

Additional Analysis with Liking as on Outcome and Covariate

Study 1a Results

Liking

Preliminary 3 way ANOVAs with LSD post-hoc tests revealed that liking varied by condition, $F(2, 131) = 5.03, p = .008, \eta_p^2 = .07$, with managers at companies accused of anti-Asian bias ($M = 1.91, SE = 0.14$) disliked more than the control company accused of environmental misconduct ($M = 2.56, SE = 0.15, p = .002, 95\% CI = [0.24, 1.06]$), and slightly more than companies accused of anti-Latino bias ($M = 2.29, SE = 0.16, p = .07, 95\% CI = [-0.04, 0.79]$). No difference was found between the control condition and the anti-Latino company condition, $p = .21, 95\% CI = [-0.16, 0.70]$. Because liking varied by condition across all studies, ANCOVAs were conducted with liking as a covariate to demonstrate that the transfer effect could not be accounted for by a liking penalty to organizations accused of prejudice.

Anti-Asian Bias

ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 130) = 10.81, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .14$. LSD simple effects on the covariate adjusted means revealed that Asian Americans viewed the companies with Latino claimants ($M = 3.48, SE = 0.15, p = .003, 95\% CI = [0.21, 1.03]$) and Asian claimants ($M = 3.80, SE = 0.14, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.53, 1.34]$) as more biased against Asians compared to the environment claimants ($M = 2.86, SE = 0.15$), but no difference was found between Asian and Latino claimant conditions, $p = .12, 95\% CI = [-0.08, 0.72]$.

Anticipated Racial Stigmatization

ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 130) = 3.85, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .06$. Participants viewed the anti-Latino ($M = 5.44, SE = 0.23, p = .035, 95\% CI = [0.05, 1.32]$)

and anti-Asian companies ($M = 5.58$, $SE = 0.22$, $p = .01$, 95% CI = [0.20, 1.46]) as more likely to devalue their racial identity compared to the control company ($M = 4.75$, $SE = 0.23$), but no difference was found between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions, $p = .65$, 95% CI = [-0.48, 0.77].

American Threat

To test whether participants anticipated American threat, we conducted a 3 (Condition: Anti-Asian, Anti-Latino or Control) x 2 (Patriotism Perceptions: manager versus participant) mixed-model ANCOVA with repeated measures on the second factor and liking as a covariate. The degree of American threat was therefore determined by the extent to which the individual felt as though the managers at the company would view themselves as more American than the participant. The analysis revealed that participants thought that the managers would view themselves as more American than participants, $F(1, 130) = 165.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .56$, 95% CI = [1.27, 1.75], however, this effect was moderated by condition, $F(2, 130) = 3.57$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, (See Figure 1). Consistent with hypotheses, ANCOVAs examining the difference scores revealed that the American threat was larger in the anti-Latino ($M_{diff} = 1.79$, $SE = 0.22$, $p = .02$, 95% CI = [0.14, 1.37]) and anti-Asian companies ($M_{diff} = 1.70$, $SE = 0.21$, $p = .03$, 95% CI = [0.06, 1.27]) than the control ($M_{diff} = 1.03$, $SE = 0.23$), but no difference was found between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions, $p = .78$, 95% CI = [-0.52, 0.69].

Study 1b

Liking

A preliminary ANOVA followed up by LSD post-hoc tests revealed that liking varied by condition, $F(2, 114) = 4.05$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, with companies accused of Latino discrimination ($M_{Latino} = 1.80$, $SE_{Latino} = 0.15$) disliked more than the control companies ($M_{control} = 2.40$, $SE_{control}$

= 0.16), $p = .006$, 95% CI = [0.18, 1.03]. Moreover, the Asian discrimination company was viewed as marginally less favorable ($M_{asian} = 2.03$, $SE_{asian} = 0.15$) than the control company, $p = .09$, 95% CI = [-0.81, 0.06]. No difference was found between the anti-Latino and the anti-Asian conditions, $p = .28$, 95% CI = [-0.66, 0.19].

Anti-Latino Bias

Consistent with hypotheses, an ANCOVA controlling for liking revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 113) = 24.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$. Participants viewed the anti-Latino ($M = 3.58$, $SE = 0.15$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [1.12, 2.02]) and anti-Asian companies ($M = 3.10$, $SE = 0.16$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.64, 1.54]) as more biased against Latinos compared to the control company ($M = 2.01$, $SE = 0.16$), and the difference between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions was also significant, $p = .03$, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.92].

