**Online Supplemental Materials**

**Supplemental Material: Additional Measures and Analyses**

**Study 1**

**Pre-Registration**

We pre-registered that we would obtain access to two semesters of course grades. However, based on requested revisions, we subsequently obtained access to an additional semester of grades that helped bolster our sample size, and as such we report results in the main text across all three semesters of course grades to which we ultimately obtained access. Importantly, results are largely equivalent when only analyzing the data from the two semesters to which we initially had access (see Table S1).

Table S1. *Effect of social class on individual performance and social class composition on group performance in Study 1 for original two semesters of course grades (*N *= 1130 individuals;* N *= 158 groups*)*.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* | **Group Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* |
| Social Class | -.10\*\* | -3.20 | .001 | Social Class Composition | .20\* | 2.55 | .012 |

Note: \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01.

**Main Text Measures**

**Peer evaluations.** The following were the 20 dimensions on which students were rated for peer evaluations: Planning & Organization Ability, Initiative & Self-motivation, Dependability & Reliability, Meets All Team Deadlines, Meeting Attendance, Prepared for Meetings, Appropriate Use of Technology (distraction-free), Positive & Flexible Attitude, Facilitation & People Skills, Responsive & Open Communication Skills, Goal Orientation, Holds Teammates Accountable, Leadership Ability, Manages Conflict Appropriately, Team Spirit & Cooperation, Helpful & Supportive, Quantity of Contribution, Quality of Contribution, Degree of Effort, and Class Attendance. Each dimension was rated on the following scale: 1 = *Needs Substantial Improvement/Poor*, 2 = *Needs Improvement*,3 = *Good/Meets Expectations*, 4 = *Very Good*,5 = *Outstanding*.

**Additional Measures**

We had access to additional measures not included in the main text that students completed as part of the separate prescreen survey to be eligible for studies in one of the university’s behavioral labs.

**Belonging.** A subset of participants (*N* = 1131) completed three items that assessed their sense of belonging at their university. The three items were: “I feel like I belong at [university],” “I feel like part of a community at [university],” and “I do not feel socially connected to my peers at [university].” Participants responded using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (⍺ = .78).

**Empowerment.** A subset of participants (*N* = 1127) completed three items that assessed their sense of empowerment at their university. The three items were: “I can manage the most difficult tasks at [university],” “I am able to master the skills required for success at [university],” and “My skills and abilities allow me to meet the demands of being a student at [university].” Participants responded using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (⍺ = .83)

**Social Class Bicultural Identity Integration.** A subset of participants (*N* = 1120) completed an 8-item Social Class Bicultural Identity Integration Scale (adapted from Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). Example items are: “I find it easy to balance both working-class and middle-class cultures,” “I am able to feel both working-class and middle-class,” and “For me, middle-class and working-class ways of doing things are often conflicted” [reverse-scored]. Participants responded using a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (⍺ = .76).

**Subjective SES.** A subset of participants (*N* = 1325) completed the ladder measure of subjective SES (Adler et al., 2000; 1 = *lowest rung of the ladder*, 10 = *highest rung*). A smaller subset of participants (*N* = 483) also responded to three items about their general sense of their current SES (“I have enough money to buy things I want,” “I don’t need to worry too much about paying my bills,” and “I don’t think I’ll have to worry about money too much in the future”; 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*; ⍺ = .72).

**Family income.** A subset of participants (*N* = 1098) completed one item assessing family income (“What was your family’s yearly household income when you last lived with your parents?; 0 = *$9,999 or less*, 8 = *Greater than $200,000*).

**Additional Analyses: Parental Educational Attainment as Linear Predictor**

We also conducted analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using mean parental educational attainment as a linear predictor, rather than creating a dichotomous working-class vs. middle-class background indicator variable. We took the mean of maternal and paternal educational attainment to create an average parental educational attainment indicator. As such, higher scores on this continuous predictor reflect higher levels of mean parental educational attainment, and higher levels of social class background (Scale: 1 = *Less than a high school degree*, 6 = *Graduate or Professional Degree (MA/PhD, JD, MBA, MD)*.

**Additional Results: Parental Educational Attainment as Linear Predictor**

**Individual performance.** Similar to the results utilizing a binary indicator of social class, mean parental educational attainment was significantly positively associated with performance on individual assignments, ß = 0.13, *t*(1582) = 5.10, *p* < .001.

**Group performance.** Similar to the results utilizing a binary indicator of social class, mean parental educational attainment of the group was significantly negatively associated with performance on group assignments, ß = -0.13, *t*(270) = -2.09, *p* = .04.

**Additional Analyses: Subjective SES**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text instead using self-reported subjective SES as an alternate proxy for social class at the individual level, and mean subjective SES group composition at the group level (see Table S1). Subjective SES was the alternate measure to which we had the highest proportion of responses, which is why we chose to utilize this measure as our alternate proxy (rather than family income). To test mean subjective SES group composition, we created a group-level variable (i.e., Level 2) that enabled us to test the effect of a group’s subjective SES composition on group performance. Similar to the process employed to construct this variable using parental educational attainment, we excluded data from groups where more than one member did not report the necessary information to determine their social class background (*N* = 116 groups). This is because, in these cases, a large portion of the group’s social class composition was unknown (i.e., anywhere from 25-33%). For groups where only one member did not report the information necessary to determine their social class background, we retained the data in our dataset because only a small portion was of the group’s social class composition unknown and we sought to minimize missing data. Following recommendations for handling missing continuous data, we used mean substitution to impute the unknown background information with the mean subjective SES: 7. As such, for group-level analyses with mean subjective SES, our final usable sample size was *N* = 180 groups. This variable represented the mean subjective SES rating in a given group (*M* = 6,65, *SD* = 1.29). Specifically, 19% of groups had a mean subjective SES rating of ≤ 6.00; 44% had a mean subjective SES rating of 6.01-7.00; 33% had a mean subjective SES rating of 7.01-8.00; and 4% had a mean subjective SES rating of > 8.00.

**Additional Results: Subjective SES**

**Individual performance.** Similar to the results utilizing parental educational attainment as a proxy for social class, subjective SES was significantly positively associated with performance on individual assignments, ß = 0.11, *t*(1323) = 4.02, *p* < .001 (see Table S2, left panel).

**Group performance.** Similar to the results utilizing parental educational attainment as a proxy for social class, mean subjective SES of the group was significantly negatively associated with performance on group assignments, ß = -0.15, *t*(178) = -1.98, *p* = .05 (see Table S2, right panel).

Table S2. *Effect of subjective SES on individual and group course performance in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* | **Group Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* |
| Social Class | .11\*\* | 4.02 | <.001 | Social Class Composition | -.15\*\* | -1.98 | .05 |

Note: \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**Additional Analyses: Gender and Race Covariates**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text instead including the binary White/non-White race indicator and gender as covariates at the individual level, and White/non-White racial group composition and gender group composition at the group level (see Table S3). To include gender composition as a covariate, we created a group-level variable (i.e., Level 2) that enabled us to test the effect of a group’s gender composition on group performance. This variable represented the percentage of male students in a given group (*M* = 58% male students, *SD* = 21%).

To include racial composition as a covariate, we created a group-level variable (i.e., Level 2) that enabled us to test the effect of a group’s racial composition on group performance. This variable represented the percentage of White students in a given group (*M* = 33% White students, *SD* = 29%).

**Additional Results: Gender and Race Covariates**

**Individual performance.** Social class remained significantly negatively associated with performance on individual assignments when controlling for race and gender, ß = -0.10, *t*(1471) = -3.92, *p* < .001 (see Table S3, left panel).

**Group performance.** Social class composition of the group remained significantly positively associated with performance on group assignments when controlling for racial and gender composition of the group, ß = 0.05, *t*(124) = 2.68, *p* = .008 (see Table S3, right panel).

Table S3. *Effect of individual social class on individual performance, and social class composition on group performance, controlling for race and gender in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* | **Group Performance** | ß | *t* | *p* |
| Social Class | -.10\*\*\* | -3.82 | <.001 | Social Class Composition | .23\*\* | 2.68 | .008 |
| Gender | -.02\*\*\* | -6.37 | <.001 | Gender Composition | .02 | 1.08 | .28 |
| Race | .003 | 0.83 | .41 | Racial Composition | .23\* | 2.58 | .01 |

Note: \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**Additional Results: Missing Data Imputed**

We also conducted the group performance analysis using imputed data. Specifically, for groups where only one member did not report the information necessary to determine their social class background (*N* = 54 groups), following recommendations for handling missing categorical data (e.g., Cheema, 2014), we used mode substitution to impute the unknown background information with the modal social class background: middle-class. By doing so, we provide a somewhat conservative test of our effects because, if anything, we are likely to underestimate the number of students from working-class contexts. As such, for this additional group-level analysis, our final usable sample size was *N* = 221 groups.

