Self-Presentation in Interracial Settings: The Competence Downshift by White Liberals

Supplemental Materials

Appendix A

Paired Speeches Delivered by Democratic or Republican Presidential Candidates to Predominately Minority or Predominately White Audiences.

Political party	Candidate	Minority audience	White audience
Republican	John McCain	2007 Hispanic Business Expo	NFIB and eBay 2008 National Small Business Summit
Republican	John McCain	Hispanic Small Business Roundtable in Santa Ana, California	Small Business Roundtable in Brooklyn, New York
Republican	John McCain	Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Atlanta, Georgia	Mackinac Republican Leadership Conference
Republican	John McCain	Remarks on Cuban Independence Day	Remarks on Memorial Day
Republican	John McCain	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials in Washington, DC	National Sheriffs' Association's 68th Annual Conference in Indianapolis
Republican	John McCain	79th Annual League of United Latin American Citizens Convention	Town Hall Meeting in Portsmouth, Ohio
Republican	John McCain	2008 National Council of La Raza Annual Meeting	Americans for Prosperity Michigan Summit
Republican	John McCain	99th Annual Convention of the	Values Voter Summit

		NAACP	
Republican	John McCain	2008 National Urban League Annual Conference	90th Annual American Legion National Convention
Republican	Mitt Romney	Republican National Hispanic Assembly	Conservative Political Action Conference
Republican	Mitt Romney	Latino Coalition's Annual Economic Summit	Remarks in Appleton, Wisconsin
Republican	Mitt Romney	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials	Newspaper Association of America
Republican	Mitt Romney	NAACP Convention	Values Voter Summit in Washington, D.C.
Republican	Mitt Romney	U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce 33rd Annual Convention	National Rifle Association National Convention
Democrat	Bill Clinton	National Urban League	Remarks in Houston, TX
Democrat	Bill Clinton	League of United Latin American Citizens	Remarks in San Diego, CA
Democrat	Bill Clinton	Rainbow Coalition National Convention	Remarks in Houston, TX
Democrat	Bill Clinton	East Los Angeles College	Remarks in Rockville, MD
Democrat	Bill Clinton	Speech regarding	Remarks in New

		LA Riots	York City, NY
Democrat	Bill Clinton	Eastside High School	Remarks in Washington DC
Democrat	Bill Clinton	Speech in Jonesboro, GA	Remarks in Madison, WI
Democrat	John Kerry	Greater Bethlehem Temple Church in Jackson, Mississippi	Remarks in Des Moines, Iowa
Democrat	John Kerry	New Northside Baptist Church in St. Louis, Missouri	Remarks in Wheeling, West Virginia
Democrat	John Kerry	National Conference of Black Mayors	American Federation of Teachers
Democrat	John Kerry	Commencement Address at Southern University at New Orleans	Commencement Address at Bedford High School in Toledo, Ohio
Democrat	John Kerry	Remarks on the Anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education	Remarks on Earth Day 2004
Democrat	John Kerry	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials	Remarks in Denver, Colorado
Democrat	John Kerry	33rd Annual Rainbow / PUSH Coalition and Citizenship Education Fund Conference	International Brotherhood of Teamsters Annual Unity Conference in Las Vegas
Democrat	John Kerry	National Council of	Veterans of Foreign

		La Raza's 37th Annual Conference	Wars 105th Annual Convention
Democrat	John Kerry	AME Convention	Remarks in Racine, West Virginia
Democrat	John Kerry	95th Annual NAACP Convention	Democratic Leadership Council
Democrat	John Kerry	2004 National Urban League Conference	Remarks in Cincinnati, Ohio
Democrat	John Kerry	UNITY 2004 Conference	Remarks in Carson, California
Democrat	John Kerry	124th Annual Session of the National Baptist Convention	Remarks in Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Democrat	John Kerry	Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's 34th Annual Legislative Conference	126th National Guard Association of the United States General Conference
Democrat	John Kerry	Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute's 27th Annual Gala	Detroit Economic Club
Democrat	John Kerry	East Mt. Zion Baptist Church	Broward Center for the Performing Arts

Appendix B

Ratings of Warmth and Competence Words by Category in Pretest (Study 2).