Anticipated Racial Stigmatization

Also consistent with hypotheses, an ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 113) = 12.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$. Participants viewed the anti-Latino ($M = 5.49$, $SE = 0.25$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.97, 2.43]) and anti-Asian companies ($M = 5.21$, $SE = 0.26$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.69, 2.14]) as more likely to devalue their racial identity compared to the control company ($M = 3.79$, $SE = 0.26$), but no difference was found between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions, $p = .43$, 95% CI = [-0.42, 0.99].

American Threat

As in Study 1a, the repeated measures ANCOVA revealed that participants thought that the managers would view themselves as more American than participants, $F(1, 113) = 99.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .47$, 95% CI = [1.09, 1.67], however, this effect was marginally moderated by condition $F(2, 113) = 2.59$, $p = .08$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. ANCOVAs examining the difference scores

revealed that the American downgrade was significantly larger in the anti-Latino company ($M_{diff} = 1.71, SE = 0.25, p = .03, 95\% CI = [0.72, 1.55]$) and marginally larger in the anti-Asian company conditions ($M_{diff} = 1.53, SE = 0.26, p = .09, 95\% CI = [-0.10, 1.37]$) compared to the control condition ($M_{diff} = 0.90, SE = 0.26$). No difference was found between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions, $p = .63, 95\% CI = [-0.54, 0.89]$.

Study 2

Liking

A preliminary ANOVA followed by LSD post hoc tests revealed that liking varied by condition, $F(2, 166) = 33.55, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .29$. Participants disliked the anti-Asian evaluator ($M_{asian} = 2.02, SE = 0.10; p < .001, 95\% CI = [-1.29, -0.72]$) and the anti-Latino evaluator ($M = 2.08, SE = 0.10, p < .001, 95\%, CI = [-1.35, -0.79]$) more than control evaluators ($M = 3.09, SE = 0.11$). No difference was found between the anti-Latino and the anti-Asian condition, $p = .64$.

Anti-Asian Bias

ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 165) = 49.33, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .37$. Participants viewed the anti-Latino ($M = 3.05, SE = 0.12, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.64, 1.43]$) and anti-Asian evaluators ($M = 3.95, SE = 0.12, p < .001, 95\% CI = [1.55, 2.32]$) as more biased against Asians compared to the control evaluator ($M = 2.01, SE = 0.15$), and the difference between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions was also significant, $p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.58, 1.23]$, with participants perceiving greater anti-Asian bias from the anti-Asian evaluator.

Anticipated Racial Stigmatization

ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 165) = 33.66, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .29$. Participants anticipated greater racial stigmatization from the anti-Latino ($M = 5.57,$

$SE = 0.20, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.39, 2.71]$) and anti-Asian evaluators ($M = 6.21, SE = 0.20, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [2.04, 3.35]$) compared to the control evaluator ($M = 3.52, SE = 0.24$), and the difference between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions was also significant, $p = .02, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.10, 1.19]$, with participants anticipating greater racial stigma from the anti-Asian evaluator.

American Threat

Recall that the other perception measure was unreliable in Study 2. Thus, ANCOVA was conducted, revealing a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 165) = 13.21, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .14$. Participants anticipated being viewed as significantly less American from the anti-Latino ($M = 3.24, SE = 0.13, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-1.40, -0.56]$) and anti-Asian evaluators ($M = 3.23, SE = 0.13, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-1.40, -0.57]$) compared to the control evaluator ($M = 4.22, SE = 0.15$), and the difference between the anti-Asian and anti-Latino conditions was not significant, $p = .96, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.36, 0.34]$.

Study 3

Liking

An ANOVA followed up by LSD post-hoc tests revealed that liking significantly varied by condition, $F(2, 112) = 3.69, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .06$, with companies accused of anti-Latino prejudice that involved American threats ($M = 1.74, SE = 0.14, p = .02, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.10, 0.89]$) or competence threats ($M = 2.24, SE = 0.14, p = .03, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.05, 0.89]$) disliked more than the control company ($M_{\text{control}} = 2.24, SE_{\text{control}} = 0.14$). No difference was found between the American or competence threat conditions, $p = .89, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.38, 0.44]$.

Anti-Asian Bias

An ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 111) = 14.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .21$. Participants viewed the anti-Latino American-based threats ($M = 3.09, SE = 0.16, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.70, 1.63]$) and anti-Latino competence-based threats ($M = 3.03, SE = 0.18, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.62, 1.59]$) as more biased against Asians than the control ($M = 1.93, SE = 0.17$), but no difference was found between the competence or American threats, $p = .79, 95\% CI = [-0.53, 0.41]$.