**Group performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, social class composition of the group was significantly positively associated with performance on group assignments, ß = .16, *t*(220) = 2.46, *p* = .015. Consistent with the idea that working together improves the performance of groups of students from working-class contexts, the analyses revealed that a higher proportion of working-class students working together in a group was associated with significantly better performance on group assignments.

**Additional Results: Reduced Sample Using Only Groups with Complete SES Information**

We also conducted the group performance analysis using only groups with complete social class information (*N* = 125 groups).

**Group performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, social class composition of the group was significantly positively associated with performance on group assignments, ß = .19, *t*(124) = 2.20, *p* = .03. Consistent with the idea that working together improves the performance of groups of students from working-class contexts, the analyses revealed that a higher proportion of working-class students working together in a group was associated with significantly better performance on group assignments.

**Additional Results: Repeated Measures by Social Class Composition of Group**

As noted in the Discussion of Study 1, we conducted a repeated measures analysis to better compare the effect of social class across individual versus group performance by social class composition of the group. Specifically, we entered aggregated individual course performance and group course performance as our two dependent measures. We entered social class composition of the group as our predictor of the two different types of course performance. We specifically look at contrasts within social class composition (i.e., groups with zero vs. one vs. two or more students from working-class contexts) by assignment type (individual vs. group) to determine whether working together (vs. individually) benefits people from working-class contexts, but not people from middle-class contexts.

Providing more direct support of Hypothesis 1, individual vs. group performance differed significantly by group social class composition, *F*(2, 272) = 9.80, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .07. We specifically examined how performance on aggregated individual vs. group performance differed as a function of the social class composition of the group. On aggregated individual course performance, groups with zero students from working-class contexts had significantly better aggregated performance on individual assignments (*M* = 82.7%, *SD* = 4%), compared to both groups with a solo working-class member (*M* = 81.6%, *SD* = 4%), and groups with two or more students from working-class contexts (*M* = 81.1%, *SD* = 4%), *F*(2, 272) = 4.34, *p* = .01, *η*2 = .03. This provides further evidence that, if group performance simply reflected aggregated individual performance, having groups with more (vs. fewer) students from working-class contexts would be associated with worse performance. In contrast, and consistent with Hypothesis 1, on actual group course performance, groups with two or more students from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 89.6%, *SD* = 3%) than groups with a solo working-class member (*M* = 88.3%, *SD* = 3%) and groups with zero students from working-class contexts (*M* = 88.2%, *SD* = 3%), *F*(2, 272) = 4.87, *p* = .008, *η*2 = .04. This pattern of results provides further evidence that having groups with more (vs. fewer) people from working-class contexts is associated with better group performance.

**Additional Results: Repeated Measures by Social Class Composition of Group Excluding Groups with Three or More Students from Working-Class Contexts**

We conducted the same repeated measures analysis as above excluding groups with three or more students from working-class contexts (*N* = 255 groups).

Specifically, we entered aggregated individual course performance and group course performance as our two dependent measures. We entered social class composition of the group as our predictor of the two different types of course performance. We specifically look at contrasts within social class composition (i.e., groups with zero vs. one vs. two or more students from working-class contexts) by assignment type (individual vs. group) to determine whether working together (vs. individually) benefits people from working-class contexts, but not people from middle-class contexts.

Consistent with the analysis including all groups, individual vs. group performance differed significantly by group social class composition, *F*(2, 252) = 8.67, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .06. We specifically examined how performance on aggregated individual vs. group performance differed as a function of the social class composition of the group. Consistent with the analysis including all groups, on aggregated individual course performance, groups with zero students from working-class contexts had significantly better aggregated performance on individual assignments (*M* = 82.7%, *SD* = 4%), compared to both groups with a solo working-class member (*M* = 81.6%, *SD* = 4%), and groups with two or more students from working-class contexts (*M* = 80.7%, *SD* = 5%), *F*(2, 252) = 5.59, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .04. In contrast, and consistent with the analysis including all groups, on actual group course performance, groups with two or more students from working-class contexts performed marginally better (*M* = 89.3%, *SD* = 4%) than groups with a solo working-class member (*M* = 88.3%, *SD* = 3%; *Mdiff* = 1%, *p* = .068) and than groups with zero students from working-class contexts (*M* = 88.2%, *SD* = 3%; *Mdiff* = 1.1%, *p* = .050), *F*(2, 252) = 2.22, *p* = .11, *η*2 = .02.

**Additional Results: Repeated Measures by Individual Social Class and Social Class Composition of Group on Unstandardized Performance**

We conducted the same repeated measures analysis as reported in the main text instead using unstandardized dependent variables. We entered individual course performance and group course performance as our two dependent measures. We used the same indicator variable that reflected individuals from different social class contexts in groups with different social class compositions (i.e., students from middle-class contexts in groups with zero students from working-class contexts, students from middle-class contexts in groups with 1 student from working-class contexts, students from middle-class contexts in groups with 2 or more students from working-class contexts, students from working-class contexts where they were the solo working-class member, students from working-class contexts where there were 2 or more students from working-class contexts).

Providing more direct support of Hypothesis 1, individual vs. group performance differed significantly by the individual social class/group social class composition indicator, *F*(4, 1571) = 9.83, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .02 (see Figure S1 and Tables S4-5). We specifically examined how performance on individual vs. group performance differed as a function of the individual social class/group social class composition indicator variable. Individual course performance differed significantly by the individual social class/group social class composition indicator variable, *F*(4, 1571) = 5.13, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .01 (see Table S4). This provides further evidence that students from working-class contexts performed worse on individual assignments than students from middle-class contexts, regardless of the social class composition of their group. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, group course performance also differed significantly by the individual social class/group social class composition indicator variable, *F*(4, 1571) = 6.77, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .02 (Table S5). This provides further evidence that students from working-class contexts performed better on group assignments when they were in a group with at least one other student from a working-class context, compared to when they were the solo working-class member in their group.

**Boxplots and Scatterplots of Raw Data**

Boxplots and scatterplots of raw data are presented in Figures S2-3.

Table S4. *Individual performance in Study 1 by individual social class and social class composition of the group.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Individual Social Class ×  Group Social Class Composition | Individual Performance *M* (*SD*) | 95% CI |
| *Students from Middle-Class Contexts* | | |
| In Groups with Zero Students from Working-Class  Contexts | 82.6a (7) | [82, 83.2] |
| In Groups with One Student from a Working-Class  Context | 82.0ab (6) | [81.4, 82.6] |
| In Groups with Two or More Students from   Working-Class Contexts | 81.6b (7) | [80.8, 82.3] |
| *Students from Working-Class Contexts* | | |
| In Groups with One Student from a Working-Class  Context | 80.0c (7) | [78.7, 81.4] |
| In Groups with Two or More Students from  Working-Class Contexts | 80.5bc (8) | [79.5, 81.5] |

*Note*. Means that have different subscripts differ based on post hoc tests of adjusted means (*p* < .05). Means, SDs, and 95% CIs reported as percentages.

Table S5. *Group performance in Study 1 by individual social class and social class composition of the group.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Individual Social Class ×  Group Social Class Composition | Group Performance  *M* (*SD*) | 95% CI |
| *Students from Middle-Class Contexts* | | |
| In Groups with Zero Students from Working-Class  Contexts | 88.4a (3) | [88.1, 88.7] |
| In Groups with One Student from a Working-Class  Context | 88.6a (3) | [88.2, 88.9] |
| In Groups with Two or More Students from  Working-Class Contexts | 89.4b (4) | [89, 89.8] |
| *Students from Working-Class Contexts* | | |
| In Groups with One Student from a Working-Class  Context | 88.1a (4) | [87.4, 88.8] |
| In Groups with Two or More Students from  Working-Class Contexts | 89.5b (4) | [88.9, 90] |

*Note*. Means that have different subscripts differ based on post hoc tests of adjusted means (*p* < .05). Means, SDs, and 95% CIs reported as percentages.

Figure S1. *Raw individual vs. group assignment performance for individuals from different social contexts in groups of varying social class composition in Study 1.*
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Figure S2. *Boxplot of individual assignment performance for individuals from different social contexts in Study 1.*
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Figure S3. *Scatterplot of group assignment by group social class composition (i.e., number of working-class students in a group) in Study 1.*

**Study 2**

**Main Text Measures**

**Subjective experience with team.** The additional items that comprised the index od students’ subjective experience with their team were: “Rate your overall college athletic experience to this point” and “How positive or negative has the overall influence of your college athletic participation been on your current mental health?”

**Additional Measures: Athletic Experiences**

We had access to additional variables not included in the main text that were related to students’ athletic experiences.

**Roster spot.** Participants responded to one item assessing their roster spot on the team: “Based on your roster spot or frequency of competition, how would you classify your current status in your main sport?” The response options were: 1 = *First team (for example, you start in a team sport or compete in your preferred events in individual sports)*, 2 = *Second team (e.g., regular substitute in a team sport, often compete in some event in individual sports)*, 3 = *Third team (e.g., participate in practice but compete infrequently)*, 4 = *Practicing or training but not competing*.

