptions of their partner as well as how they would like their partner to perceive them.

**Impressions of task.** To measure participants’ impressions of the 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 moderated regression analyses as reported in the main text. We entered our standard set of covariates on Step 1, race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male). On Step 2, we entered condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) and, on Step 3, we entered their interaction. See Table 1 for complete statistical results.

Table 1.

Moderated Regression Analyses for Additional Dependent Variables (Study 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Dependent Variables* | | | | | | | 95% CI | |
|  | Predictor | *b* | *SE* | *t* | *df* | *p* | Lower | Upper |
| *Cardiac Output (CO)* | | | | | | | | |
|  | BMI | -0.01 | 0.01 | -1.05 | 123 | .293 | -0.03 | 0.01 |
|  | Gender | 0.10 | 0.07 | 1.35 | 123 | .180 | -0.04 | 0.24 |
|  | Race | -0.06 | 0.08 | -0.83 | 123 | .407 | -0.22 | 0.09 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.12 | 0.06 | -1.88 | 120 | .063 | -0.24 | 0.01 |
|  | Condition | 0.10 | 0.07 | 1.44 | 120 | .151 | -0.04 | 0.23 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.16 | 0.08 | 2.05 | 119 | .043 | 0.01 | 0.32 |
| *Total Peripheral Resistance (TPR)* | | | | | | | | |
|  | BMI | -5.81 | 7.84 | -0.74 | 123 | .460 | -21.33 | 9.71 |
|  | Gender | -1.15 | 54.76 | -0.02 | 123 | .983 | -109.57 | 107.27 |
|  | Race | 32.24 | 61.20 | 0.53 | 123 | .599 | -88.95 | 153.27 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 55.49 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 120 | .234 | -36.44 | 147.42 |
|  | Condition | -62.33 | -1.21 | -1.21 | 120 | .230 | -164.60 | 39.93 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | -66.90 | -1.10 | -1.10 | 119 | .272 | -187.01 | 53.22 |
| *Impressions of Task* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.25 | 0.14 | 1.85 | 211 | .066 | -0.02 | 0.51 |
|  | Race | 0.01 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 211 | .965 | -0.30 | 0.31 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.23 | 209 | .820 | -0.19 | 0.23 |
|  | Condition | -0.01 | 0.13 | -0.07 | 209 | .944 | -0.26 | 0.24 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | -0.00 | 0.15 | -0.01 | 208 | .993 | -0.29 | 0.28 |
| *Perceptions of Partner* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.16 | 0.11 | 1.44 | 211 | .152 | -0.06 | 0.39 |
|  | Race | 0.29 | 0.13 | 2.19 | 211 | .030 | 0.03 | 0.55 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.53 | 209 | .594 | -0.13 | 0.23 |
|  | Condition | -0.09 | 0.11 | -0.83 | 209 | .410 | -0.30 | 0.12 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.66 | 208 | .513 | -0.16 | 0.32 |
| *Importance of Partner’s Respect* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.27 | 0.17 | 1.59 | 211 | .114 | -0.07 | 0.60 |
|  | Race | -0.30 | 0.20 | -1.55 | 211 | .123 | -0.69 | 0.08 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.19 | 0.13 | -1.40 | 209 | .163 | -0.45 | 0.08 |
|  | Condition | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.59 | 209 | .558 | -0.22 | 0.40 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 208 | .877 | -0.33 | 0.39 |
| *Desire to be Seen as Smart* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | -0.18 | 0.15 | -1.19 | 211 | .234 | -0.48 | 0.12 |
|  | Race | -0.18 | 0.17 | -1.02 | 211 | .307 | -0.52 | 0.16 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.17 | 0.12 | -1.41 | 209 | .160 | -0.40 | 0.07 |
|  | Condition | -0.01 | 0.14 | -0.10 | 209 | .918 | -0.29 | 0.26 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.33 | 0.16 | 2.07 | 208 | .040 | 0.02 | 0.65 |
| *Desire to be Seen as a Good Person* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | -0.04 | 0.16 | -0.25 | 211 | .804 | -0.35 | 0.27 |
|  | Race | -0.36 | 0.18 | -1.95 | 211 | .052 | -0.72 | 0.00 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.03 | 0.13 | -0.26 | 209 | .795 | -0.28 | 0.22 |
|  | Condition | -0.19 | 0.15 | -1.31 | 209 | .192 | -0.49 | 0.10 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.38 | 208 | .704 | -0.27 | 0.40 |
| *Attribution for Partners’ Performance* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | -0.03 | 0.15 | -0.19 | 149 | .848 | -0.33 | 0.27 |
|  | Race | -0.14 | 0.17 | -0.86 | 149 | .393 | -0.47 | 0.19 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.19 | 0.13 | -1.47 | 147 | .144 | -0.43 | 0.06 |
|  | Condition | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.23 | 147 | .822 | -0.25 | 0.31 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.88 | 146 | .381 | -0.18 | 0.47 |
| *My partner should have tried harder on the test* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | -0.44 | 0.23 | -1.92 | 149 | .057 | -0.90 | 0.01 |
|  | Race | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 149 | .804 | -0.43 | 0.56 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.25 | 0.19 | 1.31 | 147 | .191 | -0.13 | 0.63 |
|  | Condition | -0.23 | 0.21 | -1.08 | 147 | .281 | -0.65 | 0.19 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | -0.11 | 0.25 | -0.42 | 146 | .675 | -0.60 | 0.39 |