	Competence ratings	Warmth ratings
Category word	*M* (*SD*)	*M* (*SD*)
High competence/High warmth	5.69 (0.23)	5.84 (0.43)
Euphoric	5.48 (0.81)	6.15 (0.84)
Prodigious	6.08 (0.74)	5.47 (1.08)
Unprecedented	5.75 (0.97)	5.17 (1.22)
Exemplary	5.68 (0.77)	6.15 (0.73)
Commendable	5.43 (0.81)	5.88 (0.92)
Exquisite	5.73 (0.76)	6.22 (1.06)
High competence/Low warmth	5.34 (0.27)	2.90 (0.38)
Melancholy	5.32 (0.70)	3.32 (1.48)
Inept	5.22 (0.87)	2.57 (1.66)
Trite	5.48 (1.03)	3.00 (1.40)
Mediocre	5.05 (0.85)	3.30 (1.39)
Deficient	5.15 (1.09)	2.83 (1.53)
Repugnant	5.80 (0.92)	2.37 (1.93)
Low competence/Low warmth	3.54 (0.27)	2.52 (0.49)
Sad	3.85 (0.69)	2.70 (1.09)
Stupid	3.12 (1.17)	2.00 (1.04)
Old	3.72 (0.80)	3.33 (0.90)
Lousy	3.37 (0.90)	2.25 (1.10)
Weak	3.70 (0.81)	2.70 (1.15)
Nasty	3.45 (0.85)	2.12 (1.12)
Low competence/High warmth	3.78 (0.36)	5.23 (0.42)
Happy	4.02 (0.73)	5.68 (0.98)
Brainy	3.77 (1.21)	5.08 (1.05)
New	3.95 (0.57)	4.83 (0.87)
Fab	3.07 (0.95)	4.75 (1.43)
Great	3.97 (0.71)	5.72 (1.12)
Pretty	3.90 (0.73)	5.33 (0.93)

Appendix C

Supplemental analyses: SDO-E and SDO-D effects

As an exploratory measure, Studies 3 – 5 included additional analyses of both sub-dimensions of hierarchy-based conservatism (i.e., Social Dominance Orientation (SDO-D). These supplemental analyses tested the interactive effects of interaction partner race and either hierarchy-based conservatism subdimension (Anti-egalitarianism (SDO-E) or Dominance (SDO-D) on Whites' self-presentation and explicit interaction goals.

The following tables report the effects of Interaction Partner Race and SDO-E (Model 1), or Interaction Partner Rcae and SDO-D (Model 2) predicting self-presentation of competence and warmth across studies.

Tables are organized by study.

Table S1

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Word Selection and Interaction Goals (Study 3)

	Competence of Word Selections				Warmth of Word Selections			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	–.12	–2.54	.011	–.22, –.03	.02	0.31	.757	–.08, .11
Partner Race	–.03	–0.57	.566	–.12, .07	.02	0.40	.693	–.08, .11
SDO-E × Partner Race	.09	1.82†	.070	–.01, .18	–.07	–1.48	.139	–.17, .02
Model *F*	3.13*				0.80			
R^2	.02				.01			
Model 2								
SDO-D	–.13	–2.69**	.008	–.22, –.04	.01	0.11	.915	–.09, .10
Partner Race	–.03	–.057	.567	–.12, .07	.02	0.40	.690	–.08, .11
SDO-D × Partner Race	–.00	–0.06	.954	–.10, .09	–.06	–1.29	.197	–.16, .03
Model *F*	2.58†				0.61			
R^2	.02				.00			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S1 Continued