**NCAA championship participation.** Participants responded to one item assessing whether their team had participated in any NCAA championship competitions during their time at the school. The response options were: 1 = *Never*, 2 = *Once*, 3 = *More than once*, 4 = *First season – no opportunity yet*. While this measure could conceivably serve as a measure of group performance, we had no way of determining when the team had participated in an NCAA championship competition, and whether the current social class composition of the team was the social class composition of the team that had participated in the NCAA championship. As such, we were unable to use this as a group performance measure.

**Likelihood of a professional or Olympic athletic career.** Participants responded to one item assessing the extent to which they thought they would have a professional or Olympic athletic career in the sport (1 = *Very unlikely,* 6 = *Very likely*).

**Likelihood of an athletic career.** Participants responded to one item assessing the extent to which students thought they would have a career related to athletics in any way (“Do you anticipate that your career will involve athletics or exercise sciences in any form?”; 1 = *Very unlikely*, 5 = *Very likely*).

**Involved in intramurals.** Participants responded to one item assessing whether they were involved in intramural sports (“Have you been or will you be involved in intramural or club sports during college?”; 1 = *No, I have no interest*, 2 = *No, I would enjoy but no time*, 3 = *Not yet, but plan to participate*, 4 = *Yes, current and/or past involvement*).

**Athletics requires service.** Participants responded to one item assessing whether students’ sports teams required them to engage in service (“Are you required to take part in service projects or volunteer activities as part of your athletics participation?”; 1 = *No, we do not take part in such activities as a team*, 2 = *My coach/team suggests we take part in these types of activities but does not require them*, 3 = *Yes, my coach/team requires it occasionally*, 4 = *Yes, my coach/team requires it frequently*).

**Athletics effect on cross-race interactions.** Participants responded to one item assessing whether athletics participant had had an effect on their cross-race interactions (“Do you believe that your athletics participation has had an effect on your interactions and experiences with people from other racial and ethnic groups?”; 1 = *No, it has had no effect*, 2 = *Yes, it has had a negative effect*, 3 = *Yes, it has had a positive effect*).

**See self as more of an athlete.** Participants responded to a 3-item measure assessing their perceptions that they were seen more as an athlete than as a student, by various groups (i.e., self, other students, professors; 1 = *Strongly disagree*, 6 = *Strongly agree*).

**Think about sport.** Participants responded to one item assessing the extent to which they thought about the sport more than academics (1 = *Strongly disagree*, 6 = *Strongly agree*).

**Benefit of athletics for future job.** Participants responded to two items assessing whether they believed athletics participation had benefits for their future job in terms of skills and personal contacts (1 = *no help at all*, 5 = *A great deal of help*, 6 = *Don’t know*).

**Inclusiveness of team.** Participants responded to an eight-item measure of perceived team inclusiveness. Two example items were: “I always feel comfortable expressing my social and political views on this team” and “I always feel comfortable expressing my religious views on this team.” Items were rated on a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*).

**Friends on team.** Participants responded to one item assessing how many of their friends at college were on the team (“How many of your closest friends at this college are on your sports team?”; 1 = *None*, 2 = *Few*, 3 = *Some*, 4 = *Many*, 5 = *All*).

**Physical health*.*** Participants responded to one item assessing the sport’s effect on their physical health (“How positive or negative has the overall influence of your college athletic participation been on your current physical health?”; 1 = *Very negative*, 7 = *Very positive*).

**Time spent on athletics.** Participants responded to two items indicating how many hours they spent on athletics during a typical weekday, and during a typical weekend day (1 = *0 hours*, 8 = *8+ hours*).

**Additional Measures: Demographics**

**Athletic scholarship recipient.** Participants indicated whether they had received an athletics scholarship that year (0 = *No,* 1 = *Yes, partial*, 2 = *Yes, full*).

**Second sport participation.** Participants responded to one item assessing whether they participated in another sport in addition to the one about which they completed the survey. The response options were: 1 = *No*, 2 = *Yes, but not this year*, 3 = *Yes, I’m participating in more than one sport this year*.

**Recruit.** Participants indicated whether a coach had recruited them to play their sport (0 = *No,* 1 = *Yes*).

**GPA.** Participants indicated their current overall GPA on a 4.0 scale.

**Major.** Participants indicated their major area of study (1= *Not yet chosen*, 2 = *Biological sciences*, 3= *Business*, 4 = *Communications*, 5 = *Education*, 6 = *Engineering/Computer information sciences*, 7 = *Exercise, Sports*, 8 = *Humanities/Fine Arts*, 9 = *Physical Sciences/Math*, 10 = *Professional Studies*, 11 = *Social Sciences*, 12 = *Other*).

**Pell Grant recipient.** Participants also indicated whether they had received a Pell Grant (only low-income students are eligible for these grants; 1 = *Yes*, 0 = *No*). Of the sample, 12% indicated that they had received a Pell Grant.

**Family monetary contribution.** Participants also indicated whether they had received family contributions to pay for college (1 = *Yes*, 0 = *No*). Of the sample, 51% indicated that they had received family contributions to pay for college. This indicator was significantly positively correlated with first-generation college student status, *r*(17,006) = 0.19, *p* < .001.

**Family monetary contribution composition of team.** We created a group-level variable (i.e., Level 2) that enabled us to test the effect of a group’s family contribution to paying for college composition. This variable represented the percentage of students who did not receive family contributions in a given group (*M* = 49% students without family contribution, *SD* = 28%). Specifically, 16% of teams had less than 20% students without family contributions, 29% of teams had 20-40% students without family contributions, 22% of teams had 41-60% students without family contributions, 17% had 61-80% students without family contributions, and 16% had 81-100% students without family contributions.

**Gender.** Gender could only be investigated at the group level since sports are single-gender at the collegiate level. In the sample, 54% of teams were women’s teams.

**Racial composition of team.** We created a group-level variable (i.e., Level 2) that enabled us to test the effect of a group’s racial composition on group performance. This variable represented the percentage of non-White students in a given group (*M* = 23% non-White students, *SD* = 28%). Specifically, 63% of teams had less than 20% non-White students, 17% of teams had 20-40% non-White students, 9% of teams had 41-60% non-White students, 4% had 61-80% non-White students, and 7% had 81-100% non-White students.

**Additional Analyses: Family Monetary Contribution**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text with subjective experience as our outcome instead using family monetary contribution status at an individual level as a proxy for individual social class, and family monetary contribution composition of team as a group-level proxy for the social class composition of the team.

**Additional Results with Family Monetary Contribution**

Results were somewhat similar, though failed to reach significance, when instead using family monetary contribution status as our proxy for social class. Specifically, though there was a positive three-way interaction between family monetary contribution, team type, and proportion of students without family contributions on a team, this interaction was nonsignificant, *b* = 0.06, *t*(17,006) = 1.25, *p* = .21 (See Table S6).

Table S6. *Multilevel regression analysis predicting sense of fit with team utilizing family monetary contribution status as proxy for social class in Study 2.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subjective Experience with Team | | | | | |
| Fixed Effect | *B* | *SE B* | *t* | *p* | 95% CI |
| Family Contribution | 0.009 | 0.01 | 0.87 | .39 | [-0.012, 0.030] |
| Sport Type | -0.07\*\*\* | 0.02 | -3.87 | <.001 | [-0.105, -0.035] |
| Family Contribution × Sport Type | -0.003 | 0.01 | -0.28 | .78 | [-0.024, 0.018] |
| Family Contribution Composition | -0.12\* | 0.06 | -2.16 | .03 | [-0.235, -0.011] |
| Sport Type × Family Contribution Composition | -0.09 | 0.06 | -1.54 | .12 | [-0.200, 0.024] |
| Family Contribution × Family Contribution Composition | 0.08 | 0.05 | 1.62 | .11 | [-0.016, 0.167] |
| Family Contribution × Sport Type × Family Contribution Composition | 0.06 | 0.05 | 1.25 | .21 | [-0.033, 0.150] |
| Level 1 *n* = 17,008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 2 *n* = 1,403 |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subjective Experience with Team | | | | |
| Random Effect | *B* | *SE B* | Wald *Z* | *p* | 95% CI |
| Between Groups | 0.165 | 0.011 | 15.333 | <.001 | [0.145, 0.187] |
| Residual | 0.993 | 0.008 | 87.658 | <.001 | [0.971, 1.015] |

**Additional Analyses: Covariates**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text with sense of fit as our outcome including minority status, gender, and roster spot as covariates.

**Additional Results with Covariates**

Results were robust to the addition of covariates (see Table S7). Specifically, the three-way interaction between team type, individual social class, and social class composition of the team on individual subjective experience was still significant, *b* = 0.19, *t*(17,006) = 3.29, *p* = .001.