*Note.* On Step 1, we entered our covariates: gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and race (0 = non-White, 1 = White). On Step 2, we entered condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) and on Step 3, we entered their interaction.

**Fig. 1.** Cardiac output (CO) during anticipation period as a function of condition (0 =lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participant social class background (mean-centered) interaction on the threat-challenge index, controlling for gender (0 = female, 1 = male), race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), and body mass index (mean-centered). Graphed at ±1 *SD* from the mean on the composite measure of participants’ social class background. Larger values indicate greater challenge relative to threat for CO. \* *p* < .05.

**Fig. 2.** Total peripheral resistance (TPR) during anticipation period as a function of condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participant social class background (mean-centered) interaction on the threat-challenge index, controlling for gender (0 = female, 1 = male), race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), and body mass index (mean-centered). Graphed at ±1 *SD* from the mean on the composite measure of participants’ social class background. Larger values indicate greater threat relative to challenge for TPR. † *p* < .10.

**Impressions of the task.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ impressions of the task, *F*s < 0.05, *p*s > .820.

**Perceptions of partner.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ perceptions of their partner, *F*s < 0.68, *p*s > .410.

**Importance of partner’s respect.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on importance of partner’s respect, *F*s < 1.96, *p*s > .163.

**Desire to be seen as smart.** There was no significant main effect of condition, *t* (209) = -0.10, *b* = -0.01, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.26], *p* = .918, or participants’ social class background, *t* (209) = -1.41, *b* = -0.17, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.07], *p* = .160, on participants’ desire for their partner to see them as smart. However, there was a significant condition by social class background interaction, *F* (1, 208) = 4.27, *b* = 0.33, 95% CI [0.02, 0.65], ∆*R*² = .020, *p* = .040. Although no simple slopes reached statistical significance. Participants from higher social class backgrounds, *b* = 0.30, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.69], *p* = .135, reported similar levels of desire to be seen as smart across conditions as did those from lower social class backgrounds, *b* = -0.28, 95% CI [-0.67, 0.11], *p* = .155. Additionally, participants’ social class background was not significantly associated with desire to be seen as smart among those who anticipated interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *b* = -0.17, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.07], *p* = .160, and among those who anticipated interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = 0.17, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.38], *p* = .132.

**Desire to be seen as a good person**. There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ desire to be seen as a good person by their partner, *F*s < 1.72, *p*s > .192.

**Attribution for partners’ performance.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ attributions for their partner’s poor performance on the individual task, *F*s < 2.16, *p*s > .144., nor on the single item, “My partner should have tried harder on the test,” *F*s < 1.72, *p*s > .191.

**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-challenge index, individual task performance, and affect, we conducted moderated regression analyses, in which we entered condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 1, and their interaction on Step 2.