	Competence Interaction Goals				Warmth Interaction Goals			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	.01	0.14	.888	–.09, .10	–.13	–2.66**	.008	–.22, –.03
Partner Race	.01	0.22	.828	–.09, .11	–.04	–0.80	.428	–.13, .06
SDO-E × Partner Race	–.01	–.023	.820	–.11, .08	.01	0.13	.894	–.09, .10
Model *F*	0.04				2.61			
R^2	.00				.02			
Model 2								
SDO-D	–.01	–0.12	.901	–.10, .09	–.08	–1.66	.098	–.18, .02
Partner Race	.01	0.22	.823	–.08, .11	–.04	–0.81	.417	–.13, .06
SDO-D × Partner Race	–.02	–0.41	.682	–.12, .08	–.02	–0.31	.751	–.11, .08
Model *F*	0.08				1.24			
R^2	.00				.01			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S2

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Trait Selection and Interaction Goals (Study 4)

	Competence Trait Selections				Warmth Trait Selections			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	.05	0.90	.369	–.06, .16	.10	1.81†	.071	–.01, .21
Partner Race	–.04	–0.73	.465	–.15, .07	–.09	–1.66†	.098	–.20, .02
SDO-E × Partner Race	.05	0.88	.381	–.06, .16	.04	0.71	.481	–.07, .15
Model *F*	0.69				2.13†			
R^2	.01				.02			
Model 2								
SDO-D	.08	1.45	.149	–.03, .19	.10	1.84†	.067	–.01, .21
Partner Race	–.04	–0.72	.471	–.15, .07	–.09	–1.63	.104	–.20, .02
SDO-D × Partner Race	–.02	–0.34	.733	–.13, .09	.03	0.50	.621	–.08, .14
Model *F*	0.94				2.03			
R^2	.01				.02			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S2 Continued

	Competence Interaction Goals				Warmth Interaction Goals			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	–.06	–1.00	.317	–.16, .05	–.05	–0.93	.355	–.16, .06
Partner Race	.01	0.20	.840	–.10, .12	.03	0.57	.568	–.08, .14
SDO-E × Partner Race	–.06	–1.00	.319	–.16, .05	–.04	–0.81	.420	–.15, .06
Model *F*	0.68				0.60			
R^2	.01				.01			
Model 2								
SDO-D	.02	0.28	.778	–.09, .12	–.08	–1.52	.130	–.19, .03
Partner Race	.01	0.18	.859	–.10, .12	.03	0.56	.575	–.08, .14
SDO-D × Partner Race	–.06	–1.02	.307	–.17, .05	.03	0.48	.634	–.08, .14
Model *F*	0.40				0.99			
R^2	–.01				.00			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S3

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Content of Introductions, Trait Ratings, and Interaction Goals (Study 4)

	Competence Word Usage				Warmth Word Usage			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	.02	0.47	.640	–.06, .10	.03	0.63	.529	–.05, .10
Partner Race	–.06	–1.58	.115	–.14, .02	.02	0.46	.643	–.06, 10
SDO-E × Partner Race	.07	1.72†	.087	–.01, .14	–.03	–0.64	.520	–.10, .05
Model *F*	1.88				0.35			
R^2	.01				.00			
Model 2								
SDO-D	–.02	–0.40	.691	–.09, .06	–.01	–0.21	.835	–.09, .07
Partner Race	–.06	–1.59	.113	–.14, .02	.02	0.46	.648	–.06, .10
SDO-D × Partner Race	.06	1.51	.131	–.02, .14	.01	0.15	.885	–.07, .08
Model *F*	1.64				0.09			
R^2	.01				.00			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S3 Continued

	Competence of Trait Ratings				Warmth of Trait Ratings			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	.11	2.94**	.003	.04, .19	–.12	–3.12**	.002	–.20, –.05
Partner Race	.04	1.04	.301	–.04, .12	–.04	–1.11	.268	–.12, .03
SDO-E × Partner Race	.06	1.62	.105	–.01, .14	–.08	–1.97*	.049	–.15, .00
Model *F*	4.04**							
R^2	.02							
Model 2								
SDO-D	.11	2.86**	.004	.04, .19	–.12	–3.10**	.002	–.20, –.04
Partner Race	.04	1.08	.283	–.03, .12	–.05	–1.15	.251	–.12, .03
SDO-D × Partner Race	.11	2.93**	.004	.04, .19	–.10	–2.70**	.007	–.18, –.03
Model *F*	6.05***				6.14***			
R^2	.03				.02			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S3 Continued