Table S7. *Multilevel regression analysis predicting subjective experience with team including race (Level 1 and Level 2), gender (Level 2), and roster spot (Level 1) covariates in Study 2.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subjective Experience with Team | | | | | |
| Fixed Effect | *B* | *SE B* | *t* | *p* | 95% CI |
| Social Class | 0.004 | 0.01 | 0.46 | .65 | [-0.016, 0.025] |
| Sport Type | -0.05\*\* | 0.02 | -3.06 | .002 | [-0.090, -0.020] |
| Social Class × Sport Type | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.13 | .27 | [-0.009, 0.032] |
| Social Class Composition | 0.13+ | 0.08 | 1.67 | .09 | [-0.023, 0.281] |
| Sport Type × Social Class Composition | -0.02 | 0.07 | -0.25 | .81 | [-0.166, 0.129] |
| Social Class × Social Class Composition | -0.06 | 0.06 | -1.02 | .31 | [-0.168, 0.053] |
| Social Class × Sport Type × Social Class Composition | 0.19\*\* | 0.06 | 3.29 | .001 | [0.074, 0.296] |
| Gender | 0.07\* | 0.03 | 2.46 | .01 | [0.015, 0.131] |
| Race | -0.03 | 0.02 | -1.17 | .24 | [-0.069, 0.018] |
| Racial Composition | -0.21\*\* | 0.06 | -3.39 | .001 | [-0.339, -0.091] |
| Roster Spot | 0.20\*\*\* | 0.01 | 22.36 | <.001 | [0.183, 0.218] |
| Level 1 *n* = 17,008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 2 *n* = 1,403 |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: + *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subjective Experience with Team | | | | |
| Random Effect | *B* | *SE B* | Wald *Z* | *p* | 95% CI |
| Between Groups | 0.170 | 0.011 | 15.475 | <.001 | [0.150, 0.193] |
| Residual | 0.955 | 0.011 | 87.027 | <.001 | [0.934, 0.977] |

**Scatterplots of Raw Data**

Scatterplots of raw data are presented in Figure S4.
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Figure S4. *Scatterplots of individual athletic experience by team social class composition in Study 2, clockwise from top left: (A) middle-class students on working individually teams, (B) working-class students on working individually teams, (C) middle-class students on working together teams, and (D) working-class students on working together teams.*

**Study 3**

We also measured four additional psychological outcomes as indicators of participants’ perceptions of the task, which we do not report in detail in the main text. Four were related to engagement: (a) task engagement, (b) task difficulty, (c) self-efficacy, and (d) empowerment. Only for participants in the *working together* condition, we also included a partner evaluation measure. Finally, two measures were related to cultural models of self: (a) independent and interdependent self-construal, and (b) inclusion of other in self. We also measured two other proxies of social class: (a) subjective SES, and (b) self-reported income.

**Additional Measures**

We collected responses to additional variables not included in the main text.

**Engagement with task*.*** We measured engagement with the task with a 7-item measure that we created for this purpose (e.g., “To what extent were you committed to performing well on the task?” and “How motivated were you to perform well on the task?”; 1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*; ⍺ = .83).

**Perceived task difficulty*.*** We measured perceived difficulty of the task via a 4-item measure adapted from previous research (Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012; e.g., “How easy was the task?,” “How difficult was the task?” (reverse-scored), “How stressful was it completing the task?” and “Did you feel like you had enough time to complete the task”; 1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very*; ⍺ = .76).

**Comfort with task.** We measured comfort with task with a 2-item measure building on previous research (Stephens, Fryberg et al., 2012). The two items were: “How comfortable did it feel to work on the task?” and “How natural did it feel to work on the task?” (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*; *r*(317) = .77).

**Self-efficacy.** We measured self-efficacy on the task with a 4-item measure adapted from previous research (Law & Hall, 2009). The four items were: “During the task I was able to stay positive when performing the task,” “During the task I was able to utilize the strategies required to perform well on the task,” “During the task I was able to stay motivated to perform well on the task,” and “During the task I was able to stay focused when performing the task” (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*; ⍺ = .82).

**Empowerment.** We measured empowerment on the task with a 3-item measure adapted from previous research (Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996). The three items were: “I was able to perform the task in a way that was right for me,” “I had the power to influence my experience during the task, and “I was able to perform the necessary activities to succeed on the task” (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*; ⍺ = .79).

**Partner evaluations*.*** Participants in the working *together* condition also completed an 8-item partner evaluation measure after the partner interaction that we created for this purpose (e.g., “How competent was your partner?”, “To what extent would you be willing to work with your partner again in the future?” on a scale from 1 = *Not at all* to 7 = *Very much*; ⍺ = .92).

**Interdependent self-construal.** We measured interdependent self-construal with 4 items adapted from previous research (Singelis, 1994). The 4 items were: “It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group,” “I respect people who are modest about themselves,” “I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments,” and “It is important for me to respect decisions made by the group,” (1 = *Does not describe me well*, 7 = *Describes me very well*; ⍺ = .68).

**Independent self-construal.** We measured independent self-construal with 4 items adapted from previous research (Singelis, 1994). The 4 items were “I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards,” “I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met,” “I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects,” and “My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me” (1 = *Does not describe me well*, 7 = *Describes me very well*; ⍺ = .65).

**Inclusion of other in the self.** We measured perceived overlap between the self and two close others: closest friend and mother utilizing the scale developed by Aron, Aron, & Smollan (1992).

**Subjective SES.** Participants completed the ladder measure of subjective SES (Adler et al., 2000; 1 = *lowest rung of the ladder*, 10 = *highest rung*).

**Income.** Participants completed an item assessing income (“What is your yearly household income?; 0 = *$9,999 or less*, 8 = *Greater than $200,000*).

**Additional Analyses: Components of Subjective Experience**

We also included results when analyzing the two components of subjective experience separately (i.e., sense of fit and subjective performance).

**Additional Analyses: Additional Perceptions of Task**

Following the analyses in the main text, we included the same two key control variables in all of our analyses: self-rated familiarity with the task and how seriously participants took the task. We investigated social class × task condition interactions for the measures related to the task (i.e., engagement, perceived difficulty, self-efficacy, and learner empowerment, time spent on the task).

**Additional Analyses: Additional Perceptions of Task**

**Engagement with task.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on engagement with task, *F*(1, 313) = 2.01, *p* = .16, *η*2 = .006.

**Perceived task difficulty.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on perceived task difficulty, *F*(1, 313) = 0.97, *p* = .33, *η*2 = .003.

**Comfort with task.** We obtained a significant task condition × social class interaction on comfort, *F*(1, 313) = 6.28, *p* = .013, *η*2 = .02. Decomposing the interaction, in the *working individually* condition, individuals from working-class contexts reported lower comfort (*M* = 5.47, *SE* = 0.11) than individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = 5.81, *SE* = 0.12), *F*(1, 313) = 4.71, *p* = .03, *η*2 = .015. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, though in the predicted direction, individuals from working-class contexts did not differ in their comfort (*M* = 5.70, *SE* = 0.13) compared to individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = 5.42, *SE* = 0.14), *F*(1, 313) = 2.13, *p* = .15, *η*2 = 0.007.

Next, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among individuals from working-class contexts, though in the predicted direction, participants in the *working together* condition did not report significantly higher comfort (*M* = 5.70, *SE* = 0.13) than those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 5.47, *SE* = 0.11), *F*(1, 313) = 1.83, *p* = .18, *η*2 = .006. In contrast, among individuals from middle-class contexts, those in the *working together* condition reported significantly lower comfort (*M* = 5.42, *SE* = 0.13) than those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 5.81, *SE* = 0.12), *F*(1, 313) = 4.71, *p* = .03, *η*2 = .015.

**Self-efficacy.** We obtained a significant task condition × social class interaction on self-efficacy, *F*(1, 313) = 4.80, *p* = .029, *η*2 = .015. Decomposing the interaction, in the *working individually* condition, people from working-class contexts reported lower self-efficacy (*M* = 6.22, *SE* = 0.06) than people from middle-class contexts (*M* = 6.42, *SE* = 0.07), *F*(1, 313) = 4.74, *p* = .03, *η*2 = .015. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, people from working-class contexts did not differ in their self-efficacy (*M* = 6.37, *SE* = 0.08) compared to people from middle-class contexts (*M* = 6.25, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 313) = 1.09, *p* = .30, *η*2 = 0.003.

Next, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, participants in the *working together* condition did not report significantly greater self-efficacy (*M* = 6.37, *SE* = 0.08) than those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 6.22, *SE* = 0.06), *F*(1, 313) = 2.15, *p* = .14, *η*2 = .007. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, those in the *working together* condition reported marginally lower self-efficacy (*M* = 6.25, *SE* = 0.08) than those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 6.42, *SE* = 0.07), *F*(1, 313) = 2.67, *p* = .10, *η*2 = .008.

