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# **Section 1: Studies 1 and 2 Saturated Models**

Table S1

*Study 1 Steps 1-4 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology and Predicting Free-Speech Protections*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 2.12 | .14 |  | .000 | 1.84, 2.40 |
| **Act Severity** | -.40 | .17 | -.171 | .019 | -.73, -.07 |
| **Vignette Type** | .01 | .17 | .003 | .962 | -.32, .34 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .13 | .08 | .147 | .093 | -.02, .28 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.04 | .07 | -.043 | .624 | -.17, .11 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 2.28 | .17 |  | .000 | 1.93, 2.62 |
| **Act Severity** | -.54 | .24 | -.233 | .022 | -1.01, -.08 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.06 | .23 | -.025 | .800 | -.52, .40 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .08 | .15 | .085 | .614 | -.22, .37 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.08 | .13 | -.104 | .516 | -.34, .17 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | -.07 | .05 | -.118 | .126 | -.16, .02 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.14 | .14 | -.118 | .324 | -.41, .14 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .36 | .15 | .295 | .018 | .06, .66 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | .16 | .34 | .059 | .628 | -.50, .83 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | -.25 | .16 | -.203 | .122 | -.56, .07 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | .24 | .14 | .204 | .097 | -.04, .52 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 2.14 | .19 |  | .000 | 1.77, 2.50 |
| **Act Severity** | -.33 | .25 | -.143 | .180 | -.83, .16 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.04 | .26 | -.015 | .889 | -.54, .47 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .07 | .18 | .078 | .702 | -.28, .42 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.25 | .16 | -.304 | .122 | -.56, .07 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .07 | .08 | .120 | .343 | -.08, .23 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .09 | .22 | .077 | .685 | -.35, .53 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .46 | .25 | .370 | .074 | -.05, .95 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | .19 | .33 | .070 | .566 | -.47, .85 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | -.24 | .23 | -.202 | .281 | -.69, .20 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | .50 | .20 | .423 | .015 | .10, .90 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.02 | .10 | -.023 | .846 | -.22, .18 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.31 | .29 | -.186 | .299 | -.88, .27 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.17 | .31 | -.103 | .585 | -.79, .45 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.23 | .10 | -.279 | .023 | -.42, -.03 |
| 4 | **Constant** | 2.13 | .19 |  | .000 | 1.75, 2.50 |
| **Act Severity** | -.32 | .26 | -.137 | .219 | -.83, .19 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.01 | .28 | -.006 | .963 | -.57, .54 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .07 | .18 | .078 | .701 | -.29, .42 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.25 | .16 | -.310 | .120 | -.57, .07 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .08 | .09 | .132 | .348 | -.09, .25 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .10 | .23 | .083 | .667 | -.35, .54 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .45 | .26 | .363 | .085 | -.06, .95 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | .15 | .39 | .055 | .700 | -.62, .92 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | -.25 | .23 | -.206 | .276 | -.70, .20 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | .50 | .21 | .429 | .015 | .10, .91 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.04 | .15 | -.048 | .782 | -.33, .25 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.32 | .31 | -.197 | .294 | -.93, .28 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.15 | .33 | -.091 | .646 | -.81, .50 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.24 | .13 | -.299 | .061 | -.49, .01 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .04 | .20 | .038 | .843 | -.35, .43 |

Table S2

*Study 1 Steps 1-4 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology Predicting Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 3.29 | .16 |  | .000 | 2.97, 3.61 |
| **Act Severity** | .73 | .19 | .273 | .000 | .36, 1.11 |
| **Vignette Type** | .28 | .19 | .103 | .144 | -.10, .65 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .02 | .09 | .021 | .806 | -.15, .19 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.06 | .08 | -.064 | .453 | -.22, .10 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 3.17 | .19 |  | .000 | 2.80, 3.55 |
| **Act Severity** | .94 | .26 | .350 | .000 | .43, 1.46 |
| **Vignette Type** | .39 | .26 | .146 | .130 | -.12, .90 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .27 | .16 | .269 | .098 | -.05, .60 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.07 | .14 | -.074 | .631 | -.35, .21 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .00 | .05 | .004 | .958 | -.10, .11 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .12 | .16 | .085 | .460 | -.19, .42 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.63 | .17 | -.442 | .000 | -.96, -.29 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | -.25 | .37 | -.078 | .506 | -.98, .49 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | .11 | .18 | .079 | .530 | -.24, .46 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | -.06 | .16 | -.041 | .727 | -.37, .26 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 3.12 | .21 |  | .000 | 2.71, 3.52 |
| **Act Severity** | .89 | .28 | .330 | .002 | .34, 1.43 |
| **Vignette Type** | .67 | .28 | .249 | .019 | .11, 1.23 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .37 | .20 | .362 | .066 | -.03, .76 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.18 | .18 | -.193 | .309 | -.53, .17 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .06 | .09 | .087 | .476 | -.11, .23 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .33 | .25 | .247 | .177 | -.15, .82 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.93 | .28 | -.660 | .001 | -1.49, -.38 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | -.30 | .37 | -.095 | .418 | -1.03, .43 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | .06 | .25 | .045 | .802 | -.43, .56 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | .06 | .22 | .045 | .788 | -.38, .50 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.27 | .11 | -.285 | .014 | -.49, -.06 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.17 | .32 | -.092 | .592 | -.81, .47 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .24 | .35 | .126 | .487 | -.45, .93 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .12 | .11 | .124 | .289 | -.10, .33 |
| 4 | **Constant** | 3.13 | .21 |  | .000 | 2.71, 3.54 |
| **Act Severity** | .87 | .29 | .323 | .003 | .30, 1.44 |
| **Vignette Type** | .64 | .31 | .238 | .041 | .03, 1.25 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .37 | .20 | .361 | .067 | -.03, .76 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.17 | .18 | -.186 | .333 | -.53, .18 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .05 | .10 | .073 | .591 | -.14, .24 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .32 | .25 | .240 | .196 | -.17, .82 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.92 | .29 | -.651 | .002 | -1.48, -.36 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type**  | -.25 | .43 | -.077 | .574 | -1.10, .61 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias** | .07 | .25 | .050 | .783 | -.43, .57 |
| **Act Severity x Political Ideology**  | .05 | .23 | .038 | .820 | -.40, .50 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.25 | .16 | -.255 | .129 | -.56, .07 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.15 | .34 | -.079 | .662 | -.82, .52 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .22 | .37 | .112 | .557 | -.51, .94 |
| **Act Severity x Anti-Black Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .14 | .14 | .149 | .333 | -.14, .42 |
| **Act Severity x Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.05 | .22 | -.045 | .806 | -.49, .38 |

Table S3

*Study 1 T-value and Residual Degrees of Freedom (df) for Steps 1-4 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology Predicting Free-Speech Protections and Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Free-Speech Protections** | **Hate Crime Designation** |
| **Step** | **t-value** | **df** | **Step** | **t-value** | **df** |
| 1 | 1.45 | 185 | 1 | 2.15 | 185 |
| 2 | 1.48 | 179 | 2 | 1.94 | 179 |
| 3 | 1.48 | 175 | 3 | 1.81 | 175 |
| 4 | 1.42 | 174 | 4 | 1.74 | 174 |

Table S4

*Study 2 T-value and Residual Degrees of Freedom (df) for Steps 1-5 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education Predicting Free-Speech Protections and Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Free-Speech Protections** | **Hate Crime Designation** |
| **Step** | **t-value** | **df** | **Step** | **t-value** | **df** |
| 1 | 1.12 | 257 | 1 | 2.13 | 256 |
| 2 | 1.32 | 247 | 2 | 1.90 | 246 |
| 3 | 1.28 | 237 | 3 | 1.60 | 236 |
| 4 | 1.17 | 232 | 4 | 1.53 | 231 |
| 5 | 1.15 | 231 | 5 | 1.50 | 230 |