	Competence Interaction Goals				Warmth Interaction Goals			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1								
SDO-E	.14	3.57***	.000	.06, .21	–.15	–3.97***	.000	–.23, –.08
Partner Race	–.05	–1.17	.244	–.12, .03	.04	0.92	.357	–.04, .11
SDO-E × Partner Race	.08	2.05*	.041	.00, .16	–.07	–1.78†	.076	–.15, .01
Model *F*	6.00***				6.52***			
R^2	.00				.03			
Model 2								
SDO-D	.14	3.57***	.000	.06, .21	–.11	–2.85**	.005	–.19, –.03
Partner Race	–.04	–1.12	.262	–.12, .03	.04	0.89	.376	–.04, .11
SDO-D × Partner Race	.07	1.72†	.086	–.01, .14	–.02	–0.45	.653	–.09, .06
Model *F*	5.78**				3.08*			
R^2	.03				.01			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Appendix D

Competence and Morality-relatedness of Values Tested by Wojciszke (1997).

Value	Competence	Morality
Ambitious	8.44	4.82
Capable	7.61	2.23
Cheerful	3.78	1.59
Courageous	7.17	4.24
Forgiving	2.72	7.47
Helpful	3.61	6.88
Honest	5.11	9.59
Imaginative	7.78	3.94
Independent	7.89	4.71
Intellectual	9.39	4.59
Logical	7.94	3.24
Loving	3.28	5.71
Obedient	6.67	4.94
Polite	4.44	6.76
Responsible	8.56	6.18
Self-controlled	4.27	3.94

Appendix E

Supplemental analyses: Readability of text.

Table S4

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Self-Reported Conservatism Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Readability of Introductions (Study 5)

Variables	Flesch Reading Ease				Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1: Conservatism								
Conservatism	.07	1.82†	.069	–.01, .15	–.04	–0.88	.377	–.11, .04
Partner Race	.03	0.66	.508	–.05, .10	–.05	–1.41	.160	–.13, .03
Conservatism × Partner Race	.03	0.74	.461	–.05, .11	–.04	–1.08	.280	–.12, .04
Model *F*	1.39				1.27			
R^2	.01				.01			
Model 2: SDO								
SDO	.10	2.47*	.014	.02, .17	–.07	–1.69†	.092	–.14, .01
Partner Race	.02	0.61	.540	–.05, .10	–.05	–1.39	.165	–.13, .02
SDO × Partner Race	–.03	–0.70	.485	–.10, .05	.02	0.57	.566	–.05, .10
Model *F*	2.30†				1.68			
R^2	.01				.01			
Model 3: RWA								
RWA	.12	2.96**	.003	.04, .19	–.07	–1.78†	.076	–.15, .01
Partner Race	.03	0.66	.511	–.05, .10	–.06	–1.41	.158	–.13, .02
RWA × Partner Race	–.01	–0.15	.883	–.08, .07	–.02	–0.60	.547	–.10, .05
Model *F*	3.05*				1.79			
R^2	.01				.01			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Appendix F

Supplemental Study: Affiliative Interaction Partners

This supplemental study tested a proposed explanation for why liberals draw on stereotypes when reacting to Blacks: as an attempt to gain favor from wary minorities. Research converges on the notion that many Whites are concerned about rejection from Blacks (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008; Plant & Devine, 2003; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Vorauer, Hunter, Main, & Roy, 2000). This concern is likely to most strongly affect liberal Whites. Because we reliably find this shift in verbal behavior among the most well-intentioned Whites—potentially those most concerned about race-based rejection—we suggest that liberals' competence downshift may in part be driven by a desire to more effectively communicate with minorities. If this is the case, then a minority partner who is already affiliative with Whites will not elicit such a desire, reversing the competence downshift for liberal Whites. To test this proposal, we manipulate the affiliation motive of the Black partner. We portrayed a minority partner who is highly affiliative with Whites, predicting that this also would reverse the competence downshift. Liberal Whites should present more competence to an affiliative Black partner than to a stereotypic minority partner (outgroup affiliative needs unspecified).