**Empowerment.** We obtained a significant task condition × social class interaction on empowerment, *F*(1, 313) = 4.00, *p* = .046, *η*2 = .013. Decomposing the interaction, in the *working individually* condition, people from working-class contexts reported marginally lower empowerment (*M* = 6.15, *SE* = 0.08) than people from middle-class contexts (*M* = 6.36, *SE* = 0.09), *F*(1, 313) = 3.02, *p* = .08, *η*2 = .01. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, people from working-class contexts did not differ in their reported empowerment (*M* = 5.94, *SE* = 0.10) compared to people from middle-class contexts (*M* = 5.77, *SE* = 0.11), *F*(1, 313) = 1.35, *p* = .25, *η*2 = 0.004.

Next, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, participants in the *working together* condition did not report significantly lower empowerment (*M* = 5.94, *SE* = 0.10) compared to those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 6.15, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 313) = 2.42, *p* = .12, *η*2 = .008. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, those in the *working together* condition reported significantly lower empowerment (*M* = 5.77, *SE* = 0.11) than those in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 6.36, *SE* = 0.09), *F*(1, 313) = 17.98, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .054.

**Time spent on task.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on time spent on task, *F*(1, 313) = 0.59, *p* = .44, *η*2 = .002.

**Partner evaluation.** We obtained a marginal main effect of social class on partner evaluations, *F*(1, 124) = 2.91, *p* = .09, *η*2 = .02. People from working-class contexts rated their partner marginally more positively (*M* = 5.58, *SE* = 0.16) than people from middle-class contexts (*M* = 5.19, *SE* = 0.17).

**Additional Analyses: Constructs Related to Models of Self**

We investigated main effects of social class for the measures related to the self more generally (i.e., self-construal and inclusion of other in the self).

**Additional Results: Constructs Related to Models of Self**

**Interdependent self-construal.** We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on interdependent self-construal, *F*(1, 313) = 0.75, *p* = .39, *η*2 = .002.

**Independent self-construal.** We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on independent self-construal, *F*(1, 313) = 1.93, *p* = .17, *η*2 = .006.

**Inclusion of other in the self.** We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on inclusion of closest friend in the self, *F*(1, 313) = 0.27, *p* = .60, *η*2 = .001. We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on inclusion of mother in the self, *F*(1, 313) = 0.90, *p* = .34, *η*2 = .003.

**Additional Analyses: Educational Attainment as a Linear Predictor**

As in Study 1, we also conducted analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using educational attainment as a linear predictor, rather than creating a dichotomous working-class vs. middle-class indicator variable. As such, higher scores on this continuous predictor reflect higher levels of educational attainment, and higher levels of social class (Scale: 1 = *Less than a high school degree*, 6 = *Graduate or Professional Degree (MA/PhD, JD, MBA, MD)*.

**Additional Results: Educational Attainment as a Linear Predictor**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a marginally significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (continuous educational attainment) interaction on task performance, *b* = -2.29, *t*(313) = -1.86, *p* = .064, 95% CI = [-4.716, 0.130].

This also enabled us to conduct a Johnson-Neyman floodlight analysis (Spiller, Fitzsimons, Lynch, & McClelland, 2013) using the PROCESS Macro in SPSS (Hayes, 2018). Entering educational attainment as a continuous moderator, the cutoff value for the region of significance emerged as 3.90. 42% of the sample fell into the region of significance, while the remaining 58% fell above the region of significance. In other words, this is roughly equivalent to saying that among participants with education level ≤ 4 (i.e., those with a 2-year college degree or less), those in the working together task condition performed significantly better than those in the working individually condition. Among participants with education level > 4 (i.e., those with a 4-year college degree or more), those in the working together task condition did not perform significantly differently than those in the working individually condition. The results of this floodlight analysis further support the validity of our binary indicator which distinguishes between individuals with less than a college degree vs. those with a college degree or more.

**Subjective experience with task.** Consistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (continuous educational attainment) interaction on subjective experience with the task, *b* = -0.19, *t*(313) = -2.61, *p* = .01.

Similar to performance, we again conducted a Johnson-Neyman floodlight analysis using the PROCESS Macro in SPSS. Entering educational attainment as a continuous moderator, two distinct regions of significance emerged: the cutoff value for the first region of significance was 2.04. 12% of the sample fell into this region of significance, while the remaining 88% fell above the region of significance. The cutoff value for the second region of significance was 4.95. 53% of the sample fell into this region of significance, while the remaining 47% fell above this region of significance. In other words, this is roughly equivalent to saying that among participants with education level ≤ 2 (i.e., those with a high school degree or less), those in the working together task condition reported a significantly more positive experience with the task than those in the working individually condition. For participants with 2 < education level < 5 (i.e., those with some college experience or a two-year college degree), those in the working together task condition did not report a significantly different experience with the task compared to those in the working individually condition. Finally, among participants with education level ≥ 5 (i.e., those with a 4-year college degree or more), those in the working together task condition reported a significantly more negative experience with the task than those in the working individually condition.

**Additional Analyses: Subjective SES**

We also conducted multiple regression analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using self-reported subjective SES as an alternate proxy for social class. Note that we include as many participants as possible in the following analyses, and as such degrees of freedom may differ by analysis because not all participants provided responses for a given alternative indicator of social class.

**Additional Results: Subjective SES**

**Performance.** Inconsistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as an indicator of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class (subjective SES) interaction, *b* = -0.587, *t*(312) = -0.654, *p* = .514, 95% CI = [-2.355, 1.181].

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as an indicator of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class (subjective SES) interaction, *b* = -0.038, *t*(312) = -0.721, *p* = .471, 95% CI = [-0.140, 0.065].

**Additional Analyses: Income**

We also conducted multiple regression analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using income as an alternate proxy for social class.

**Additional Results: Income**

**Performance.** Inconsistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as an indicator of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class (income) interaction, *b* = 0.155, *t*(313) = 0.167, *p* = .868, 95% CI = [-1.672, 1.981].

**Subjective experience with task.** Consistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as an indicator of social class, we obtained a marginally significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class (income) interaction, *b* = -0.105, *t*(313) = -1.962, *p* = .051, 95% CI = [-0.209, 0.000]. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. Supporting Hypothesis 2a, in the *working individually* task condition, higher income was associated with a significantly better experience with the task, *b* = 0.091, *t*(313) = 2.599, *p* = .010, 95% CI = [0.022, 0.161]. In contrast, in the *working together* task condition, higher income was not significantly associated with a worse experience with the task, *b* = -0.013, *t*(313) = -0.332, *p* = .740, 95% CI = [-0.092, 0.065].

Next, we compared subjective experience with the task at low (-1 *SD*) and high (+1 *SD*) income. Among low-income individuals (-1 *SD*), though in the predicted direction, being in the *working together* task condition was not associated with a significantly better experience with the task, *b* = 0.123, *t*(313) = 0.979, *p* = .328. In contrast, among high-income individuals (+1 *SD*), being in the *working together* task condition was associated with a marginally worse experience with the task, *b* = -0.218, *t*(313) = -1.790, *p* = .074.

**Additional Analyses: Demographic Covariates**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text including URM status and gender as covariates.

**Additional Results with Demographic Covariates**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a marginally significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for gender and URM status, *F*(1, 311) = 2.99, *p* = .085, *η*2 = .01. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 48.05, *SE* = 1.60) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 42.80, *SE* = 1.31), *F*(1, 311) = 6.41, *p* = .012, *η*2 = .02. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition did not perform significantly differently (*M* = 48.44, *SE* = 1.68) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 48.41, *SE* = 1.40), *F*(1, 311) = 0, *p* = .99.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed significantly worse (*M* = 42.80, *SE* = 1.31) than yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 48.41, *SE* = 1.40), *F*(1, 311) = 8.52, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .03. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 48.05, *SE* = 1.60) as dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 48.44, *SE* = 1.68), *F*(1, 311) = 0.03, *p* = .87.

**Subjective experience with task.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for gender and URM status, *F*(1, 311) = 7.74, *p* = .006, *η*2 = .02. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, individuals in the *working together* condition reported marginally more positive experience with the task (*M* = 0.08, *SE* = 0.09) compared to individuals in the *working individually* condition (*M* = -0.13, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 311) = 2.86, *p* = .09, *η*2 = .009. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, individuals in the *working together* condition reported significantly more negative experience with the task (*M* = -0.12, *SE* = 0.10) than individuals in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 0.17, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 311) = 5.01, *p* = .03, *η*2 = .02.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, individuals from working-class contexts reported significantly more negative experience with the task (*M* = -0.13, *SE* = 0.08) than individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = 0.17, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 311) = 6.72, *p* = .01, *η*2 = .02. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, individuals from working-class contexts reported directionally more positive experience with the task (*M* = 0.08, *SE* = 0.09) than individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = -0.12, *SE* = 0.10), *F*(1, 311) = 2.17, *p* = .14, *η*2 = .007.