Table S5

*Study 2 Steps 1-5 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education Predicting Freedom of Speech Violations*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 2.46 | .13 |  | .000 | 2.21, 2.72 |
| **FOS Mention** | .01 | .16 | .004 | .951 | -.30, .32 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.38 | .15 | -.153 | .014 | -.69, -.08 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.03 | .09 | -.023 | .758 | -.19, .14 |
| **Political Ideology** | .02 | .06 | .029 | .693 | -.10, .14 |
| **Education** | -.01 | .05 | -.008 | .904 | -.11, .10 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 2.53 | .16 |  | .000 | 2.23, 2.84 |
| **FOS Mention** | .04 | .22 | .014 | .873 | -.40, .47 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.36 | .22 | -.145 | .094 | -.78, .06 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.16 | .14 | -.136 | .274 | -.44, .12 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.07 | .11 | -.088 | .494 | -.28, .14 |
| **Education** | -.04 | .09 | -.042 | .707 | -.22, .15 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | -.10 | .05 | -.134 | .035 | -.19, -.01 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | .05 | .13 | .037 | .721 | -.20, .29 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .35 | .18 | .204 | .047 | .01, .69 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.08 | .11 | -.065 | .452 | -.29, .13 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .03 | .06 | .043 | .572 | -.09, .15 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.06 | .04 | -.098 | .199 | -.14, .03 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | .15 | .11 | .127 | .169 | -.06, .37 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | -.14 | .31 | -.050 | .648 | -.75, .47 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | .15 | .12 | .133 | .208 | -.09, .40 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .03 | .17 | .018 | .868 | -.31, .37 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 2.72 | .18 |  | .000 | 2.37, 3.07 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.22 | .25 | -.090 | .363 | -.71, .26 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.53 | .24 | -.211 | .027 | -.99, -.06 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.23 | .16 | -.201 | .155 | -.55, .09 |
| **Political Ideology** | .11 | .12 | .137 | .356 | -.13, .35 |
| **Education** | .00 | .12 | -.003 | .981 | -.23, .23 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | -.24 | .08 | -.324 | .004 | -.40, -.08 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.34 | .18 | -.281 | .063 | -.69, .02 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .52 | .26 | .305 | .042 | .02, 1.03 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.19 | .16 | -.152 | .222 | -.50, .12 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .07 | .11 | .081 | .555 | -.15, .28 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.05 | .08 | -.092 | .520 | -.22, .11 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | .10 | .15 | .085 | .509 | -.20, .40 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | -.01 | .31 | -.003 | .976 | -.63, .61 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.21 | .18 | -.179 | .242 | -.56, .14 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .16 | .26 | .097 | .534 | -.34, .66 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .05 | .10 | .053 | .574 | -.14, .24 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .00 | .13 | -.002 | .987 | -.26, .25 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.05 | .09 | -.059 | .570 | -.23, .13 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | -.05 | .13 | -.048 | .697 | -.31, .20 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | .06 | .09 | .073 | .550 | -.13, .24 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .01 | .03 | .017 | .817 | -.06, .07 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.27 | .36 | -.118 | .454 | -.98, .44 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | .72 | .25 | .432 | .005 | .22, 1.21 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .20 | .10 | .214 | .033 | .02, .39 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .16 | .22 | .089 | .481 | -.28, .59 |
| 4 | **Constant** | 2.76 | .19 |  | .000 | 2.38, 3.13 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.28 | .27 | -.111 | .314 | -.82, .26 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.58 | .26 | -.230 | .030 | -1.09, -.06 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.26 | .17 | -.223 | .128 | -.59, .07 |
| **Political Ideology** | .13 | .12 | .156 | .304 | -.12, .37 |
| **Education** | -.05 | .13 | -.054 | .726 | -.30, .21 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | -.27 | .10 | -.367 | .006 | -.46, -.08 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.35 | .18 | -.292 | .058 | -.71, .01 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .54 | .27 | .315 | .043 | .02, 1.06 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.14 | .17 | -.115 | .400 | -.48, .19 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .10 | .13 | .121 | .461 | -.16, .35 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.08 | .10 | -.134 | .435 | -.27, .12 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | .14 | .18 | .116 | .449 | -.22, .49 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | .09 | .37 | .033 | .802 | -.64, .82 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.22 | .18 | -.190 | .221 | -.58, .14 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .18 | .26 | .108 | .503 | -.34, .70 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .10 | .14 | .098 | .476 | -.18, .38 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.05 | .21 | -.040 | .801 | -.46, .35 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.02 | .14 | -.025 | .878 | -.31, .26 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | -.10 | .19 | -.091 | .609 | -.46, .27 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | .09 | .14 | .115 | .527 | -.18, .36 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .04 | .06 | .097 | .465 | -.07, .16 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.27 | .37 | -.119 | .462 | -1.00, .45 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | .71 | .25 | .426 | .006 | .21, 1.21 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .25 | .14 | .262 | .071 | -.02, .52 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .13 | .23 | .075 | .572 | -.33, .60 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .09 | .27 | .050 | .747 | -.44, .61 |
| **Edu x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.03 | .07 | -.057 | .627 | -.17, .10 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x Pol Ideology** | -.04 | .07 | -.049 | .573 | -.17, .10 |
| **FOS Mention x Edu x Vig. Type x Pol Ideology** | -.04 | .19 | -.034 | .834 | -.41, .33 |
| **Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology** | -.08 | .20 | -.060 | .672 | -.47, .30 |
| 5 | **Constant** | 2.75 | .19 |  | .000 | 2.38, 3.13 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.27 | .27 | -.109 | .321 | -.81, .27 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.58 | .26 | -.231 | .029 | -1.10, -.06 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.24 | .17 | -.213 | .151 | -.58, .09 |
| **Political Ideology** | .12 | .13 | .150 | .324 | -.12, .37 |
| **Education** | -.03 | .14 | -.033 | .838 | -.30, .24 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | -.27 | .10 | -.362 | .007 | -.46, -.07 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.35 | .18 | -.289 | .061 | -.71, .02 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .54 | .27 | .316 | .043 | .02, 1.06 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.18 | .18 | -.142 | .337 | -.54, .19 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .09 | .13 | .118 | .474 | -.16, .35 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.07 | .10 | -.122 | .483 | -.27, .13 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | .10 | .20 | .087 | .601 | -.28, .49 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | .10 | .37 | .036 | .780 | -.63, .83 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.22 | .18 | -.186 | .235 | -.57, .14 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .17 | .26 | .106 | .514 | -.35, .69 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .10 | .14 | .095 | .492 | -.18, .38 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.06 | .21 | -.045 | .777 | -.47, .35 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | -.03 | .15 | -.034 | .836 | -.32, .26 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | -.10 | .19 | -.093 | .604 | -.46, .27 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | .08 | .14 | .105 | .565 | -.19, .35 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .03 | .07 | .063 | .676 | -.10, .16 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.28 | .37 | -.123 | .450 | -1.01, .45 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | .69 | .26 | .419 | .007 | .19, 1.20 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | .25 | .14 | .257 | .078 | -.03, .52 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .19 | .26 | .105 | .475 | -.33, .70 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .10 | .27 | .059 | .708 | -.43, .63 |
| **Edu x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.01 | .09 | -.013 | .931 | -.18, .16 |
| **Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology** | .00 | .11 | .001 | .991 | -.21, .21 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Id** | -.03 | .19 | -.027 | .868 | -.41, .34 |