**Threat-challenge index.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (123) = -1.42, *b* = -0.39, 95% CI [-0.94, 0.15], *p* = .158, but a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds exhibited greater threat than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *t* (123) = 2.17, *b* = 0.54, 95% CI [0.05, 1.03], *p* = .032. Importantly, consistent with our predictions and results reported in the main text, we found a significant condition by social class background interaction, *F* (1, 122) = 5.39, *b* = -0.76, 95% CI [-1.40, -0.11], ∆*R*² = .042, *p* = .022. Specifically, participants from higher social class backgrounds exhibited greater threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background than a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = -1.11, 95% CI [-1.90, -0.32], ∆*R*² = .060, *p* = .006. However, participants from lower social class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat across conditions, *b* = 0.20, 95% CI [-0.57, 0.96], ∆*R*² = .002, *p* = .617.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds experienced significantly greater threat than participants from lower social class backgrounds when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *b* = 0.54, 95% CI [0.05, 1.03], ∆*R*² = .036, *p* = .032. However, participants from higher and lower social class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = -0.22, 95% CI [-0.63, 0.20], ∆*R*² = .008, *p* = .307.

**Individual task performance.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (211) = -1.01, *b* = -0.23, 95% CI [-0.67, 0.22], *p* = .314, but a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *t* (211) = 3.35, *b* = 0.64, 95% CI [0.26, 1.02], *p* = .001, such that participants from higher social class backgrounds performed better than those from lower social class backgrounds, which is consistent with the results reported in the main text. The condition by social class background interaction was marginally significant, *F* (1, 210) = 2.81, *b* = -0.43, 95% CI [-0.94, 0.08], ∆*R*² = .013, *p* = .095. Among participants from higher social class backgrounds, those anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background performed significantly *better* than those anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = -0.63, 95% CI [-1.26, -0.01], ∆*R*² = .018, *p* = .048. However, among participants from lower social class backgrounds, performance on the task was similar across conditions, *b* = 0.12, 95% CI [-0.50, 0.75], ∆*R*² = .001, *p* = .702.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds performed better than those from lower social class backgrounds when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background, *b* = 0.64, 95% CI [0.26, 1.02], ∆*R*² = .050, *p* = .001. However, participants from higher and lower social class backgrounds performed similarly when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, , *b* = 0.21, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.55], ∆*R*² = .006, *p* = .236.

Although this interaction effect was relatively small and did not reach significance, we were interested in examining possible individual performance differences in our follow-up research. Therefore, we preregistered predictions for performance in Study 2.

**Affect.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, we found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background on negative affect, *t* (211) = -2.76, *b* = -0.37, 95% CI [-0.63, -0.10], *p* = .006, such that participants from higher social class backgrounds reported lower negative affect than those from lower social class backgrounds. There were no other significant main or interactive effects, *F*s < 2.10, *p*s > .149, which is also consistent with the results reported in the main text.

**Study 1: Primary Analyses Using Parental Educational Attainment as Measure of Social Class Background**

In this section, we report the analyses on our primary dependent variables using parental educational attainment as the measure of social class background instead of the composite measure of social class background reported in the main text. We categorized participants who indicated that neither parent had a 4-year degree as participants from lower social class backgrounds and those who indicated that at least one parent had a 4-year degree as participants from higher social class backgrounds. Specifically, we conducted a 2 × 2 univariate analysis of variance: condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) by participants’ social class background (0 = participants from lower social class background, 1 = participants from higher social class backgrounds). We included the same covariates reported in the main text. Specifically, for the cardiovascular measure, we controlled for: race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male), and body mass index (BMI; mean-centered). For the individual task performance and affect analyses, we controlled for: gender and race.