**Additional Analyses: Without Covariates**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text without covariates.

**Additional Results Without Covariates**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a marginally significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction, *F*(1, 315) = 2.98, *p* = .086, *η*2 = .01. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 48.06, *SD* = 12.87) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 42.87, *SD* = 11.71), *F*(1, 315) = 6.24, *p* = .013, *η*2 = .02. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition did not perform significantly differently (*M* = 48.34, *SD* = 16.40) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 48.37, *SD* = 12.62), *F*(1, 315) = 0, *p* = .99, *η*2 = 0.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed significantly worse (*M* = 42.87, *SD* = 11.71) than yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 48.37, *SD* = 12.62), *F*(1, 315) = 8.24, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .03. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 48.06, *SD* = 12.87) as dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 48.34, *SD* = 16.40), *F*(1, 315) = 0.03, *p* = .86, *η*2 = 0.

**Subjective experience with task.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction, *F*(1, 315) = 8.19, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .03. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, though in the predicted direction, individuals in the *working together* condition did not report a significantly more positive experience with the task (*M* = 0.07, *SD* = 0.85) compared to individuals in the *working individually* condition (*M* = -0.13, *SD* = 0.88), *F*(1, 315) = 2.46, *p* = .12, *η*2 = .008. In contrast, among people from middle-class contexts, individuals in the *working together* condition reported a significantly more negative experience with the task (*M* = -0.14, *SD* = 0.70) than individuals in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 0.19, *SD* = 0.76), *F*(1, 315) = 6.03, *p* = .015, *η*2 = .02.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, individuals from working-class contexts reported significantly more negative experiences with the task (*M* = -0.13, *SD* = 0.88) than individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = 0.19, *SD* = 0.76), *F*(1, 315) = 7.14, *p* = .008, *η*2 = .02. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, though in the predicted direction, individuals from working-class contexts did not report significantly more positive experiences with the task (*M* = 0.07, *SD* = 0.85) than individuals from middle-class contexts (*M* = -0.14, *SD* = 0.70), *F*(1, 315) = 2.28, *p* = .13, *η*2 = .007.

**Study 4**

**Main Text**

**Effective Group Processes Coding.** We report descriptive statistics for all video coding dimensions in Table S8.

Table S8. *Descriptive statistics for all coded effective group process variables in Study 4.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Code | *Minimum* | *Maximum* | *Mean* | *SD* |
| Turns/Minute | 1.08 | 12.83 | 6.7838 | 2.35084 |
| Task Focus | 3 | 7 | 6.6618 | 0.78437 |
| Information Sharing | 2 | 7 | 5.6618 | 1.29995 |
| Integrativeness | 2 | 7 | 3.8824 | 1.45098 |
| Positive Responsiveness | 1 | 5 | 2.7647 | 1.00918 |
| Elaboration | 1 | 5 | 3.4265 | 1.11055 |
| Opinion-Seeking | 1 | 5 | 3.0882 | 1.15559 |
| Coordination | 2 | 5 | 3.3235 | 0.98407 |

**Additional Measures**

The additional measures included in Study 4 were identical to that of Study 3 (i.e., engagement, perceived difficulty, self-efficacy, empowerment, time spent on the task, partner evaluation, interdependent and independent self-construal, and inclusion of other in the self), with the exception of income. Given that participants were current college students, we instead asked participants to report on family income, as in Study 1:

**Family income.** Participants completed one item assessing family income (“What was your family’s yearly household income when you last lived with your parents?; 0 = *$9,999 or less*, 8 = *Greater than $200,000*).

**Additional Analyses: Additional Perceptions of Task**

As in Study 3, we investigated social class × task condition interactions for the measures related to the task (i.e., engagement, perceived difficulty, self-efficacy, empowerment, and time spent on the task), utilizing the same covariates as in the main text (i.e., self-rated familiarity with the task and how seriously participants took the task).

**Additional Results: Additional Perceptions of Task**

**Engagement with task.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on engagement, *F*(1, 273) = 0.51, *p* = .48.

**Perceived task difficulty.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on perceived task difficulty, *F*(1, 273) = 1.07, *p* = .30, *η*2 = .004.

**Comfort with task.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on comfort, *F*(1, 272) = .268, *p* = .61.

**Stress.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on stress, *F*(1, 272) = .003, *p* = .96.

**Self-efficacy.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on self-efficacy, *F*(1, 273) = 0.04, *p* = .85.

**Empowerment.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on empowerment, *F*(1, 273) = 0.28, *p* = .60.

**Time spent on task.** We did not obtain a significant task condition × social class interaction on time spent on task, *F*(1, 273) = 0.002, *p* = .97.

**Partner evaluation.** We did not obtain a significant effect of social class on partner evaluations, *F*(1, 139) = 0.41, *p* = .52.

**Additional Analyses: Constructs Related to Models of Self**

As in Study 2, we investigated main effects of social class for the measures related to the self more generally (i.e., self-construal and inclusion of other in the self).

**Additional Results: Constructs Related to Models of Self**

**Interdependent self-construal.** We obtained a marginally significant main effect of social class on interdependent self-construal, *F*(1, 273) = 2.83, *p* = .09, *η*2 = .01. Contrary to previous research (Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012), students from working-class contexts endorsed marginally less interdependent self-construals (*M* = 5.38, *SE* = 0.07) than students from middle-class contexts (*M* = 5.55, *SE* = 0.08).

**Independent self-construal.** We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on independent self-construal, *F*(1, 273) = 1.46, *p* = .23, *η*2 = .005.

**Inclusion of other in the self.** We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on inclusion of closest friend in the self, *F*(1, 273) = 0.01, *p* = .91, *η*2 = .0. We did not obtain a significant main effect of social class on inclusion of mother in the self, *F*(1, 273) = 0.05, *p* = .83, *η*2 = .0.

**Additional Analyses: URM-URM Dyads**

As noted in Footnote 15 in the main text, several key results comparing URM-URM dyads to all other types of dyads suggest the possibility that URM-URM dyads may have inferred that the study was about race.

**Additional Results: URM-URM Dyads**

**Performance.** Performance was significantly lower among URM-URM dyads (*M* = 68.22, *SD* = 8.43) than for all other types of dyads (*M* = 60.52, *SD* = 13.51), *F*(1, 116) = 5.45, *p* = .021, *η*2 = .045.

**Stress.** Members of URM-URM dyads also reported experiencing more stress while completing the task (*M* = 3.23, *SD* = 1.65) than members of other types of dyads (*M* = 2.53, *SD* = 1.56), *F*(1, 122) = 3.56, *p* = .062, *η*2 = .028.

**Additional Analyses: Prescreen Indicator of Social Class Background**

As noted in Footnote 16, we also conducted analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using participants’ prescreen social class background classification (i.e., how they were recruited to the study), rather than their responses to post-task demographic questionnaires.

**Additional Results: Prescreen Indicator of Social Class Background**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text utilizing participants’ responses to the post-task demographic survey as the proxy of social class, we obtained a significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class background (prescreen response) interaction on task performance, *F*(1, 270) = 6.86, *p* = .009, *η*2 = .025. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 57.48, *SE* = 1.27) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.19, *SE* = 1.45), *F*(1, 270) = 33.82, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .11. Among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition did not perform significantly better (*M* = 49.26, *SE* = 1.94) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.25, *SE* = 1.61) , *F*(1, 270) = 1.42, *p* = .24, *η*2 = .005.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 46.19, *SE* = 1.45) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 46.25, *SE* = 1.61), *F*(1, 270) = 0.001, *p* = .98. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 57.48, *SE* = 1.27) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 49.26, *SE* = 1.94), *F*(1, 270) = 12.59, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .045.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (prescreen response) interaction on subjective experience with the task, *F*(1, 270) = 1.03, *p* = .31.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance when using prescreen response as a proxy of social class. We entered prescreen response as our predictor, performance as our outcome, and turn-taking as our putative mediator. Mediation analyses indicated that turn-taking mediated the observed relationship between prescreen response and performance. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of 3.697 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of 1.040, 7.949]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of social class on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that dyads from working-class (vs. middle-class) contexts took significantly more turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform better on the task.

**Additional Analyses: Excluding Individuals with Mismatched Social Class Indicators**

We also conducted analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) excluding the *n* = 14 individuals who had mismatched prescreen vs. post-task social class background indicators.

**Additional Results: Excluding Individuals with Mismatched Social Class Indicators**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class background interaction on task performance, *F*(1, 256) = 8.30, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .031. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 58.16, *SE* = 1.34) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.14, *SE* = 1.42), *F*(1, 256) = 37.38, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .127. Among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition did not perform significantly better (*M* = 49.24, *SE* = 1.90) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.27, *SE* = 1.57) , *F*(1, 256) = 1.45, *p* = .23, *η*2 = .006.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 46.14, *SE* = 1.42) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 46.27, *SE* = 1.57), *F*(1, 256) = 0.004, *p* = .95. In contrast, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 58.16, *SE* = 1.34) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 49.24, *SE* = 1.90), *F*(1, 256) =14.75, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .054.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class interaction on subjective experience with the task, *F*(1, 256) = 1.55, *p* = .22.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance when using prescreen response as a proxy of social class. We entered prescreen response as our predictor, performance as our outcome, and turn-taking as our putative mediator. Mediation analyses indicated that turn-taking mediated the observed relationship between prescreen response and performance. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of 3.743 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of [0.839, 8.322]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of social class on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that dyads from working-class (vs. middle-class) contexts took significantly more turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform better on the task.