Table S6

*Study 2 Steps 1-5 of the Model Containing all Main and Interactive Effects of FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education Predicting Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 2.81 | .14 |  | .000 | 2.52, 3.09 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.21 | .17 | -.074 | .222 | -.55, .13 |
| **Vignette Type** | .63 | .17 | .223 | .000 | .30, .97 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.15 | .09 | -.114 | .115 | -.33, .04 |
| **Political Ideology** | .08 | .07 | .081 | .261 | -.06, .21 |
| **Education** | -.13 | .06 | -.136 | .026 | -.25, -.02 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 2.77 | .17 |  | .000 | 2.44, 3.10 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.24 | .24 | -.083 | .326 | -.71, .24 |
| **Vignette Type** | .54 | .23 | .191 | .021 | .08, 1.00 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .05 | .15 | .036 | .763 | -.26, .35 |
| **Political Ideology** | .14 | .12 | .146 | .235 | -.09, .36 |
| **Education** | -.12 | .10 | -.119 | .261 | -.32, .09 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .09 | .05 | .103 | .088 | -.01, .19 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.17 | .14 | -.128 | .200 | -.44, .09 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.55 | .19 | -.281 | .004 | -.92, -.17 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.02 | .12 | -.010 | .900 | -.24, .22 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .11 | .07 | .120 | .098 | -.02, .24 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.06 | .05 | -.084 | .244 | -.15, .04 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | -.04 | .12 | -.030 | .735 | -.27, .19 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | .17 | .34 | .051 | .622 | -.50, .83 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.02 | .13 | -.017 | .866 | -.28, .24 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .11 | .19 | .060 | .552 | -.26, .48 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 2.65 | .19 |  | .000 | 2.28, 3.03 |
| **FOS Mention** | .01 | .27 | .002 | .985 | -.52, .53 |
| **Vignette Type** | .65 | .26 | .231 | .012 | .15, 1.16 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .07 | .18 | .050 | .710 | -.28, .41 |
| **Political Ideology** | .13 | .13 | .139 | .329 | -.13, .39 |
| **Education** | -.07 | .13 | -.068 | .603 | -.31, .18 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .19 | .09 | .227 | .033 | .02, .37 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.18 | .20 | -.135 | .351 | -.57, .20 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.63 | .28 | -.327 | .024 | -1.18, -.08 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.15 | .17 | -.107 | .373 | -.48, .18 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .02 | .12 | .023 | .862 | -.22, .26 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | .01 | .09 | .013 | .923 | -.17, .19 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | -.25 | .17 | -.188 | .133 | -.58, .08 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | -.02 | .34 | -.007 | .945 | -.70, .65 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | .01 | .19 | .009 | .951 | -.37, .39 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .10 | .28 | .051 | .732 | -.45, .65 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.05 | .11 | -.039 | .665 | -.25, .16 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .06 | .14 | .039 | .686 | -.22, .34 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | .04 | .10 | .043 | .670 | -.15, .24 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .08 | .14 | .063 | .595 | -.20, .35 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.16 | .10 | -.189 | .110 | -.36, .04 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .04 | .04 | .071 | .328 | -.04, .11 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .20 | .39 | .075 | .620 | -.58, .97 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | .02 | .27 | .010 | .945 | -.52, .56 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.18 | .10 | -.162 | .092 | -.38, .03 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .44 | .24 | .218 | .073 | -.04, .91 |
| 4 | **Constant** | 2.59 | .20 |  | .000 | 2.19, 2.99 |
| **FOS Mention** | .14 | .30 | .049 | .640 | -.44, .72 |
| **Vignette Type** | .78 | .28 | .274 | .007 | .22, 1.33 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .02 | .18 | .013 | .926 | -.34, .37 |
| **Political Ideology** | .14 | .13 | .146 | .310 | -.13, .40 |
| **Education** | -.15 | .14 | -.150 | .304 | -.42, .13 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .24 | .11 | .287 | .024 | .03, .45 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.17 | .20 | -.128 | .383 | -.56, .22 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.57 | .29 | -.292 | .049 | -1.13, .00 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.12 | .18 | -.086 | .511 | -.48, .24 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .05 | .14 | .050 | .746 | -.23, .32 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.03 | .11 | -.048 | .768 | -.24, .18 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | -.09 | .20 | -.067 | .645 | -.47, .29 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | -.23 | .40 | -.070 | .570 | -1.01, .56 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.01 | .20 | -.010 | .943 | -.40, .37 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .16 | .29 | .086 | .573 | -.40, .72 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.19 | .15 | -.162 | .219 | -.49, .11 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.10 | .22 | -.068 | .649 | -.54, .34 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | .11 | .16 | .112 | .470 | -.19, .42 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .00 | .20 | .000 | .998 | -.40, .40 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.09 | .15 | -.107 | .535 | -.38, .20 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .09 | .06 | .186 | .140 | -.03, .22 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .10 | .40 | .039 | .802 | -.68, .88 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | .01 | .27 | .005 | .971 | -.53, .55 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.30 | .15 | -.278 | .043 | -.60, -.01 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .32 | .25 | .159 | .211 | -.18, .82 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .25 | .29 | .128 | .389 | -.32, .82 |
| **Edu x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.12 | .07 | -.180 | .111 | -.26, .03 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .04 | .07 | .040 | .628 | -.11, .18 |
| **FOS Mention x Edu x Vig. Type x Pol Ideology** | -.09 | .20 | -.069 | .656 | -.49, .31 |
| **Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology** | .28 | .21 | .181 | .180 | -.13, .70 |
| 5 | **Constant** | 2.59 | .21 |  | .000 | 2.18, 2.99 |
| **FOS Mention** | .14 | .30 | .051 | .626 | -.44, .73 |
| **Vignette Type** | .77 | .28 | .273 | .007 | .21, 1.33 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .03 | .18 | .026 | .854 | -.33, .39 |
| **Political Ideology** | .13 | .14 | .139 | .336 | -.14, .40 |
| **Education** | -.12 | .15 | -.123 | .418 | -.41, .17 |
| **Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology**  | .25 | .11 | .293 | .022 | .04, .46 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology**  | -.17 | .20 | -.124 | .399 | -.56, .22 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.56 | .29 | -.291 | .050 | -1.13, .00 |
| **Education x Vignette Type** | -.17 | .20 | -.120 | .394 | -.56, .22 |
| **Education x Anti-Black Bias**  | .04 | .14 | .046 | .766 | -.24, .32 |
| **Education x Political Ideology**  | -.02 | .11 | -.033 | .843 | -.24, .19 |
| **Education x FOS Mention** | -.14 | .21 | -.105 | .505 | -.56, .27 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type**  | -.21 | .40 | -.065 | .598 | -1.00, .58 |
| **FOS Mention x Political Ideology**  | -.01 | .20 | -.004 | .977 | -.39, .38 |
| **FOS Mention x Anti-Black Bias**  | .16 | .29 | .083 | .587 | -.41, .72 |
| **Vignette Type x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.19 | .15 | -.166 | .209 | -.49, .11 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Bias**  | -.11 | .22 | -.075 | .619 | -.55, .33 |
| **Education x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology** | .10 | .16 | .100 | .520 | -.21, .41 |
| **Education x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .00 | .20 | -.002 | .990 | -.40, .39 |
| **Education x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.10 | .15 | -.120 | .492 | -.40, .19 |
| **Education x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .07 | .07 | .143 | .319 | -.07, .21 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Bias**  | .09 | .40 | .034 | .828 | -.70, .87 |
| **FOS Mention x Vignette Type x Pol Ideology**  | -.01 | .28 | -.005 | .974 | -.55, .54 |
| **FOS Mention x Bias x Pol Ideology**  | -.31 | .15 | -.285 | .039 | -.61, -.02 |
| **FOS Mention x Education x Vignette Type** | .40 | .28 | .198 | .160 | -.16, .95 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention**  | .27 | .29 | .139 | .353 | -.30, .84 |
| **Edu x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology**  | -.08 | .09 | -.123 | .392 | -.26, .10 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x Pol Ideology** | .09 | .12 | .105 | .419 | -.13, .32 |
| **FOS Mention x Edu x Vig. Type x Pol Ideology** | -.08 | .21 | -.060 | .700 | -.48, .33 |
| **Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Ideology** | .29 | .21 | .183 | .176 | -.13, .70 |
| **Edu x Vig. Type x Bias x FOS Mention x Pol Id** | -.10 | .15 | -.081 | .517 | -.39, .20 |

# **Section 2: Studies 1 and 2 Models Used to Calculate Simple Effects in Main Text**

Table S7

*Study 1 Steps 1-3 of the Model Containing Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology Predicting Free-Speech Protections*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 2.12 | .14 |  | <.001 | 1.84, 2.40 |
| **Act Severity** | -.40 | .17 | -.171 | .019 | -.73, -.07 |
| **Vignette Type** | .01 | .17 | .003 | .962 | -.32, .34 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .13 | .08 | .147 | .093 | -.02, .28 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.04 | .07 | -.043 | .624 | -.17, .11 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 2.15 | .14 |  | <.001 | 1.87, 2.43 |
| **Act Severity** | -.45 | .17 | -.193 | .008 | -.78, -.12 |
| **Vignette Type** | .01 | .17 | .003 | .970 | -.32, .33 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.03 | .10 | -.036 | .749 | -.23, .16 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.04 | .07 | -.045 | .598 | -.17, .10 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .32 | .13 | .258 | .013 | .07, .57 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 2.14 | .14 |  | <.001 | 1.86, 2.42 |
| **Act Severity** | -.45 | .17 | -.190 | .009 | -.78, -.11 |
| **Vignette Type** | .01 | .17 | .002 | .977 | -.32, .33 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.08 | .11 | -.087 | .474 | -.29, .13 |
| **Political Ideology** | .04 | .10 | .046 | .695 | -.15, .23 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .41 | .15 | .336 | .007 | .11, .71 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology** | -.16 | .14 | -.136 | .252 | -.43, .12 |

Table S8

*Study 1 Steps 1-3 of the Model Containing Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology Predicting Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 3.29 | .16 |  | <.001 | 2.97, 3.61 |
| **Act Severity** | .73 | .19 | .273 | <.001 | .36, 1.11 |
| **Vignette Type** | .28 | .19 | .103 | .144 | -.10, .65 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .02 | .09 | .021 | .806 | -.15, .19 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.06 | .08 | -.064 | .453 | -.22, .10 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 3.23 | .16 |  | <.001 | 2.93, 3.54 |
| **Act Severity** | .82 | .18 | .306 | <.001 | .46, 1.18 |
| **Vignette Type** | .28 | .18 | .104 | .124 | -.08, .64 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .31 | .11 | .303 | .005 | .09, .52 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.06 | .08 | -.060 | .463 | -.21, .09 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.56 | .14 | -.397 | <.001 | -.83, -.29 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 3.24 | .16 |  | <.001 | 2.93, 3.54 |
| **Act Severity** | .82 | .18 | .304 | <.001 | .46, 1.18 |
| **Vignette Type** | .28 | .18 | .105 | .122 | -.08, .64 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .34 | .12 | .338 | .004 | .11, .57 |
| **Political Ideology** | -.12 | .10 | -.124 | .265 | -.32, .09 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.64 | .17 | -.452 | <.001 | -.97, -.31 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology** | .13 | .15 | .096 | .395 | -.17, .43 |