Anticipated Racial Stigmatization

An ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 111) = 19.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .26$. Participants viewed the company accused of anti-Latino American-based threats ($M = 5.03, SE = 0.25, p < .001, 95\% CI = [1.21, 2.65]$) and anti-Latino competence-based threats ($M = 5.74, SE = 0.28, p < .001, 95\% CI = [1.40, 2.91]$) as more likely to devalue their racial identity compared to the control company ($M = 3.59, SE = 0.26$), but, no difference was found between the American and competence based threat conditions, $p = .54, ns, 95\% CI = [-0.96, 0.51]$.

American Threat

To test whether participants anticipated being downgraded in their Americanism relative to the managers at this company, we conducted a mixed ANCOVA following the prior studies. Participants generally thought that the managers would view themselves as more American than participants, $F(1, 111) = 101.94, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .48, 95\% CI = [1.33, 1.87]$, however, this effect was moderated by condition $F(2, 111) = 9.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .15$ (see Figure 4). ANCOVAs examining the difference scores revealed that the anticipated American threat was larger in the American-based Latino threat ($M_{diff} = 2.15, SE = 0.25, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.70, 1.63]$), and the competence-based Latino threat conditions ($M_{diff} = 1.94, SE = 0.23, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.62,$

1.59]) compared to the control condition ($M_{diff} = 0.72$, $SE = 0.24$), but no difference was found between the types of threat, $p = .53$, 95% CI = [-0.53, 0.41].

Study 4

Liking

Preliminary 2 x 2 ANOVAs followed up by LSD post hoc tests revealed that liking varied by level of prejudice, $F(1, 168) = 70.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$, 95% CI = [0.98, 1.59], but not type, $F(1, 168) = 0.23$, $p = .63$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, 95% CI = [-0.23, 0.38]. High prejudice evaluators were viewed as significantly less likeable ($M = 2.08$, $SE = 0.11$) compared to low prejudice evaluators ($M = 3.37$, $SE = 0.11$).

Anti-Asian Bias

A 2 x 2 ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of prejudice level, $F(1, 167) = 44.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .21$, 95% CI = [0.77, 1.41], such that participants viewed the high outgroup prejudice evaluator ($M = 3.09$, $SE = 0.16$) as more biased against Asians than the low prejudice outgroup evaluator ($M = 1.93$, $SE = 0.17$), regardless of the targeted group (African Americans versus Latinos). Moreover, unexpectedly, there was a significant main effect of prejudice type such that having a profile involving African American prejudice (whether evaluators indicated high or low prejudice) ($M = 2.45$, $SE = 0.10$) made participants anticipate greater anti-Asian bias than having a profile involving Latino prejudice ($M = 2.10$, $SE = 0.10$), $F(1, 167) = 6.54$, $p = .011$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, 95% CI = [0.08, 0.62]. The two-way interaction between prejudice level and type was not significant, $F(1, 167) = 1.25$, $p = .265$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. This pattern of results suggested that participants used the prejudice cue to determine level of Anti-Asian bias regardless of whether the bias was directed towards African Americans or Latino Americans.

Anticipated Racial Stigmatization

A 2 x 2 ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect of prejudice level, $F(1, 167) = 85.19, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.93, 2.98]$. The high outgroup prejudice evaluator ($M = 4.85, SE = 0.17$) led to more anticipated racial stigma than the low outgroup prejudice evaluator ($M = 2.40, SE = 0.17$) regardless of the targeted group (African Americans versus Latinos). The main effect of prejudice type, $F(1, 167) = 0.13, p = .72, \eta_p^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.53, 0.36]$, and the two-way interaction between prejudice level and type were not significant, $F(1, 167) = 0.04, p = .84, \eta_p^2 < .001$. This pattern of results suggested that participants' anticipated stigma depended on level of prejudice from the evaluators regardless of prejudice type (anti-Black or Latino).