**Additional Analyses: Parental Educational Attainment as a Linear Predictor**

As in Study 3, we also conducted analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using parental educational attainment as a linear predictor, rather than creating a dichotomous working-class vs. middle-class background indicator variable. We took the mean of maternal and paternal educational attainment to create an average parental educational attainment indicator. As such, higher scores on this continuous predictor reflect higher levels of mean parental educational attainment, and higher levels of social class background (Scale: 1 = *Less than a high school degree*, 6 = *Graduate or Professional Degree (MA/PhD, JD, MBA, MD)*.

**Additional Results: Parental Educational Attainment as a Linear Predictor**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class background (mean parental educational attainment) interaction on task performance, *b* = -2.70, *t*(270) = -2.98, *p* = .003, 95% CI = [-4.479, -0.914].

We again conducted a Johnson-Neyman floodlight analysis using the PROCESS Macro in SPSS. Entering mean parental educational attainment as a continuous moderator, the cutoff value for the region of significance emerged as 5.22. 75% of the sample fell into the region of significance, while the remaining 25% fell above the region of significance. In other words, this is roughly equivalent to saying that among participants with mean parental education level ≤ 5 (i.e., mean parental educational attainment less than 4-year college degrees), those in the working together task condition performed significantly better than those in the working individually condition. Among participants with mean parental education level > 5 (i.e., mean parental educational attainment greater than a 4-year college degree), those in the working together task condition did not perform significantly differently than those in the working individually condition. The results of this floodlight analysis further support the validity of our binary indicator which distinguishes between individuals with parents who have less than a college degree vs. those who have parents with a college degree or more.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results in the main text utilizing a binary indicator as the proxy of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (continuous parental educational attainment) interaction on subjective experience with the task, *b* = -0.08, *t*(270) = -1.57, *p* = .12.

Though we were not able to perform a Johnson-Neyman floodlight analysis, given that the overall interaction failed to reach significance, we still examined the conditional effect of task condition on subjective experience at high vs. low levels of mean parental educational attainment (i.e., ±1 *SD*). For those with low (-1 *SD*) levels of mean parental educational (i.e., mean parental educational attainment < 2), individuals in the working together condition reported a marginally more positive experience with the task than individuals in the working individually condition, effect = 0.22, *t*(270) = 1.90, *p* = .06. In contrast, for those with high (+1 *SD*) levels of mean parental educational attainment (i.e., mean parental educational attainment > 5), individuals in the working together condition did not significantly differ in their experience with the task compared to individuals in the working individually condition, effect = -0.04, *t*(270) = -0.31, *p* = .76.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance when using mean parental educational attainment as a proxy of social class. We entered mean parental educational attainment as our predictor, performance as our outcome, and turn-taking as our putative mediator. Mediation analyses indicated that turn-taking mediated the observed relationship between mean parental educational attainment and performance. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of -0.952 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of [-2.202, -0.219]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of mean parental educational attainment on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that, as the mean parental educational attainment of a dyad increased, they took significantly fewer turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform less well on the task.

**Additional Analyses: Subjective SES**

As in Study 2, we also conducted multiple regression analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using self-reported subjective SES as an alternate proxy for social class.

**Additional Results: Subjective SES**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as the proxy of social class, we obtained a significant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (subjective SES) interaction on task performance, *b* = -1.92, *t*(273) = -2.08, *p* = .038, 95% CI = [-3.727, -0.106]. Decomposing the interaction, in the *working individually* task condition, though in the predicted direction, higher subjective SES was not significantly associated with task performance, *b* = 0.644, *t*(273) = 0.997, *p* = .320. In support of Hypothesis 1b, in the *working together* task condition, higher subjective SES was marginally negatively associated with task performance, *b* = -1.273, *t*(273) = -1.941, *p* = .053.

Next, we compared performance at low (-1 *SD*) and high (+1 *SD*) subjective SES. Among those individuals low in subjective SES (-1 *SD*), being in the *working together* task condition was significantly positively associated with task performance, *b* = 12.146, *t*(273) = 5.620, *p* < .001. In contrast, among individuals high in subjective SES (+1 *SD*), being in the *working together* task condition was also significantly positively associated with task performance, but the magnitude of this effect was much smaller than those individuals low in subjective SES, *b* = 5.818, *t*(273) = 2.683, *p* = .008.

**Subjective experience with task.** Though generally consistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as a proxy for social class, the task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (subjective SES) interaction on subjective experience with task was not significant, *b* = 0.06, *t*(273) = 1.32, *p* = .19.

**Additional Analyses: Family Income**

As in Study 2, we also conducted multiple regression analyses on our key dependent measures (i.e., performance and subjective experience) instead using self-reported family household income as an alternate proxy for social class.

**Additional Results: Family Income**

**Performance.** Inconsistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as the proxy of social class, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (family income) interaction on task performance, *b* = -0.34, *t*(268) = -0.40, *p* = .69.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results utilizing parental educational attainment as a proxy for social class, the task condition (*working individually* vs. *together*) × social class (family income) interaction on subjective experience with task was not significant, *b* = -0.02, *t*(268) = -0.39, *p* = .69.

**Additional Analyses: Participants Binned by Assignment Strategy**

As noted in Footnote 17, we also conducted the same analyses as in the main text on our key dependent measures utilizing a variable that represented the bin to which participants were assigned based on our assignment strategy outlined in the main text as the condition predictor (vs. the working individually vs. together condition predictor utilized in the main text). These analyses ensure that our assignment strategy did not introduce any systematic confounds. This condition indicator has three levels: individuals assigned to the working individually condition who showed up as a solo participant to an experimental session vs. individuals randomly assigned to the working individually condition who showed up to a session where other participants also showed up and were assigned to the working together condition vs. individuals assigned to the working together condition.

**Additional Results with Participants Binned by Assignment Strategy**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*assigned to working together* vs. *randomly assigned to working individually* vs. *assigned to working individually condition by default*) × social class interaction, *F*(2, 268) = 3.24, *p* = .041, *η*2 = .024. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 58.19, *SE* = 1.35) compared to yoked participants in the *randomly assigned to working individually* condition (*M* = 48.58, *SE* = 1.81), and yoked participants in the *assigned to working individually by default* condition (*M* = 42.12, *SE* = 2.35), *F*(2, 268) = 20.51, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .133. Among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition did not perform significantly better (*M* = 50.27, *SE* = 1.67) than yoked participants in the *randomly assigned to working individually* condition (*M* = 46.81, *SE* = 1.81) or yoked participants in the *assigned to working individually by default* condition (*M* = 44.47, *SE* = 3.32), *F*(2, 268) = 1.67, *p* = .190, *η*2 = .012.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *assigned to working individually by default* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 42.12, *SE* = 2.35) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 44.47, *SE* = 3.32), *F*(1, 268) = 0.34, *p* = .562, *η*2 = .001. Similarly, in the *randomly assigned to working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 48.58, *SE* = 1.81) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 46.81, *SE* = 1.81), *F*(1, 268) = 0.48, *p* = .489, *η*2 = .002. In contrast, and equivalent to the results reported in the main text, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 58.19, *SE* = 1.35) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 50.27, *SE* = 1.67), *F*(1, 268) = 13.67, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .049.

**Subjective experience with task.** We obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*assigned to working together* vs. *randomly assigned to working individually* vs. *assigned to working individually condition by default*) × social class interaction, *F*(2, 268) = 1.08, *p* = .340, *η*2 = .008. We nonetheless decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Consistent with the results reported in the main text, among people from working-class contexts, individuals in the *working together* condition reported having a directionally better experience with the task (*M* = 0.08, *SE* = 0.07) compared to individuals in the *randomly assigned to working individually* condition (*M* = -0.03, *SE* = 0.10), and a significantly better experience with the task compared to individuals in the *assigned to working individually by default* condition (*M* = -0.31, *SE* = 0.13), *F*(2, 268) = 3.52, *p* = .031, *η*2 = .026. Among people from middle-class contexts, individuals in the *working together* condition did not report having a significantly different experience with the task (*M* = -0.012, *SE* = 0.09) compared to both individuals in the *randomly assigned to working individually* condition (*M* = 0.11 *SE* = 0.10) and individuals in the *assigned to working individually by default* condition (*M* = -0.14, *SE* = 0.18), *F*(2, 268) = 0.91, *p* = .404.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. There were no significant differences by social class background across task condition, *p*’s > .30.

**Additional Analyses: Demographic Covariates**

We also conducted additional sets of analyses on our key dependent measures including URM status and gender as covariates.