**Threat-challenge index.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (121) = 2.56, η*p*2 = .021, *p* = .113, nor of participants’ social class background, *F* (121) = 1.72, η*p*2 = .014, *p* = .193. However, the condition by social class background interaction was significant, *F* (1, 120) = 4.39, η*p*2 = .035, *p* = .038. Consistent with our predictions, participants from higher social class backgrounds exhibited greater threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background (*M* = 0.73, *SD* = 1.32) than a partner from a higher social class background (*M* = -0.28, *SD* = 1.66), *F* (120) = 6.87, 95% CI [0.25, 1.78], η*p*2 = .054, *p* = .010. In contrast, but also consistent with our predictions, participants from lower social class backgrounds exhibited similar levels of threat across conditions, *F* (120) = 0.12, 95% CI [-0.64, 0.91], η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .728.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 0.73, *SD* = 1.32) exhibited greater threat background than participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = -0.22, *SD* = 1.61) when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background, *F* (120) = 5.75, 95% CI [0.16, 1.71], η*p*2 = .046, *p* = .018. However, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = -0.28, *SD* = 1.66) and participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = -0.07, *SD* = 1.44) exhibited similar levels of threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (120) = 0.31, 95% CI [-0.98, 0.55],η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .577.

**Individual task performance.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (210) = 1.34, η*p*2 = .006, *p* = .248, but a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (210) = 7.54, η*p*2 = .035, *p* = .007, such that participants from higher social class backgrounds performed better than participants from lower social class backgrounds. We found a significant condition by social class background interaction, *F* (210) = 5.00, η*p*2 = .023, *p* = .026. Specifically, participants from higher social class backgrounds performed better when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background (*M* = 3.84, *SD* = 1.96) than when anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background (*M* = 3.15, *SD* = 1.43), *F* (209) = 5.54, 95% CI [0.12, 1.32],η*p*2 = .026, *p* = .020. However, participants from lower social class backgrounds performed similarly across conditions, *F* (209) = 0.60, 95% CI [-0.35, 0.80],η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .439.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 3.84, *SD* = 1.96) performed better than participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 2.75, *SD* = 1.51) when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *F* (209) = 12.78, 95% CI [0.47, 1.63],η*p*2 = .058, *p* < .001. However, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 3.15, *SD* = 1.43) and participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 2.96, *SD* = 1.60) performed similarly on the individual task when anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (209) = 0.13, 95% CI [-0.49, 0.71],η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .721.

**Positive Affect.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (210) = 0.36, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .549, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (210) = 0.33, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .568. However, we found a marginally significant interaction, *F* (209) = 2.96, η*p*2 = .014, *p* = .087. Specifically, participants from higher social class backgrounds reported similar levels of positive affect across conditions, *F* (209) = 0.60, 95% CI [-0.50, 0.22],η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .439. However, among participants from lower social class backgrounds, those anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background (*M* = 3.69, *SD* = 0.91) reported marginally more positive affect than those anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = 0.89), *F* (209) = 2.80, 95% CI [-0.64, 0.05],η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .096.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds and participants from lower social class backgrounds reported similar levels of positive affect when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *F* (209) = 2.73, 95% CI [-0.63, 0.06],η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .100, and when anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (209) = 0.63, 95% CI [-0.21, 0.50],η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .427.

**Negative Affect.** We did not find any significant effects for participants’ negative affect: main effect of condition, *F* (210) = 0.11, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .916, main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (210) = 2.52, η*p*2 = .012, *p* = .114, or interaction, *F* (210) = 1.97, η*p*2 = .009, *p* = .162.

**Vigilance.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (210) = 0.15, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .901, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (210) = 0.59, η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .444. However, we found a marginally significant interaction, *F* (209) = 2.75, η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .099. Specifically, participants from higher social class backgrounds reported similar levels of vigilance across conditions, *F* (209) = 1.13, 95% CI [-0.60, 0.18],η*p*2 = .005, *p* = .288, as did participants from lower social class backgrounds, *F* (209) = 1.65, 95% CI [-0.62, 0.13],η*p*2 = .008, *p* = .200. Additionally, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 3.92, *SD* = 0.99) and participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 4.04, *SD* = 0.86) reported similar levels of vigilance when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *F* (209) = 0.41, 95% CI [-0.50, 0.25],η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .521. However, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 4.11, *SD* = 0.86) reported marginally more vigilance than participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 3.79, *SD* = 1.28) when anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (209) = 2.83, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.72],η*p*2 = .013, *p* = .094.

**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, Gray, Mendoza-Denton, Major, & Epel, 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, Oppenheimer, Epley, & Eyre, 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, Oyserman, & Mourey, 2013). We expected participants from higher social 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 on this ratio indicate greater threat, *M* = 1.19, *SD* = 0.92.