American Threat

To test whether participants anticipated American threat more when encountering an anti-Latino prejudice evaluator, we conducted a 2 (prejudice type) x 2 (level of prejudice) x 2 (Perceptions of patriotism: manager v. participant) ANCOVA with repeated measures on the third factor and liking as a covariate. Participants thought that the evaluator would view himself as more American than the participant, $F(1, 167) = 84.00, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.95, 1.41]$, however, this effect was moderated by prejudice level, $F(1, 167) = 20.31, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$, and marginally by the interactive effect of prejudice level and type, $F(2, 167) = 3.56, p = .061, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Asian Americans anticipated significantly more American threat when Latino bias was high ($M_{diff} = 2.15, SE = 0.23$), compared to low ($M_{diff} = 0.40, SE = 0.23, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .21, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.03, 2.47]$). In the African American conditions, this effect was weaker, such that participants anticipated marginally significantly more threat when African American bias was high ($M_{diff} = 1.47, SE = 0.28$), compared to low ($M_{diff} = 0.69, SE = 0.29, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .04, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.07, 1.62]$).

Study 5

Liking

A preliminary one way ANOVA revealed that liking varied by level of prejudice, $F(1, 256) = 63.28, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .20, 95\% \text{ CI} = [1.12, 1.86]$. High prejudice evaluators were viewed as significantly less likeable ($M = 3.24, SE = 0.13$) compared to low prejudice evaluators ($M = 4.73, SE = 0.14$). An ANCOVA controlling for liking revealed that participants' lay theory of prejudice did not significantly vary by condition, $F(1, 255) = 0.56, p = .46, \eta_p^2 = .002, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.22, 0.50]$.

Anti-Asian Bias

Using hierarchical linear regression, anti-Asian bias was regressed on condition (-1 = low Latino bias, 1 = high Latino bias), standardized lay theory of prejudice scores, and liking in Step 1, and the condition x lay theory interaction in Step 2. While both condition, $B = 0.69, SE = 0.06, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.57, 0.81]$, and lay theory, $B = 0.20, SE = 0.05, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.10, 0.31]$, significantly predicted anti-Asian bias, these main effects were qualified by a significant condition x lay theory interaction, $B = 0.33, SE = 0.06, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.22, 0.44]$. While participants low in a monolithic lay theory of prejudice (-1SD) perceived greater anti-Asian bias in the high prejudice condition than the low prejudice condition, $B = 0.36, SE = 0.08, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.21, 0.51]$, this effect was greater among participants high in a monolithic lay theory (+1 SD), $B = 1.02, SE = 0.09, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.85, 1.19]$.

Anticipated Racial Stigma. For anticipated stigma, hierarchical linear regression revealed that a main effect of condition, $B = 1.15, SE = 0.11, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.93, 1.36]$, and monolithic lay theory, $B = 0.36, SE = 0.10, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.17, 0.56]$, as well as a significant condition x monolithic lay theory interaction, $B = 0.54, SE = 0.10, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} =$

[0.34, 0.74]. While participants low in a monolithic lay theory (-1SD) anticipated greater racial stigma in the high prejudice condition than the low prejudice condition, $B = 0.61$, $SE = 0.14$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.33, 0.88], this effect was greater among participants high in a monolithic lay theory (+1 SD), $B = 1.68$, $SE = 0.16$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [1.37, 1.99].

American Threat. For simplicity, hierarchical regression was performed using the difference score for American identity threat. A significant main effect of condition, $B = 0.60$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.42, 0.78], and monolithic lay theory, $B = 0.42$, $SE = 0.08$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.26, 0.58], and a significant condition x monolithic prejudice theory interaction emerged, $B = 0.40$, $SE = 0.08$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.23, 0.56]. While participants low in a monolithic lay theory (-1SD) did not report significantly more American threat in the high prejudice condition than the low prejudice condition, $B = 0.20$, $SE = 0.12$, $p = .09$, 95% CI = [-0.03, 0.43], they did report greater American threat in the high prejudice condition compared to the low prejudice condition when high in a monolithic lay theory (+1 SD), $B = 1.00$, $SE = 0.13$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.74, 1.26].

Additional Analysis Conducted Separately on the Patriotism Dimensions (Self and Other)

Study 1a Perceived Patriotism

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the self* revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 131) = 3.55$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. Participants viewed the companies accused of Asian bias ($M = 3.27$, $SE = 0.20$, $p = .009$, 95% CI = [-1.33, -0.20]) as less likely to view them as patriotic compared to the control company ($M = 4.03$, $SE = 0.21$). No difference was found between the Latino bias and the control condition, $p = .14$, 95% CI = [-1.04, 0.15] or anti-Asian condition, $p = .28$, 95% CI = [-0.90, 0.26].