Table S9

*Study 2 Steps 1-3 of the Model Containing FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, Education, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology Predicting Free-Speech Protections*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 2.49 | .26 |  | <.001 | 1.99, 2.99 |
| **FOS Mention** | .01 | .16 | .004 | .951 | -.30, .32 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.38 | .15 | -.153 | .014 | -.69, -.08 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.03 | .09 | -.023 | .758 | -.19, .14 |
| **Education** | -.01 | .05 | -.008 | .904 | -.11, .10 |
| **Political Ideology** | .02 | .06 | .029 | .693 | -.10, .14 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 2.48 | .25 |  | <.001 | 1.99, 2.98 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.01 | .15 | -.002 | .968 | -.31, .30 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.38 | .15 | -.153 | .013 | -.68, -.08 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.22 | .11 | -.194 | .039 | -.43, -.01 |
| **Education** | .00 | .05 | -.005 | .938 | -.11, .10 |
| **Political Ideology** | .04 | .06 | .049 | .507 | -.08, .16 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .41 | .14 | .240 | .004 | .13, .69 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 2.47 | .25 |  | <.001 | 1.96, 2.97 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.01 | .15 | -.005 | .937 | -.32, .29 |
| **Vignette Type** | -.38 | .15 | -.152 | .013 | -.68, -.08 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.19 | .12 | -.164 | .122 | -.43, .05 |
| **Education** | .00 | .05 | .001 | .990 | -.10, .11 |
| **Political Ideology** | .00 | .09 | .000 | .999 | -.17, .17 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | .36 | .17 | .207 | .036 | .02, .69 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology** | .08 | .12 | .063 | .537 | -.16, .31 |

Table S10

*Study 2 Steps 1-3 of the Model Containing FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, Education, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology Predicting Hate Crime Designation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **Constant** | 3.35 | .28 |  | .000 | 2.80, 3.91 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.21 | .17 | -.074 | .222 | -.55, .13 |
| **Vignette Type** | .63 | .17 | .223 | .000 | .30, .97 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | -.15 | .09 | -.114 | .115 | -.33, .04 |
| **Education** | -.13 | .06 | -.136 | .026 | -.25, -.02 |
| **Political Ideology** | .08 | .07 | .081 | .261 | -.06, .21 |
| 2 | **Constant** | 3.36 | .27 |  | .000 | 2.83, 3.90 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.18 | .17 | -.063 | .281 | -.51, .15 |
| **Vignette Type** | .63 | .16 | .222 | .000 | .31, .95 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .19 | .12 | .143 | .110 | -.04, .42 |
| **Education** | -.14 | .06 | -.139 | .018 | -.25, -.02 |
| **Political Ideology** | .05 | .07 | .053 | .448 | -.08, .18 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.70 | .15 | -.359 | .000 | -.99, -.40 |
| 3 | **Constant** | 3.40 | .27 |  | .000 | 2.86, 3.93 |
| **FOS Mention** | -.17 | .17 | -.059 | .314 | -.49, .16 |
| **Vignette Type** | .63 | .16 | .221 | .000 | .30, .95 |
| **Anti-Black Bias** | .12 | .13 | .093 | .353 | -.14, .38 |
| **Education** | -.14 | .06 | -.149 | .013 | -.26, -.03 |
| **Political Ideology** | .12 | .10 | .133 | .191 | -.06, .31 |
| **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.59 | .18 | -.304 | .001 | -.95, -.23 |
| **Vignette Type x Political Ideology** | -.14 | .13 | -.104 | .280 | -.40, .12 |

# **Section 3: Studies 1 and 2 Simple Effects in Model Excluding Political Ideology**

Table S11

*Study 1 Simple Effects of Vignette Type and Anti-Black Bias from the Model Containing Act Severity, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, with 183 Residual Degrees of Freedom, Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FSP) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.05 | .09 | -.061 | .550 | -.23, .12 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | .26 | .09 | .297 | .003 | .09, .43 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | -.41 | .24 | -.175 | .084 | -.87, .06 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | .43 | .24 | .184 | .068 | -.03, .89 |
| **HCD** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | .27 | .10 | .270 | .006 | .08, .47 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.29 | .10 | -.285 | .003 | -.48, -.10 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | 1.04 | .26 | .385 | <.001 | .53, 1.54 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | -.46 | .26 | -.171 | .074 | -.97, .05 |

Table S12

*Study 2 Simple Effects of Vignette Type and Anti-Black Bias from the Model Containing FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Education, and Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FSP) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD), with 255 Residual Degrees of Freedom for FSP and 254 Residual Degrees of Freedom for HCD*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.19 | .09 | -.165 | .046 | -.37, .00 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | .21 | .10 | .187 | .042 | .01, .42 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | -.82 | .22 | -.328 | <.001 | -1.24, -.40 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | .06 | .22 | .024 | .784 | -.37, .48 |
| **HCD** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | .23 | .10 | .175 | .027 | .03, .43 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.48 | .11 | -.365 | <.001 | -.70, -.26 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | 1.40 | .23 | .494 | <.001 | .94, 1.85 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | -.14 | .23 | -.049 | .552 | -.60, .32 |

# **Section 4: Studies 1 and 2 Moderated Mediation Figures**

**

*Figure S1*. Study 1 Moderated Mediation Model Showing Mediating Role of Hate Crime Designation on Relationship between Anti-Black Bias x Vignette Type and Free-Speech Protections

**

*Figure S2*. Study 2 Moderated Mediation Model Showing Mediating Role of Free-Speech Protections on Relationship between Anti-Black Bias x Vignette Type and Hate Crime Designation

**

*Figure S3*. Study 2 Moderated Mediation Model Showing Mediating Role of Hate Crime Designation on Relationship between Anti-Black Bias x Vignette Type and Free-Speech Protections

# **Section 5: Study 1 Results Removing Black and/or Non-White Participants**

Table S13

*Study 1 Main, Interactive, and Simple Main Effects (SM) of Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias on Free-Speech Protections and Hate Crime Designation, Excluding Black Participants (Total N=178)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Free-Speech Protections** | **Hate Crime Designation** |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | Vignette Type | .09 | .17 | .040 | .579 | -.23, .42 | .23 | .20 | .085 | .244 | -.16, .62 |
| Act Severity | -.61 | .17 | -.267 | .000 | -.94, -.28 | .76 | .20 | .280 | <.001 | .37, 1.15 |
| 4 | Vignette Type | -.03 | .28 | -.013 | .917 | -.58, .53 | .61 | .33 | .223 | .067 | -.04, 1.25 |
| Act Severity | -.67 | .27 | -.295 | .013 | -1.20, -.14 | .86 | .31 | .316 | .007 | .24, 1.48 |
| 2 | Vignette Type x Bias | .31 | .15 | .266 | .042 | .01, .62 | -.65 | .18 | -.459 | <.001 | -1.00, -.29 |
| 2 | White Target: SM of Bias | .00 | .11 | .003 | .984 | -.21, .22 | .36 | .13 | .349 | .005 | .11, .61 |
| Black Target: SM of Bias | .35 | .11 | .413 | .001 | .14, .56 | -.30 | .12 | -.298 | .015 | -.55, -.06 |
| Low Bias: SM of Vig.  | -.39 | .26 | -.169 | .144 | -.90, .13 | 1.13 | .31 | .415 | <.001 | .53, 1.73 |
| High Bias: SM of Vig.  | .55 | .26 | .241 | .034 | .04, 1.05 | -.63 | .30 | -.231 | .036 | -1.22, -.04 |
| *Note*. Main effects and interactions (top half of table) are from steps 1, 2, and 4 of the model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, and all 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interactions between variables. Simple effects (bottom half of table) are from step 2 of the model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology |

Table S14

*Study 1 Main, Interactive, and Simple Main Effects (SM) of Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias on Free-Speech Protections and Hate Crime Designation, Excluding Non-White Participants (Total N=144)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Free-Speech Protections** | **Hate Crime Designation** |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | Vignette Type | .05 | .18 | .020 | .800 | -.31, .40 | .58 | .30 | .214 | .056 | -.01, 1.18 |
| Act Severity | -.74 | .18 | -.326 | .000 | -1.10, -.38 | 1.17 | .31 | .431 | <.001 | .56, 1.79 |
| 4 | Vignette Type | -.06 | .31 | -.027 | .841 | -.67, .54 | .78 | .37 | .288 | .036 | .05, 1.51 |
| Act Severity | -.71 | .31 | -.312 | .025 | -1.33, -.09 | 1.15 | .38 | .424 | .003 | .41, 1.90 |
| 2 | Vig. Type x Bias | .29 | .17 | .247 | .098 | -.05, .63 | -.69 | .21 | -.493 | .001 | -1.10, -.28 |
| 2 | White Target: SM of Bias | .04 | .12 | .043 | .763 | -.20, .28 | .30 | .14 | .295 | .038 | .02, .58 |
| Black Target: SM of Bias | .40 | .12 | .473 | .001 | .16, .64 | -.43 | .14 | -.427 | .003 | -.71, -.15 |
| Low Bias: SM of Vig.  | -.46 | .30 | -.203 | .122 | -1.05, .12 | 1.24 | .35 | .456 | .001 | .54, 1.93 |
| High Bias: SM of Vig. | .51 | .28 | .223 | .069 | -.04, 1.05 | -.71 | .33 | -.261 | .032 | -1.36, -.06 |
| *Note*. Main effects and interactions (top half of table) are from steps 1, 2, and 4 of the model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, and all 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interactions between variables. Simple effects (bottom half of table) are from step 2 of the model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology |

# **Section 6: Studies 1 and 2 Additional Measures**

Study 1 included two additional measures assessing perceptions of the Black versus White-targeted act. To indicate perceptions of guilt, participants responded on a 1=*innocent* to 7=*guilty* scale to four crimes with which the perpetrator could ostensibly be charged: disturbing the peace, harassment, trespassing, and intimidation. Each crime was followed by a brief definition. The next scale measured how severe a punishment the defendant should receive for each of the four crimes listed previously. Participants responded on a scale of 1=*no punishment* to 4=*high punishment* and were given examples of lowest and highest punishment for each crime.

In Study 2, to explore possible explanations for the pro-Black responses of participants low in anti-Black Bias, we tested a number of individual differences in the first session of the study, see Table S15. Because anti-Black attitudes are often related to system-justifying ideologies (Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002), we measured political ideology, system justification, and social dominance orientation. To examine whether lower Anti-Black Bias individuals’ knowledge of racism explained their responses (Case, 2007; Pope, Price, & Wolfers, 2013), we measured awareness of one’s own racial biases, awareness of racial discrimination in American society, recognition of one’s White privilege, and feelings of remorse regarding one’s White Privilege. A libertarianism scale was included to account for differences in general belief in the protection of individuals’ rights (Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012).

Additionally, we administered a short 8-item quiz on America’s racial history. Participants indicated whether statements about America’s history were true or false. We designed the scale to measure accuracy in understanding of American racial history, with an emphasis on topics often presented in a sanitized way that minimizes America’s history of institutional racism (Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2013; Theoharis, 2016). Statements included “President Nixon’s “war on drugs” was a response to widespread drug use and was not designed to harm any specific racial group”. See Table S16 for a full list of statements, the veracity of each statement, and references supporting each statement. The number of correct responses (ranging from zero to 8) was summed to create a History Knowledge score (*M*=5.32, *SD*=1.99).

During the second session, participants responded (1=*not at all* to 5=*to a great extent*) to four items, modified from Study 1, to measure perceptions of the act as protected by free speech rights under the First Amendment, α=.91. Questions included “To what extent do you think [Name] was just exercising his right to free speech as stated in the First Amendment?” and “To what extent do you believe [Name’s] actions should be protected under the free speech clause of the First Amendment?” To more fully investigate perceptions of the harmful act, we included a 6-item measure of harmfulness (*M*=3.48, *SD*=1.04), with responses ranging from 1=*not at all* to 5=*to a great extent*, which included items such as “How harmful were [Name’s] actions?” and “To what extent did [Name’s] actions hurt [White/Black] people in general?”, α=.90. At the end of the survey, based on work indicating that individuals tend to be biased against ideologically dissimilar others (Wetherell, Brandt, & Reyna, 2013), we measured negative attitudes towards individuals who hold anti-Black prejudice with a 7-item scale combined with 5 distractor items. Statements included “I get angry when someone assumes that all Black children come from single-parent families” and distractor items included “I hate it when someone assumes that all fundamentalist Christians are unintelligent.”

Table S15

*Study 2 Exploratory Individual Difference Measures*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure Name** | **Scale Used** | **#** | **Alpha** | **Example Item** |
| **System Justification** Kay & Jost, 2003 | 1=*extremely disagree* to 9=*extremely agree* | 8 | .93 | “Most policies serve the greater good.” |
| **Anti-Black Bias** Katz & Hass, 1988 | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 4 | .92 | “On the whole, Black people don’t stress education and training,” |
| **Perceptions of Own Understanding of America’s Racial History** | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 4 | .86 | “I have a pretty good understanding of how Black people have been treated at various points in America’s history” |
| **SDO- Egalitarianism**Ho et al., 2015 | 1=*very negative* to 7*=very positive* | 8 | .94 | “It is unjust to try to make groups equal |
| **SDO- Dominance**Ho et al., 2015 | 1=*very negative* to 7*=very positive* | 8 | .90 | “Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups” |
| **Bias Awareness**Perry, Dovidio, Murphy, & van Ryn, 2015 | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 5 | .76 | “Even though I know it’s not appropriate, I sometimes feel that I hold unconscious negative attitudes toward Blacks” |
| **Awareness of Racial Discrimination** Adapted from Pietri et al. (2016) | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 5 | .83 | “In my opinion, Black people often do not have trouble getting hired (reverse scored)” |
| **White Privilege Awareness** Lowery, Knowles & Unzueta, 2007 | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 6 | .94 | “White people have certain advantages that minorities do not have in this society” |
| **White Privilege Remorse** Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009 | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 6 | .97 | “I am ashamed of my White privilege” |
| **Libertarianism** | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 8 | .69 | “A government should protect citizens’ individual freedoms, at all costs” |
| **Prejudiced Against the Prejudiced** | 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree* | 7 | .85 | “I would be mad at a friend if they wore Blackface as part of a Halloween costume “ |

Table S16

*Study 2 Items from History Knowledge Scale*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Statement** | **Correct Response** | **Reference** |
| 1. Jim Crow laws—which enforced segregation, limited job opportunities and kept Black Americans from voting—were in effect until the 1960s.
 | True | Tafari, 2002 |
| 1. In 1963, the FBI considered Dr. Martin Luther King Jr to be a potential threat to national security and thus took a series of measures to monitor his behavior.
 | True | Gage, 2014 |
| 1. During the Civil Rights Era, police officers in general did not use force to subdue individuals who engaged in peaceful and non-violent forms of protest.
 | False | Siemaszko, 2012 |
| 1. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was necessary to ensure that all Black people could exercise their right to vote.
 | True | U.S Dept. of Justice, 2017 |
| 1. After the Great Depression, a government organization intentionally labeled neighborhoods with large Black populations as undesirable; because the Federal Housing Administration would not insure mortgages for homes in these neighborhoods, Black families’ ability to own homes was directly impacted.
 | True | Domonoske, 2016 |
| 1. During the time before the Civil War, most African slaves were generally well cared for by their owners.
 | False | Boston, 2004 |
| 1. Since the passage of the 15th amendment, state governments have, for the most part, supported Black people’s right to vote.
 | False | Fabry, 2016 |
| 1. President Nixon’s “war on drugs” was a response to widespread drug use and was not designed to harm any specific racial group
 | False | Newman & Papa, 2016 |

# **Section 7: Study 2 Additional Analyses**

## **Predicting Harmfulness**

Participants’ responses to the six items assessing the perceived harm caused by the act were averaged to create a Harmfulness score. Harmfulness ratings were positively associated with the willingness to label the act a hate crime; see Table S17 for bivariate correlations between Harmfulness and all other relevant variables. These data indicate that Hate Crime Designation may be employed as an indirect measure of perceived harmfulness. We investigated Harmfulness using the method utilized in the main text. We first examined main and interactive effects of Vignette Type, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, FOS Mention, and Education using a model testing all 2-way, 3-way, 4-way, and 5-way interactions between the variables. In the first step of the regression model, there was a significant effect of Vignette Type such that participants rated the Black-targeted act as more harmful than the White-targeted act (see Table S18). Less educated participants and participants with more conservative political ideology viewed the act as significantly more harmful than those with more education and with more liberal political ideology, regardless of target race.

The predicted Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction was significant at Step 2 and was not moderated by other predictors. In the analyses examining this interaction further (see Table S18), we controlled for the effects of FOS Mention, a manipulated independent variable, Education, Political Ideology and Political Ideology x Vignette Type. When the act was directed at Blacks, Anti-Black Bias was associated with viewing the act as less harmful. There was no effect of Anti-Black Bias for the White-targeted vignette. Both those low and high in Anti-Black Bias saw the Black-targeted incident as more harmful than the White-targeted incident, but this effect was stronger for low Anti-Black Bias participants.