***Subjective Status.*** To measure participants’ subjective status, participants indicated where they stood in the status hierarchy at their university on a 10-rung ladder (1 = *bottom*, 10 = *top*), *M* = 6.12, *SD* = 1.66.

**Additional filler item for concerns about appearing overprivileged*.*** We included lack of intelligence as a filler item when we measured participants’ concerns about appearing overprivilegedto 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 moderated regression analyses as in Study 1. We entered our covariates: race (0 = non-White, 1 = White), gender (0 = female, 1 = male) on Step 1, condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 2, and their interaction on Step 3. See Table 2 for complete results.

Table 2.

Moderated Regression Analyses for Additional Dependent Variables (Study 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Dependent Variables* | | | | | | | 95% CI | |
|  | Predictor | *b* | *SE* | *t* | *df* | *p* | Lower | Upper |
| *Warm-up Task* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.25 | .133 | 1.87 | 287 | .063 | -0.01 | 0.51 |
|  | Race | -0.04 | .159 | -0.23 | 287 | .822 | -0.35 | 0.28 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.18 | .109 | 1.62 | 285 | .105 | -0.04 | 0.39 |
|  | Condition | 0.10 | .127 | 0.79 | 285 | .428 | -0.15 | 0.35 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.01 | .148 | 0.04 | 284 | .968 | -0.29 | 0.30 |
| *Threat Before Individual Task* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.32 | .109 | 2.97 | 285 | .003 | 0.11 | 0.54 |
|  | Race | 0.47 | .132 | 3.60 | 285 | <.001 | 0.22 | 0.73 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.09 | .090 | -1.05 | 283 | .296 | -0.27 | 0.08 |
|  | Condition | -0.01 | .105 | -0.09 | 283 | .930 | -0.22 | 0.20 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.18 | .122 | 1.50 | 282 | .134 | -0.06 | 0.42 |
| *Resource Appraisal about Upcoming Interaction* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.27 | .118 | 2.30 | 286 | .022 | 0.04 | 0.50 |
|  | Race | 0.30 | .141 | 2.09 | 286 | .038 | 0.02 | 0.57 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | -0.17 | .097 | -1.74 | 284 | .083 | -0.36 | 0.02 |
|  | Condition | 0.11 | .113 | 0.94 | 284 | .346 | -0.12 | 0.33 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.20 | .132 | 1.53 | 283 | .127 | -0.06 | 0.46 |
| *Demands Appraisal about Upcoming Interaction* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | -0.25 | .132 | -1.91 | 286 | .057 | -0.51 | 0.01 |
|  | Race | -0.11 | .158 | -0.69 | 286 | .493 | -0.42 | 0.20 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.02 | .108 | 0.18 | 284 | .860 | -0.19 | 0.23 |
|  | Condition | -0.14 | .127 | -1.14 | 284 | .254 | -0.39 | 0.10 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | -0.10 | .147 | -0.69 | 283 | .488 | -0.39 | 0.19 |
| *Subjective Status* | | | | | | | | |
|  | Gender | 0.64 | .188 | 3.42 | 285 | .001 | 0.27 | 1.01 |
|  | Race | 0.57 | .227 | 2.50 | 285 | .013 | 0.12 | 1.01 |
|  | Participant Social Class Background | 0.41 | .155 | 2.63 | 283 | .009 | 0.10 | 0.71 |
|  | Condition | 0.25 | .180 | 1.37 | 283 | .172 | -0.11 | 0.60 |
|  | Condition × Social Class Background | 0.24 | .210 | 1.16 | 282 | .249 | -0.17 | 0.66 |

*Note.* On Step 1, we entered our covariates: gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and race (0 = non-White, 1 = White). On Step 2, we entered condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) and on Step 3, we entered their interaction.

**Fig. 1.**Reported resources regarding the anticipated interaction as a function of condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participant social class background (mean-centered) controlling for gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and race (0 = non-White, 1 = White). Graphed at ±1 SD from the mean on the composite measure of participants’ social class background. † *p* < .01.

**Fig. 2.**Reported demands regarding the anticipated interaction as a function of condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participant social class background (mean-centered) controlling for gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and race (0 = non-White, 1 = White). Graphed at ±1 SD from the mean on the composite measure of participants’ social class background.