Even if the affiliative Black partner elicits self-presentational shifts, such an effect may not be unique to a minority partner. If participants respond to an affiliative White partner in the same way that they do the affiliative Black partner, then we cannot claim that such a generalized affiliation-matching reverses the race-based competence downshift. To address this possibility, we added a baseline White condition and an outgroup-affiliative White condition. We narrow our predictions accordingly. White participants should present more competence to an affiliative Black partner than a stereotypic one, but self-presentation of competence should not change based on a White partner's outgroup affiliation motive.

Method

Participants and design. Participants were 589 White Mechanical Turk users (322 women, 267 men; M_{age} = 35.35, SD_{age} = 11.88) who completed the survey in exchange for a nominal fee. All participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: stereotypic Black partner, affiliative Black partner, baseline White partner, affiliative White partner. This constituted a 2 (Partner race: White, Black) × 2 (Partner outgroup affiliation: high, none) between-subjects design.

Procedure and measures. Participants assigned to the stereotypic White or Black partner condition were asked to imagine e-mailing the book club secretary, who was given a stereotypically White or Black name. Those assigned to the affiliative White or Black partner conditions were given additional information about the book club secretary. The outgroup-affiliative White or Black partner was described as a member of "Allies For Unity," a nationwide organization aimed at promoting dialogue and understanding between groups.

Participants completed the self-presentation measure by selecting 12 words to use in a book review that would be sent to their randomly assigned partner. We then assessed RWA (α = .96) and demographics, including self-reported conservatism.[1]

Results

[1] Due to experimenter error, SDO was not included in this study.

Preliminary results. Competence and warmth self-presentation scores were residualized off the opposing measure and standardized for all analyses. Preliminary analyses revealed no moderating effect of participant gender, so subsequent analyses collapsed across gender. See Table S5 for results of all regression analyses.

Self-presentation: Word selections. Warmth and competence were analyzed separately, the words being pretested for degrees of each trait.

Self-presentation of competence. When predicting self-presentation of competence, the expected three-way interaction between partner race (White, Black), partner outgroup affiliation (high, none), and conservatism reached significance for both self-reported and values-based conservatism (Conservatism × Partner Race × Partner Outgroup Affiliation: β = –.08, 95% CI = [–.17, –.01], $t(581) = -2.07$, $p = .039$; RWA × Partner Race × Partner Outgroup Affiliation: β = –.08, 95% CI = [–.17, –.01], $t(581) = -2.07$, $p = .039$). To test the hypothesis that partner outgroup affiliation would interact with conservatism to predict self-presentation of competence in the Black-partner conditions. only, we assessed the roles of partner outgroup affiliation and conservatism at each level of partner race.

As predicted, RWA × Partner Outgroup Affiliation (high, low) did not reach significance with White partners (β = .06, 95% CI = [–.05, .17], $t(581) = 1.06$, $p = .285$) but reached marginal significance with Black partners (β = –.10, 95% CI = [–.22, .01], $t(581) = -1.74$, $p = 083$. Values-based liberals presented more competence to an affiliative Black partner than they did to a stereotypic, non-affiliative Black partner (β = .10, 95% CI = [–.06, .26], $t(581) = 1.24$, $p = .217$), though this effect did not reach significance. Values-based conservatives, in contrast, presented less competence to an affiliative Black partner than to a stereotypic, non-affiliative one (β = –.11, 95% CI = [–.28, .06], $t(581) = -1.24$, p = .215), though this effect also did not reach significance.

In contrast, Conservatism × Partner Outgroup Affiliation (high, low) did not reach significance with Black partners (β = –.06, 95% CI = [–.18, .06], $t(581) = -1.09$, $p = .275$) but reached marginal with White partners (β = .11, 95% CI = [–.01, .22], $t(581) = 1.82$, $p = .257$). Self-reported conservatives presented significantly more competence to an outgroup-affiliative White partner than they did to a stereotypic, non-affiliative White partner, β = .18, 95% CI = [–.02, .34], $t(581) = 2.21$, $p = .028$. Self-reported liberals did not shift self-presentation of competence based on a White partner's outgroup affiliation, β = –.03, 95% CI = [–.20, .13], $t(581) = -0.40$, $p = .686$.