Table S17

*Study 2 Bivariate Correlations of Harmfulness with Hate Crime Designation (HCD), Free-Speech Protections (FSP), Anti-Black Bias, Education, and Political Ideology*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HCD** | **FSP** | **Anti-Black Bias** | **Education** | **Political Ideology** |
| **Harmfulness** | *r*=.626*p*<.001 | *r*=-.470*p*<.001 | *r*=.051*p*=.409 | *r*=-.141*p*=.023 | *r*=.174*p*=.005 |

Table S18

*Study 2 Main, Interactive, and Simple Effects of FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Education, Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias on Harmfulness*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| 1 | **FOS Mention** | -.07 | .11 | -.033 | .543 | -.29, .15 |
| **Vignette Type** | .99 | .11 | .478 | .000 | .78, 1.21 |
| **Political Ideology** | .13 | .04 | .192 | .003 | .05, .22 |
| **Education** | -.08 | .04 | -.105 | .052 | -.15, .00 |
| 5 | **FOS Mention** | -.06 | .19 | -.028 | .762 | -.43, .32 |
| **Vignette Type** | 1.04 | .18 | .498 | .000 | .68, 1.40 |
| **Political Ideology** | .14 | .09 | .201 | .113 | -.03, .31 |
| **Education** | -.12 | .09 | -.165 | .214 | -.30, .07 |
| 2 | **Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias** | -.33 | .12 | -.229 | .007 | -.56, -.09 |
| 2 | **White Target: Simple effect of Anti-Black Bias** | .08 | .08 | .083 | .336 | -.08, .24 |
| **Black Target: Simple effect of Anti-Black Bias** | -.47 | .13 | -.358 | <.001 | -.71, -.22 |
| **Low Anti-Black Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type**  | 1.25 | .26 | .441 | <.001 | .74, 1.75 |
| **High Anti-Black Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type** | .57 | .16 | .274 | <.001 | .25, .89 |
| *Note*. Main effects and interactions (top half of table) are from steps 1, 2, and 5 of the model containing Vignette Type, FOS Mention, Political Ideology, Education, Anti-Black Bias, and all 2-way, 3-way, 4-way, and 5-way interactions between variables. Simple effects (bottom half of table) are from step 2 of the model containing Vignette Type, FOS Mention, Political Ideology, Education, Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology |

## **Explaining Low-Prejudice Participants’ Responses**

 In Study 2, we explored additional factors that could explain why low-prejudice participants in Study 1 rated White-targeted acts as more protected by free speech rights and less likely to be a hate crime compared to those high in prejudice. During the first session, participants completed a number of individual difference measures, as described in SM Section 6. We ran a number of exploratory analyses on these measures to investigate different hypotheses.

**White Privilege Remorse and History Knowledge.** One explanation we considered is that low-prejudice individuals may have a more comprehensive understanding of the harm Blacks have endured throughout US history (Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2013), and may feel negatively about the role White Americans have played in the historical and contemporary oppression of Blacks (Amodio, Devine, & Harmon-Jones, 2007; Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005). Thus, when low-prejudice participants judged the harmfulness of the Black- versus- White-targeted incident, they may have situated the act in the broader context of interracial violence in the US, considering the centuries-long, often government-sanctioned, discrimination and violence Blacks have faced at the hands of Whites (Wyatt-Nichol & Seabrook, 2016). In this context, Black-targeted acts are much more dangerous, not only to the particular target and to others members of their racial group but also to society generally, compared to White-targeted acts.

If this interpretation is correct, we would expect that participants lower in prejudice would generally be more aware of historical injustice and/or respond more negatively to it, compared to those higher in prejudice. Moreover, to the extent that these understandings and reactions underlie the prejudice x vignette interactions we observed, we would expect that if we replaced Anti-Black Bias with each of these alternative individual-difference measures, we would obtain a measure x vignette interaction and demonstrate a simple effect of vignette (White vs. Black target) for participants high in awareness of racial history and/or high in remorse regarding their White privilege (as we find for prejudice). Alternatively, to the extent to which one or more of these measures accounts for the effects of prejudice in our primary analyses, controlling for the measure (treating it as a covariate) would reduce the prejudice x vignette interaction to non-significance.

 During the first session of Study 2, participants completed a scale measuring the extent to which they felt guilty about the unearned higher status and power Whites enjoy compared to Blacks (Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009, see SM Section 6). Responses were averaged to form the variable White Privilege Remorse. Participants also completed a quiz assessing their knowledge of the US’s past maltreatment of Backs (Theoharis, 2016, see SM Section 6). Responses were summed to form the variable History Knowledge.

To test if these two measures partially or fully accounted for the effect of Vignette Type among low Anti-Black Bias participants, we conducted three different types of analyses. First, we examined bivariate correlations with Anti-Black Bias. Anti-Black Bias was negatively associated with remorse regarding White privilege (*r*=-.492, *p*<.001) and History Knowledge (*r*=-.349, *p*<.001).

Second, we investigated each measure’s interaction with Vignette Type to see its effects on the two dependent variables. If either measure explains the effect of Anti-Black Bias in the White-targeted condition, the measure, if it were to replace Anti-Black Bias in the model, should evince a significant interaction with Vignette Type such that those with high remorse (or high knowledge of history), at one SD above the mean, should perceive the White- (versus Black-) targeted-act as more protected by free speech rights and less as a hate crime. Thus, we tested two models containing FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Political Ideology, Education, and [White Privilege Remorse or History Knowledge] in step 1, Vignette Type x [White Privilege Remorse or History Knowledge] in step 2, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology in step 3.

All statistics for the two models can be found in Table S19. The Vignette Type x White Privilege Remorse interaction had no effect on Free-Speech Protections (*p*=.368), but was significant for Hate Crime Designation (*p*=.035). Participants with more White Privilege Remorse rated the Black- (versus-) White-targeted act more as a hate crime (p<.001). The Vignette Type x History Knowledge interaction did not predict Free-Speech Protections (*p*=.548) or Hate Crime Designation (*p*=.070).

Third, building off of the regression model used to examine simple effects in the main text, we tested the robustness of the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction to the inclusion of White Privilege Remorse and/or History Knowledge, along with the measure’s interaction with Vignette Type, in a fourth step. Hence, this model contained FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Political Ideology, Education, Anti-Black Bias at step 1, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias at step 2, Vignette Type x Political Ideology in step 3, and [Measure] and Vignette Type x [Measure] at step 4. If either measure accounted for the effect of Anti-Black Bias on Free-Speech Protections or Hate Crime Designation, the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction, and the simple main effect Vignette Type among low Anti-Black Bias participants, should both be non-significant when that measure is added to the model. We tested three models—one added only History Knowledge and its interaction with Vignette Type at step 4, one added only White Privilege Remorse and its interaction with Vignette Type at step 4, and one added both measures and their interactions with Vignette Type at step 4.

The addition of History Knowledge and its interaction with Vignette Type had no effect on the results, see Table S20. The addition of White Privilege Remorse and its interaction with Vignette Type made the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction for Free-Speech Protections marginally significant (*p*=.054), but the effect of Vignette Type for low-prejudice participants remained; see Table S21. In the model with both measures and their interaction with Vignette Type, the effect of Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias on Free-Speech Protections became marginally significant (*p*=.064), but again the effect of Vignette Type for participants low in Anti-Black Bias persisted; see Table S22.

**Other Exploratory Measures**. We conducted these same three tests with each of the other exploratory measures included at Time 1 of Study 2: White Privilege Awareness, Bias Awareness, Libertarianism, System Justifying Beliefs (SJB), Awareness of Racial Discrimination, Social Dominance Orientation- Egalitarianism (SDO-E), Social Dominance Orientation- Dominance (SDO-D), and Prejudice Against the Prejudiced (see SM Section 6 for descriptions of each measure). Table S23 gives the correlation with Anti-Black Bias for each variable. Table S24 presents, for each measure, (a) its interaction with Vignette Type in a model where the measure takes the places of Anti-Black Bias, (b) The simple main effect of Vignette Type among individuals either low or high in that measure (depending on its’ relationship with Anti-Black Bias, e.g., individuals high in White Privilege Remorse, one SD above the mean, are low in Anti-Black Bias whereas individuals low in SJB are low in Anti-Black Bias) from that same model, (c) Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias when the measure is included in the fourth step of the regression model used to examine simple effects in the main text, and (d) the simple main effect of Anti-Black Bias in the White-targeted condition from that same model.