**Warm-up task.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ performance on the warm-up task, *F*s < 2.66, *p*s > .105.

**Threat before individual task.** There were no significant main or interactive effects on participants’ threat before the individual task, *F*s < 2.25, *p*s > .134.

**Subjective Status.** We found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds indicated having higher subjective status than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *t* (283) = 2.62, *b* = 0.41, 95% CI [0.10, 0.71], *p* = .009. We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (283) = 1.37, *b* = 0.25, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.60], *p* = .172, nor interaction, *F* (282) = 1.34, *b* = 0.24, 95% CI [-0.17, 0.66], *p* = .249.

**Study 2: Primary Analyses Without Covariates**

Here, we report the moderated regression analyses on our primary dependent variables in the main text without covariates. Specifically, we entered condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) and participants’ social class background (mean-centered) on Step 1, and their interaction on Step 2.

**Threat during collaborative task anticipation**. We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (285) = -1.41, *b* = -0.06, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.02], *p* = .160, but a marginally significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds exhibited marginally greater threat than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *t* (285) = 1.79, *b* = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.13], *p* = .074. Consistent with our predictions and results reported in the main text, we found a significant interaction, *F* (1, 284) = 5.42, *b* = -0.11, 95% CI [-0.21, -0.02], ∆*R*² = .019, *p* = .021. Specifically, participants from higher social class backgrounds reported greater threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background compared to a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = -0.15, 95% CI [-0.27, -0.04], ∆*R*² = .024, *p* = .009. In contrast, participants from lower social class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat across conditions, *b* = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.15], ∆*R*² = .001, *p* = .515.

In addition, participants’ social class background was marginally associated with greater threat among those anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *b* = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.13], ∆*R*² = .011, *p* = .074. However, participants’ social class background was not significantly associated with threat among those anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *b* = -0.05, 95% CI [-0.11, 0.02], ∆*R*² = .008, *p* = .136.

**Individual task performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, we did not find any significant effects for individual task performance: main effect of condition, *t* (287) = -0.09, *b* = -0.02, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.37], *p* = .929, main effect of participants’ social class background, *t* (287) = 1.16, *b* = 0.19, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.51], *p* = .246, or interaction, *F* (1, 286) = 1.73, *b* = 0.30, 95% CI [-0.15, 0.74], ∆*R*² = .006, *p* = .190.

**Status concerns.** We found a marginally significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds reported marginally greater status concerns than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *t* (285) = 1.65, *b* = 0.29, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.63], *p* = .099*.* Consistent with the results reported in the main text, we did not find a significant main effect of condition, *t* (285) = 1.60, *b* = 0.33, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.74], *p* = .111, nor a significant interaction, *F* (1, 284) = 0.57, *b* = -0.18, 95% CI [-0.66, 0.29], ∆*R*² = .002, *p* = .450.

**Concerns about appearing overprivileged.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, we found a significant main effect of condition such that participants anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background reported greater concerns about appearing overprivileged than participants anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, *t* (276) = -4.46, *b* = -0.80, 95% CI [-1.15, -0.45], *p* < .001. We also found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds reported greater concerns about appearing overprivileged than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *t* (276) = 7.06, *b* = 1.05, 95% CI [0.76, 1.35], *p* < .001. We did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 275) = 1.62, *b* = -0.26, 95% CI [-0.67, 0.14], ∆*R*² = .004, *p* = .204.

**Study 2: Pre-Registered Analyses Using Parental Educational Attainment as Measure of Social Class Background**

As indicated in the main text, we deviated from our pre-registration which states that our measure of social class background would be based solely on parental educational attainment. Instead, we used 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. Here, we report the analyses on our primary dependent variables using solely parental educational attainment as the measure of social class background instead of the composite measure of social class background reported in the main text. We categorized participants who indicated that neither parent had a 4-year degree as participants from lower social class backgrounds and those who indicated that at least one parent had a 4-year degree as participants from higher social class backgrounds. We conducted a 2 × 2 univariate analysis of variance: condition (0 = lower social class partner, 1 = higher social class partner) by participants’ social class background (0 = participants from lower social class background, 1 = participants from higher social class backgrounds). We included the same covariates as the analyses in the main text: gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and race (0 = non-White, 1 = White) for all analyses and also included self-reported SAT or ACT scores for analyses of individual task performance as stated in our pre-registration. 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. The degrees of freedom were lower on the individual task performance variable because 53 participants did not report their SAT or ACT score.