**Additional Results with Demographic Covariates**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for gender and URM status, *F*(1, 268) = 5.42, *p* = .021, *η*2 = .02. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 57.89, *SE* = 1.36) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.71, *SE* = 1.45), *F*(1, 268) = 31.09, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .10. Among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition also performed marginally better (*M* = 50.18, *SE* = 1.67) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.09, *SE* = 1.60), but this difference was much smaller in magnitude than the difference for working-class participants, *F*(1, 268) = 3.13, *p* = .078, *η*2 = .012.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 46.71, *SE* = 1.45) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 46.09, *SE* = 1.60), *F*(1, 268) = 0.08, *p* = .77. In contrast, and consistent with the results in the main text, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 57.89, *SE* = 1.36) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 50.18, *SE* = 1.67), *F*(1, 268) = 12.92, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .046.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for gender and URM status, *F*(1, 268) = 1.89, *p* = .17, *η*2 = .007.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance when controlling for gender and URM status. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of 3.288 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of [0.793, 7.854]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of social class on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that, controlling for gender and URM status, working-class (vs. middle-class) dyads took significantly more turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform better on the task.

**Additional Analyses: Study Location Covariate**

We also conducted additional sets of analyses on our key dependent measures including study location as a covariate.

**Additional Results with Study Location Covariate**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for study location, *F*(1, 269) = 6.09, *p* = .014, *η*2 = .022. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 57.53, *SE* = 1.44) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.10, *SE* = 1.45), *F*(1, 269) = 31.32, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .104. Among people from middle-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition also performed marginally better (*M* = 50.73, *SE* = 1.72) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.87, *SE* = 1.66), but this difference was much smaller in magnitude than the difference for working-class participants, *F*(1, 269) = 2.74, *p* = .099, *η*2 = .01.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts performed just as well (*M* = 46.10, *SE* = 1.45) as yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 46.87, *SE* = 1.66), *F*(1, 269) = 0.12, *p* = .73. In contrast, and consistent with the results in the main text, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 57.53, *SE* = 1.44) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 50.73, *SE* = 1.72), *F*(1, 269) = 8.67, *p* = .004, *η*2 = .031.

**Subjective experience with task.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a marginally significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction when controlling for study location, *F*(1, 269) = 3.03, *p* = .083, *η*2 = .011. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, participants in the *working together* condition reported having a significantly better experience with the task (*M* = 0.09, *SE* = 0.08) compared to participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = -0.13, *SE* = 0.08), *F*(1, 269) = 4.05, *p* = .045, *η*2 = .015. Among people from middle-class contexts, participants in the *working together* condition did not report a significantly different experience with the task (*M* = -0.02, *SE* = 0.09) than participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 0.05, *SE* = 0.09), *F*(1, 269) = 0.28, *p* = .60.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, though in the predicted direction, participants from working-class contexts did not report having significantly worse experience with the task (*M* = -0.13, *SE* = 0.08) than participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = 0.05, *SE* = 0.09), *F*(1, 269) = 2.12, *p* = .15. In the *working together* condition, participants from working-class contexts reported having a similarly positive experience with the task (*M* = 0.09, *SE* = 0.08) as participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = -0.02, *SE* = 0.09), *F*(1, 269) = 0.84, *p* = .36.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance when controlling for study location. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of 1.841 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of [0.112, 5.457]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of social class on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that, controlling for study location, working-class (vs. middle-class) dyads took significantly more turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform better on the task.

**Additional Analyses: Without Covariates**

We also conducted the same analyses as in the main text without covariates.

**Additional Results Without Covariates**

**Performance.** Consistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a significant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction without covariates, *F*(1, 272) = 6.19, *p* = .013, *η*2 = .022. We decomposed the interaction to compare the simple effects across social class groups and task condition. First, we compared the experiences within social class groups. Among people from working-class contexts, dyads in the *working together* condition performed significantly better (*M* = 58.09, *SD* = 13.25) compared to yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.35, *SD* = 11.26), *F*(1, 272) = 35.64, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .116. Among people from middle-class contexts, while dyads in the *working together* condition did perform marginally better (*M* = 50.33, *SD* = 14.90) than yoked participants in the *working individually* condition (*M* = 46.13, *SD* = 9.88), the magnitude of this improvement was smaller than that of the improvement among people from working-class contexts *F*(1, 272) = 3.30, *p* = .070, *η*2 = .012.

Next, we compared performance across task condition. In the *working individually* condition, yoked participants from working-class contexts did not perform significantly differently (*M* = 46.35, *SD* = 11.26) than yoked participants from middle-class contexts (*M* = *M* = 46.13, *SD* = 9.88), *F*(1, 272) = 0.01, *p* = .92, *η*2 = 0. In contrast, and consistent with the results presented in the main text, in the *working together* condition, dyads from working-class contexts performed significantly better (*M* = 58.09, *SD* = 13.25) than dyads from middle-class contexts (*M* = 50.33, *SD* = 14.90), *F*(1, 272) = 13.06, *p* < .001, *η*2 = .046.

**Subjective experience with task.** Inconsistent with the results in the main text, we obtained a nonsignificant task condition (*working together* vs. *individually*) × social class interaction without covariates, *F*(1, 272) = 0.38, *p* = .54. Importantly, as noted in the main text, our key covariates were significantly correlated with subjective experience on the task, indicating that these factors played a significant role in shaping participants’ subjective experience with the task, and likely partially account for why the interaction failed to reach significance without these covariates included. Furthermore, given the similar nature of Studies 3-4, we next conducted an internal meta-analysis of our key dependent measures in these two studies.

**Mediation of performance.** Consistent with the results reported in the main text, turn-taking mediated the relationship between social class and performance without covariates. Specifically, the analysis yielded a point estimate of 3.98 and a 95% bias-corrected CI of [1.36, 7.68]. This interval did not include zero, suggesting that the indirect effect of social class on performance through turn-taking was significant. This suggests that working-class (vs. middle-class) dyads took significantly more turns while working together on the task, which led them to perform better on the task.

**Internal Meta-Analysis of Studies 3-4**

**Method**

As noted in Footnote 18, we conducted an internal meta-analysis of Studies 3-4 to assess the overall reliability of the relevant simple effects (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2011; Goh, Hall, & Rosenthal, 2016; Mosteller & Bush, 1954; Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). When meta-analyzed, the task condition × social class interaction effects were significant across all of our key dependent measures: performance and subjective experience with the task, as well as the vast majority of the decomposed simple effects (see Tables S9-10 for more details).

**Results**

**Performance.** Supporting our theorizing, the key simple effect comparing the performance of people from working-class contexts in the individual vs. together condition was reliable (see Table S9 and Figure S5).

Table S9. *Meta-analyzed effects for performance in Studies 3-4.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Weighted *d* | 95% CI | Meta *p* |
| *Individual* Task Condition:   middle-class vs. working-class | 0.25+ | [-0.04, 0.55] | .092 |
| *Together* Task Condition:   working-class vs. middle-class | 0.29 | [-0.08, 0.66] | .129 |
| Working-class: *Together* vs. *Individual*  Task Condition | 0.68\*\*\* | [0.31, 1.05] | <.001 |
| Middle-class: *Together* vs. *Individual*  Task Condition | 0.15 | [-0.010, 0.39] | .231 |

Note: + *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.
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Figure S5. *Forest plots for the meta-analyzed task performance effect sizes across Studies 3-4. Squares show effect-size estimates (Cohen’s* d*s). The size of each square gives a representation of each study’s sample size. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The diamond represents the point estimate and 95% CI averaged across studies.*

**Subjective experience with task.** Supporting our theorizing the key simple effect comparing the subjective experience of people from working-class contexts in the individual vs. together condition was reliable (see Table S10 and Figure S6).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Weighted *d* | 95% CI | Meta *p* |
| *Individual* Task Condition:   middle-class vs. working-class | 0.25\* | [0.03, 0.47] | .025 |
| *Together* Task Condition:   working-class vs. middle-class | 0.17 | [-0.08, 0.41] | .185 |
| Working-class: *Together* vs. *Individual*  Task Condition | 0.25\* | [0.03, 0.47] | .028 |
| Middle-class: *Individual* vs. *Together*  Task Condition | 0.25\* | [0.01, 0.49] | .045 |

Table S10. *Meta-analyzed effects for subjective experience with task in Studies 3-4.*  
Note: + *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001.
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Figure S6. *Forest plots for the meta-analyzed subjective experience effect sizes across Studies 3-4. Squares show effect-size estimates (Cohen’s* d*s). The size of each square gives a representation of each study’s sample size. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The diamond represents the point estimate and 95% CI averaged across studies.*

**Discussion**

By conducting an internal meta-analysis of Studies 3-4, we provided additional evidence of the robustness of our causal effects. Specifically, we found that people from working-class contexts perform better when *working together* than when *working individually*. Furthermore, *working together* (vs. *individually*) also led individuals from working-class contexts to report having a more positive subjective experience with the task.
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