Table S19

*Study 2 Vignette Type x History Knowledge, Vignette Type x White Privilege Remorse, and Simple Effects of History Knowledge and White Privilege Remorse in the White-targeted Condition, Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FSP) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | Vignette Type x Remorse | -.12 | .13 | -.093 | .368 | -.38, .14 |
| High Remorse: Simple effect of Vignette | -.55 | .24 | -.220 | .023 | -1.02, -.08 |
| Vignette Type x History Knowledge | -.05 | .09 | -.061 | .548 | -.22, .12 |
| High History Knowledge: Simple effect of Vignette | -.49 | .23 | -.196 | .035 | -.94, -.04 |
| **HCD** | Vignette Type x Remorse | .30 | .14 | .209 | .035 | .02, .58 |
| High Remorse: Simple effect of Vignette | 1.06 | .26 | .375 | .000 | .55, 1.58 |
| Vignette Type x History Knowledge | .17 | .10 | .179 | .070 | -.01, .36 |
| High History Knowledge: Simple effect of Vignette | .96 | .25 | .340 | .000 | .47, 1.46 |
| Note. Effects involving White Privilege Remorse are from step 3 of the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Education, Political Ideology, and White Privilege Remorse at step 1, Vignette Type x White Privilege Remorse at step 2, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology at step 3. Effects involving History Knowledge are from step 3 of the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Education, Political Ideology, and History Knowledge at step 1, Vignette Type x History Knowledge at step 2, and Vignette Type x Political Ideology at step 3 |

Table S20

*Study 2 Main Effect of History Knowledge, Interactive Effect of Vignette Type and History Knowledge, Interactive Effect of Vignette Type and Anti-Black Bias, and Simple Effect of Vignette Type among Low Bias Individuals When History Knowledge and its Interaction with Vignette Type Is Included in the Model, Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FCD) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | History Knowledge | -.03 | .07 | -.039 | .708 | -.16, .11 |
| Vignette Type x History | -.03 | .09 | -.032 | .758 | -.20, .15 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | .34 | .17 | .201 | .044 | .01, .68 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | -.76 | .24 | -.305 | .002 | -1.24, -.29 |
| **HCD** | History Knowledge | -.10 | .07 | -.143 | .152 | -.24, .04 |
| Vignette Type x History | .13 | .09 | .137 | .160 | -.05, .32 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | -.56 | .18 | -.287 | .003 | -.92, -.20 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | 1.22 | .26 | .432 | <.001 | .72, 1.73 |
| *Note.* All numbers come from step 4 of the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education at step 1, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias at step 2, Vignette Type x Political Ideology at step 3, and History Knowledge and Vignette Type x History Knowledge at step 4.  |

Table S21

*Study 2 Main Effect of White Privilege Remorse, Interactive Effect of Vignette Type and White Privilege Remorse, Interactive Effect of Vignette Type and Anti-Black Bias, and Simple Effect of Vignette Type among Low Bias Individuals When White Privilege Remorse and its Interaction with Vignette Type Is Included in the Model, Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FSP) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | White Privilege Remorse | .00 | .10 | -.003 | .980 | -.20, .19 |
| Vignette Type x Remorse | -.05 | .14 | -.035 | .741 | -.31, .22 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | .34 | .18 | .198 | .054 | -.01, .69 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | -.75 | .25 | -.302 | .002 | -1.24, -.27 |
| **HCD** | White Privilege Remorse | -.05 | .11 | -.054 | .612 | -.26, .16 |
| Vignette Type x Remorse | .20 | .15 | .137 | .176 | -.09, .48 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | -.52 | .19 | -.269 | .006 | -.89, -.15 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | 1.20 | .26 | .424 | <.001 | .68, 1.72 |
| *Note.* All numbers come from step 4 of the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education at step 1, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias at step 2, Vignette Type x Political Ideology at step 3, and White Privilege Remorse and Vignette Type x White Privilege Remorse at step 4.  |

Table S22

*Study 2 Main Effects of White Privilege Remorse and History Knowledge; Interactive Effects of Vignette Type with Anti-Black Bias, White Privilege Remorse, and History Knowledge; and Simple Effect of Vignette Type among Low Bias Individuals When History Knowledge, White Privilege Remorse and Their Interactions with Vignette Type Are Included in the Model; Predicting Free-Speech Protections (FSP) and Hate Crime Designation (HCD)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **FSP** | History Knowledge | -.03 | .07 | -.040 | .708 | -.16, .11 |
| Vignette Type x History | -.03 | .09 | -.030 | .772 | -.20, .15 |
| White Privilege Remorse | .00 | .10 | .000 | .997 | -.20, .20 |
| Vignette Type x Remorse | -.04 | .14 | -.034 | .749 | -.31, .23 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | .33 | .18 | .193 | .064 | -.02, .68 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | -.75 | .25 | -.300 | .003 | -1.24, -.26 |
| **HCD** | History Knowledge | -.10 | .07 | -.140 | .158 | -.24, .04 |
| Vignette Type x History | .13 | .09 | .131 | .180 | -.06, .31 |
| White Privilege Remorse | -.05 | .11 | -.049 | .648 | -.26, .16 |
| Vignette Type x Remorse | .19 | .15 | .131 | .194 | -.10, .48 |
| Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias | -.49 | .19 | -.254 | .010 | -.87, -.12 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette | 1.16 | .26 | .410 | .000 | .64, 1.68 |
| *Note.* All numbers come from step 4 of the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, Political Ideology, and Education at step 1, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias at step 2, Vignette Type x Political Ideology at step 3, and White Privilege Remorse, History Knowledge, Vignette Type x White Privilege Remorse, and Vignette Type x History Knowledge at step 4.  |

Table S23

*Study 2 Bivariate Correlations for Anti-Black Bias with White Privilege Awareness, Bias Awareness, Libertarianism, System Justifying Beliefs (SJB), Awareness of Racial Discrimination, Social Dominance Orientation- Egalitarianism (SDO-E), Social Dominance Orientation- Dominance (SDO-D), and Prejudice Against the Prejudiced*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Correlation with Anti-Black Bias** |
| White Privilege Awareness | *r*=-.630, *p*<.001 |
| Bias Awareness | *r*= -.002, *p*=.970 |
| Libertarianism | *r*=.427, *p*<.001 |
| SJB | *r*=.384, *p*<.001 |
| Awareness of Racial Discrimination | *r*= -.388, *p*<.001 |
| SDO-E | *r*=.602, *p*<.001 |
| SDO-D | *r*=.570, *p*<.001 |
| Prejudice Against the Prejudiced | *r*=-.640, *p*<.001 |