Self-presentation of warmth. All participants, regardless of conservatism or partner race, presented significantly more warmth to an outgroup-affiliative partner than a non-outgroup-affiliative partner, ps < .001. In both conservatism models, this main effect was qualified by a marginal interaction with partner race, ps < .099. Participants presented more warmth to an outgroup-affiliative Black partner than to a stereotypic, non-affiliative Black partner, ps < .001. Self-presentation of warmth to a White partner based on outgroup affiliation, ps > .255.

The three-way interaction between partner race (White, Black), partner outgroup affiliation (high, none), and conservatism trended toward significance for self-reported conservatism, β = .07, 95% CI = [–.01, .15], $t(581) = 1.63$, $p = .103$. Conservatism × Partner Outgroup Affiliation (high, low) did not reach significance with Black (β = .08, 95% CI = [–.03, .19], $t(581) = -1.37$, $p = .170$) or White partners (β = –.05, 95% CI = [–.17, .06], $t(581) = -0.94$, $p = .347$); as such, simple slopes were not examined.

Explicit interaction goals. Competence and warmth interaction goals were residualized off the opposing measure and standardized for all analyses. Preliminary analyses revealed no moderating effect of participant gender, so subsequent analyses collapsed across gender.

Competence interaction goals. A main effect of partner race emerged: all participants, regardless of conservatism or partner outgroup affiliation, had the goal to appear less competent with a Black partner than with a White one, *p*s < .063. The three-way interaction between partner race (White, Black), partner outgroup affiliation (high, none), and RWA reached marginal significance, β = –.07, 95% CI = [–.15, .01], *t*(581) = –1.73, *p* = .084. RWA × Partner Outgroup Affiliation (high, low) did not reach significance with Black partners (β = .04, 95% CI = [–.15, .08], *t*(581) = –0.61, *p* = .540) but reached marginal significance with White partners (β = .11, 95% CI = [–.01, .22], *t*(581) = 1.87, *p* = .063. Values-based liberals had the goal to appear less competent with an outgroup-affiliative White partner than they did to a stereotypic, non-outgroup-affiliative White partner (β = –.13, 95% CI = [–.29, .04], *t*(581) = –1.50, *p* = .133); this effect trended toward significance. Values-based conservatives, in contrast, had the goal to appear more competent with an outgroup-affiliative White partner than with a stereotypic, non-affiliative one (β = .09, 95% CI = [–.07, .24], *t*(581) = 1.10, p = .269), though this effect also did not reach significance.

Warmth interaction goals. The three-way interaction between partner race (White, Black), partner outgroup affiliation (high, none), and RWA reached marginal significance, β = .08, 95% CI = [–.00, .16], *t*(581) = 1.89, *p* = .059. RWA × Partner Outgroup Affiliation (high, low) did not reach significance with Black partners (β = .02, 95% CI = [–.10, .14], *t*(581) = 0.34, *p* = .736) but reached significance with White partners (β = –.14, 95% CI = [–.25, –.02], *t*(581) = –2.39, *p* = .017. Values-based liberals had the goal to appear warmer with an outgroup-affiliative White partner than they did to a stereotypic, non-outgroup-affiliative White partner (β = .16, 95% CI = [–.01, .32], *t*(581) = 1.88, *p* = .061). Values-based conservatives, in contrast, had the goal to appear less warm with an outgroup-affiliative White partner than with a stereotypic, non-affiliative one (β = –.12, 95% CI = [–.27, .04], *t*(581) = –1.47, p = .142); this effect trended toward reach significance.