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the manager* revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 131) = 3.04$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Participants viewed the companies

accused of Asian bias ($M = 5.33$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = .03$, 95% CI = [0.06, 1.16]) and the company accused of Latino bias ($M = 5.32$, $SE = 0.21$, $p = .04$, 95% CI = [0.03, 1.18]) as more likely to have patriotic managers compared to the control ($M = 4.72$, $SE = 0.20$). No difference was found between the Latino bias and the anti-Asian condition, $p = .97$, 95% CI = [-0.55, 0.56].

Study 1b Perceived Patriotism

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the self* revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 114) = 8.11$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$. Participants viewed the companies accused of Latino bias ($M = 3.23$, $SE = 0.21$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-1.74, -0.57]) and anti-Asian bias ($M = 3.54$, $SE = 0.21$, $p = .006$, 95% CI = [-1.44, -0.25]) as less likely to view them as patriotic compared to the control company ($M = 4.39$, $SE = 0.21$). No difference was found between the Latino bias and the anti-Asian condition, $p = .29$, 95% CI = [-0.90, 0.27].

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the manager* revealed no main effect of condition, $F(2, 114) = 0.51$, $p = .60$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Study 3 Perceived Patriotism

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the self* revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 112) = 16.24$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$. Participants viewed the companies accused of American based Latino bias ($M = 3.03$, $SE = 0.19$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-1.80, -0.72]) and competence based Latino bias ($M = 2.78$, $SE = 0.21$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-2.08, -0.93]) as less likely to view them as patriotic compared to the control company ($M = 4.29$, $SE = 0.20$). No difference was found between the Latino bias and the anti-Asian condition, $p = .39$, 95% CI = [-0.32, 0.81].

An ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the manager* revealed no main effect of condition, $F(2, 112) = 1.25$, $p = .29$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.

Study 5

A 2 (prejudice type) x 2 (level of prejudice) ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the self* revealed a significant main effect of prejudice level, $F(1, 168) = 60.43, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .27$, such that Asian Americans anticipated that they would be viewed as less American when prejudice was high ($M = 3.51, SE = 0.15$), compared to low ($M = 5.18, SE = 0.15, p < .001$; 95% CI = [-1.25, -2.11]. No significant effect was found for prejudice type, $F(1, 168) = 0.00, p = .96, \eta_p^2 = .00$, nor was the interactive effect of type and level significant, $F(1, 168) = 0.49, p = .49, \eta_p^2 = .003$.

A 2 (prejudice type) x 2 (level of prejudice) ANOVA on the *perceived patriotism of the evaluator* revealed a significant main effect of prejudice level, $F(1, 168) = 7.84, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .05$, such that Asian Americans anticipated that the evaluator would view himself as more American when his prejudice was high ($M = 5.76, SE = 0.12$), compared to low ($M = 5.28, SE = 0.12, , 95\% CI = [0.14, 0.83]$). No significant effect was found for prejudice type, $F(1, 168) = 1.14, p = .29, \eta_p^2 = .01$, but the interactive effect of type and level significant was significant, $F(1, 168) = 5.52, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .03$ such that high prejudice individuals ($M = 6.06, SE = 0.15$) were seen as viewing themselves as more American than the low prejudice control ($M = 5.17, SE = 0.15$) in the Latino prejudice condition, $F(1, 88) = 17.35, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .17$, but not the Black prejudice condition, $F(1, 80) = 0.08, p = .78, \eta_p^2 = .001$.

Study 5 Perceived Patriotism

Hierarchical regression was performed using *the perceived patriotism self measure*. A significant main effect of condition, $B = 0.57, SE = 0.08, p < .001, 95\% CI = [0.42, 0.72]$, and monolithic lay theory, $B = 0.19, SE = 0.08, p = .01, 95\% CI = [0.04, 0.34]$, and a significant

condition x monolithic prejudice theory interaction emerged, $B = 0.48$, $SE = 0.08$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.34, 0.63]. While participants low in a monolithic lay theory (-1SD) did not report significantly more American threat in the high prejudice condition than the low prejudice condition, $B = 0.09$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = .41$, 95% CI = [-0.12, 0.30], they did report greater American threat in the high prejudice condition compared to the low prejudice condition when high in a monolithic lay theory (+1 SD), $B = 1.06$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.85, 1.27].

Hierarchical regression was performed using *the perceived patriotism of manager measure*. The analysis revealed a significant main effect of condition, $B = 0.21$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = .003$, 95% CI = [0.07, 0.34], and monolithic lay theory, $B = 0.26$, $SE = 0.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [0.12, 0.39]. The condition x monolithic prejudice theory interaction was not significant, $B = 0.01$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = 0.86$, 95% CI = [-0.13, 0.15],