**Threat during collaborative task anticipation**. We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (283) = 2.65, η*p*2 = .009, *p* = .104, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (283) = 1.65, η*p*2 = .006, *p* = .200. In addition, we did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 282) = 2.43, η*p*2 = .009, *p* = .120. However, further analysis of the simple effects revealed that participants from higher social class backgrounds reported greater threat when anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background (*M* = 0.93, *SD* = 0.46) than a partner from a higher social class background (*M* = 0.81, *SD* = 0.30), *F* (282) = 4.94, 95% CI [0.02, 0.25], η*p*2 = .017, *p* = .027. In contrast, but also consistent with our prediction, participants from lower social class backgrounds reported similar levels of threat across conditions, *F* (282) = 0.003, 95% CI [-0.12, 0.11], η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .959.

In addition, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 0.93, *SD* = 0.46) reported greater threat than participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 0.82, *SD* = 0.28) when anticipating interacting with a partner from a lower social class background, *F* (282) = 4.07, 95% CI [0.00, 0.23], η*p*2 = .014, *p* = .045. However, participants from higher social class backgrounds (*M* = 0.81, *SD* = 0.30) and participants from lower social class backgrounds (*M* = 0.82, *SD* = 0.35) reported similar levels of threat when anticipating interacting with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (282) = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.10],η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .852.

**Individual task performance.** We did not find a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (230) = 1.43, η*p*2 = .006, *p* = .233. We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (230) = 0.28, η*p*2 < .001, *p* = .598, or an interaction, *F* (1, 229) = 0.73, η*p*2 = .003, *p* = .392.

**Status concerns.** We did not find a significant main effect of condition, *F* (283) = 2.42, η*p*2 = .008, *p* = .121, nor a significant main effect of participants’ social class background, *F* (283) = 0.27, η*p*2 = .001, *p* = .607. In addition, we did not find a significant interaction, *F* (1, 282) = 0.49, η*p*2 = .002, *p* = .483.

**Concerns about appearing privileged.** We found a significant main effect of condition such that participants anticipating an interaction with a partner from a lower social class background reported greater concerns about appearing overprivileged than those anticipating an interaction with a partner from a higher social class background, *F* (274) = 22.58, η*p*2 = .076, *p* < .001. We also found a significant main effect of participants’ social class background such that participants from higher social class backgrounds reported greater concerns about appearing overprivileged than participants from lower social class backgrounds, *F* (274) = 32.40, η*p*2 = .106, *p* < .001. However, we did not find an interaction, *F* (1, 273) = 1.58, η*p*2 = .006, *p* = .209.

**Study 2: Pre-Registered Moderated Mediation Analyses**

**Analysis plan.** Following our pre-registered analyses, we conducted moderated mediation analyses for status concerns and concerns about appearing overprivileged (Hayes, 2013; PROCESS macro for SPSS 23, model 8, 10,000 bootstrapped samples). As previously mentioned in the main text, we predicted that these outcomes might partially explain experiences of threat among participants from *higher* social class backgrounds (i.e., when people anticipate *downward* cross-class interactions).

***Status concerns.*** Among participants from higher social class backgrounds, the conditional indirect effect of condition on threat through status concerns was not significant, *b* = -0.005, *SE*boot = .010, 95% CI [-0.031, 0.009].

***Concerns about appearing overprivileged.*** Similarly, among participants from higher social class backgrounds, the conditional indirect effect of condition on threat through concerns about appearing overprivileged was not significant, *b* = -0.009, *SE*boot = .015, 95% CI [-0.040, 0.023].

Table 3.

Results of Moderated Mediation Analyses with Status Concerns and concerns about appearing overprivileged 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 | .008 | -0.012 | 0.023 |
| *Concerns About Appearing Overprivileged* | -0.002 | .005 | -0.014 | 0.008 |

*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.
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