Table S5

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Self-Reported Conservatism Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Word Selection and Interaction Goals (Study S1)

Variables	Competence of Word Selections				Warmth of Word Selections			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1: Conservatism								
Conservatism	.04	1.01	.315	–.04, .12	–.05	–1.10	.272	–.13, .04
Partner Race	.08	1.94†	.053	–.00, .16	–.04	–1.03	.302	–.12, .04
Partner Affiliation	.04	0.90	.371	–.04, .12	.13	3.28**	.001	.05, .21
Conservatism × Partner Race	–.01	–0.19	.853	–.09, .07	.07	1.60	.110	–.02, .15
Conservatism × Partner Affiliation	.02	0.53	.593	–.06, .10	.01	0.29	.771	–.07, .09
Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.04	–0.89	.372	–.12, .04	.07	1.65†	.099	–.01, .15
Conservatism × Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.09	–2.07*	.039	–.17, –.00	.07	1.63	.103	–.01, .15
Model *F*	1.59				2.96**			
R^2	.02				.02			
Model 2: RWA								
RWA	–.06	–1.54	.124	–.14, .02	.06	1.44	.150	–.02, .14
Partner Race	.08	1.86†	.063	–.00, .16	–.04	–0.94	.350	–.12, .04
Partner Affiliation	.03	0.84	.402	–.05, .12	.13	3.29**	.001	.05, .22
RWA × Partner Race	.00	0.08	.934	–.08, .08	.00	0.04	.970	–.08, .08
RWA × Partner Affiliation	–.02	–0.52	.605	–.10, .06	.02	0.49	.622	–.06, .10
Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.04	–0.91	.361	–.12, .04	.07	1.66†	.098	–.01, .15
RWA × Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.08	–1.99*	.047	–.16, –.00	.03	0.84	.400	–.05, .12
Model *F*	1.71				2.43*			
R^2	.01				.02			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. For all effects of Partner Affiliation and interactions with Partner Affiliation, non-affiliative partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

Table S5 Continued

Summary of Regression Analyses for Interaction Partner Race, Self-Reported Conservatism Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Predicting Word Selection and Interaction Goals (Study S1)

Variables	Competence Interaction Goals				Warmth Interaction Goals			
	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Model 1: Conservatism								
Conservatism	.02	0.58	.560	–.06, .11	–.03	–0.70	.486	–.11, .05
Partner Race	–.08	–2.08*	.038	–.17, –.01	.02	0.47	.640	–.06, .10
Partner Affiliation	–.02	–0.35	.724	–.10, .07	.04	0.97	.335	–.04, .12
Conservatism × Partner Race	–.02	–0.55	.583	–.10, .06	–.01	–0.17	.863	–.09, .07
Conservatism × Partner Affiliation	.07	1.66†	.097	–.01, .15	–.04	–1.05	.293	–.13, .04
Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.00	–0.01	.989	–.08, .08	.03	0.63	.531	–.06, .11
Conservatism × Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.04	–0.84	.399	–.12, .05	.02	0.57	.569	–.06, .11
Model *F*	1.23				0.50			
R^2	.02				.01			
Model 2: RWA								
RWA	–.00	–0.08	.937	–.08, .08	.03	0l73	.465	–.05, .11
Partner Race	–.08	–2.05*	.041	–.17, –.00	.02	0.49	.627	–.06, .10
Partner Affiliation	–.02	–0.43	.664	–.10, .06	.04	1.04	.297	–.04, .12
RWA × Partner Race	–.03	–1.02	.311	–.12, .04	–.01	–0.18	.856	–.09, .07
RWA × Partner Affiliation	.03	–0.84	.399	–.05, .12	–.06	–1.41	.160	–.14, .02
Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	.01	0.02	.983	–.08, .08	.02	0.56	.575	–.06 .10
RWA × Partner Race × Partner Affiliation	–.07	–1.73†	.084	–.15, .01	.08	1.89*	.059	–.00, .16
Model *F*	1.35				1.12			
R^2	.02				.01			

Note. All dependent variables were residualized. All continuous variables were standardized. For all effects of Partner Race and interactions with Partner Race, White partner is coded as –1. For all effects of Partner Affiliation and interactions with Partner Affiliation, non-affiliative partner is coded as –1. †p<.10. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.