Table S24

*Study 2 Vignette Type x [Measure], Simple Effect of Vignette Type for Low Bias Individuals, Vignette x Anti-Black Bias, and Simple Effect of Vignette Type for Low/High [Measure] Individuals for the Measures White Privilege Awareness, Bias Awareness, Libertarianism, System Justifying Beliefs, Awareness of Racial Discrimination, Social Dominance Orientation- Egalitarianism (SDO-E), Social Dominance Orientation- Dominance (SDO-D), and Prejudice Against the Prejudiced*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Free-Speech Protections** | **Hate Crime Designation** |
| **Measure** | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **White Privilege Awareness** | Vig x Priv Aw | -.16 | .15 | -.112 | .314 | -.46, .15 | .41 | .17 | .263 | .014 | .08, .74 |
| High Aw: Vig | -.58 | .25 | -.233 | .022 | -1.08, -.09 | 1.16 | .27 | .410 | .000 | .62, 1.70 |
| Vig x Bias | .36 | .19 | .208 | .061 | -.02, .73 | -.47 | .20 | -.241 | .022 | -.87, -.07 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.77 | .26 | -.309 | .003 | -1.28, -.26 | 1.14 | .28 | .401 | .000 | .59, 1.68 |
| **Bias Awareness** | Vig x Bias Aw | .12 | .11 | .092 | .284 | -.10, .34 | .17 | .12 | .115 | .166 | -.07, .41 |
| High Aw: Vig | -.20 | .22 | -.081 | .356 | -.64, .23 | .86 | .24 | .303 | .000 | .38, 1.33 |
| Vig x Bias | .34 | .17 | .201 | .043 | .01, .68 | -.64 | .18 | -.332 | .000 | -1.00, -.29 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.75 | .24 | -.300 | .002 | -1.22, -.28 | -.75 | .24 | -.300 | .002 | -1.22, -.28 |
| **Libertarianism** | Vig x Lib | -.20 | .24 | -.080 | .405 | -.68, .28 | -.24 | .26 | -.084 | .362 | -.76, .28 |
| Low Lib: Vig | -.23 | .23 | -.093 | .319 | -.69, .23 | .80 | .25 | .281 | .002 | .30, 1.29 |
| Vig x Bias | .41 | .17 | .239 | .018 | .07, .75 | -.58 | .19 | -.299 | .002 | -.95, -.21 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.83 | .24 | -.331 | .001 | -1.30, -.35 | 1.26 | .26 | .444 | .000 | .74, 1.77 |
| **System Justifying Beliefs** | Vig x SJB | .10 | .09 | .119 | .231 | -.07, .27 | -.04 | .09 | -.038 | .694 | -.22, .15 |
| Low SJB: Vig | -.58 | .23 | -.234 | .011 | -1.03, -.14 | .69 | .25 | .245 | .006 | .20, 1.19 |
| Vig x Bias | .34 | .17 | .196 | .050 | .00, .67 | -.60 | .18 | -.307 | .001 | -.96, -.23 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.74 | .24 | -.298 | .002 | -1.22, -.27 | 1.27 | .26 | .450 | .000 | .76, 1.79 |
| **Awareness of Racial Disc.** | Vig x Disc Aw | .03 | .18 | .020 | .858 | -.32, .38 | .29 | .19 | .156 | .141 | -.10, .67 |
| High Aw: Vig | -.35 | .24 | -.140 | .149 | -.83, .13 | .94 | .26 | .332 | .000 | .42, 1.46 |
| Vig x Bias | .36 | .17 | .213 | .033 | .03, .70 | -.56 | .18 | -.291 | .002 | -.92, -.21 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.78 | .24 | -.314 | .001 | -1.26, -.31 | 1.25 | .26 | .442 | .000 | .74, 1.76 |
| **SDO-E** | Vig x SDO-E | -.02 | .13 | -.012 | .909 | -.27, .24 | -.21 | .14 | -.149 | .142 | -.48, .07 |
| Low SDO: Vig | -.36 | .24 | -.146 | .130 | -.84, .11 | .93 | .26 | .328 | .000 | .42, 1.44 |
| Vig x Bias | .43 | .19 | .251 | .022 | .06, .80 | -.56 | .20 | -.289 | .006 | -.95, -.16 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.86 | .25 | -.343 | .001 | -1.36, -.36 | 1.25 | .27 | .440 | .000 | .71, 1.78 |
| **SDO-D** | Vig x SDO-D | .25 | .14 | .181 | .072 | -.02, .52 | -.33 | .15 | -.212 | .030 | -.63, -.03 |
| Low SDO: Vig | -.70 | .23 | -.279 | .003 | -1.15, -.24 | 1.04 | .26 | .368 | .000 | .54, 1.54 |
| Vig x Bias | .29 | .18 | .170 | .116 | -.07, .65 | -.50 | .20 | -.260 | .012 | -.90, -.11 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.70 | .25 | -.279 | .006 | -1.19, -.20 | 1.17 | .27 | .414 | .000 | .63, 1.71 |
| **Prej. Against the Prejudiced** | Vig x Prej | -.25 | .16 | -.152 | .116 | -.57, .06 | .54 | .17 | .288 | .002 | .21, .87 |
| High Prej: Vig | -.65 | .23 | -.261 | .005 | -1.11, -.20 | 1.20 | .24 | .424 | .000 | .72, 1.68 |
| Vig x Bias | .26 | .19 | .155 | .174 | -.12, .64 | -.38 | .21 | -.195 | .067 | -.78, .03 |
| Low Bias: Vig | -.66 | .26 | -.264 | .012 | -1.17, -.15 | 1.01 | .28 | .359 | .000 | .47, 1.55 |
| *Note*. Effects involving [Measure] are from the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Education, Political Ideology, [Measure], Vignette Type x [Measure], and Vignette Type x Political Ideology. Effects involving Anti-Black Bias come from the model which includes FOS Mention, Vignette Type, Education, Political Ideology, Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Political Ideology, [Measure], and Vignette Type x [Measure]. |

# **Section 8: Probing Interactions using the Johnson-Neyman Technique**

In additional analyses, we probed the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interactive effect for Studies 1 and 2 using the Johnson-Neyman technique (Johnson & Fay, 1950), to get a fuller picture of how participants’ racial bias influenced their responses to Black- versus White-targeted incidents (D’Alonzo, 2004).

**Study 1**

Our original simple slopes analyses (Aiken, West, & Reno, 1991) examined the effect of Vignette Type on Free-Speech Protections and Hate Crime Designation at Anti-Black Bias=-1.33 and 1.33 (1 standard deviation below and above the mean). In these analyses, those low in bias perceived fewer free-speech protections and were more likely to assign the hate crime label to Black-target acts. Those high in bias showed the opposite effect. Using the Johnson-Neyman (JN) technique (Hayes, 2013), we found that Vignette Type significantly influenced responses across a wider range of Anti-Black Bias scores than suggested by these analyses. In actuality, participants at or below Z=-1.18 viewed the White-target act as significantly more protected by free speech rights, whereas participants at or above Z=1.11 showed the opposite effect. Participants at or below Z=-.12 were significantly more likely to designate the Black-target act as a hate crime; those at or above Z=1.31 showed the opposite pattern of responses.

**Study 2**

Our original analyses, which tested the effect of Vignette Type at Anti-Black Bias levels of -1.09 and 1.09 (1 standard deviation below and above the mean), showed that participants low in Anti-Black Bias viewed Black-target acts as less protected by free speech rights and were more likely to designate these acts as hate crimes, but that those high in Anti-Black Bias did not differentiate between the two acts. JN analyses revealed a more nuanced relationship between Anti-Black Bias and perceptions of hateful acts. Participants at or below Z=.21 (i.e., those average or low in bias) perceived more free-speech protections for the Black-target act and all other participants showed no effect of Vignette Type. Similarly, participants at or below Z=.45 were more willing to designate the Black-target act as a hate crime. For this measure, however, participants high in bias also showed an effect of Vignette Type—more often labeling the White-target act as a hate crime—but this effect was only significant for participants with extremely high levels of Anti-Black Bias, Z=2.89, over 2 standard deviations above the mean.

These results suggest that the null effect of Vignette Type for high Anti-Black Bias participants discussed in the main text may be an artifact of the way we chose to break down the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction, or of the Anti-Black Bias measure used in this study. As mentioned in the main text, the Study 2 racial bias scale measured more overt bias, which may have produced limited endorsement of bias as measured in the scale, even among participants who scored *relatively* high on this measure.

# **Section 9: Study 1 Examining Moderating Role of Political Ideology on Vignette Type by Anti-Black Bias Interaction for Hate Crime Designation**

As recommended by Yzerbyt, Muller, and Judd (2004), for Study 1 we examined the effects of our manipulated and ideological variables by testing a model which contained Vignette Type, Act Severity, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology in the first step, all two-way interactions between variables in the second step, all three-way interactions in the third step, and the four-way interaction in the fourth step. These analyses revealed a significant three-way interaction between Vignette Type, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology for Hate Crime Designation, b=-.27, SE=.11, β=-.285, *p*=.014, 95%CI[-.49, -.06]. We further examined this interaction using a model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Anti-Black Bias, and Political Ideology in the first step; Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology in the second step; and Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology, b=-.23, SE=.10, β=-.244, *p*=.024, 95%CI[-.44, -.03], in the final and third step.

Because the Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias interaction is central to testing our hypotheses, we chose to examine the three-way interaction by examining the Vignette Type by Anti-Black Bias interaction among those low in conservatism (1 SD below the mean), i.e., liberals and among those high in conservatism (1 SD above the mean), i.e., conservatives. This interaction was statistically significant for both liberals, b=-.42, SE=.19, β=-.300, *p*=.027, 95%CI[-.80, -.05], and conservatives, b=-1.10, SE=.26, β=-.777, *p*<.001, 95%CI[-1.61, -.59], but the interactive effect was stronger among conservatives.

As shown in Figure S4 and Table S25, liberals’ levels of Anti-Black Bias did not significantly predict willingness to designate the act as a hate crime in the Black target or White target condition. Consistent with the analyses reported in the main text, liberals high in Anti-Black Bias were not affected by Vignette Type, but liberals low in Anti-Black Bias more strongly designated the Black target (versus White target) act as a hate crime. By comparison, as shown in Figure S5 and Table S25, conservatives’ levels of Anti-Black Bias significantly predicted Hate Crime Designation in both vignette conditions. Conservatives higher in Anti-Black Bias viewed the Black target act less as a hate crime, whereas conservatives lower in Anti-Black Bias viewed the White target act less as a hate crime. Similar to liberals, conservatives low in Anti-Black Bias were significantly more willing to designate the Black target (versus White target) act as a hate crime. Interestingly, and in contrast with the pattern of results reported in the main text, conservatives high in Anti-Black Bias were more willing to designate the White target (versus Black target) act as a hate crime, although this effect just barely missed the cut-off for statistical significance with *p*=.053.

These data suggest that in Study 1, when judging if a racially motivated act should be labeled as a hate crime, conservatives’ responses were more strongly affected by their racial prejudices and the race of the target. A number of factors could explain this pattern of results. Lower variation in levels of anti-Black prejudice among liberals, who tend to be generally lower in racial prejudice when compared to conservatives (Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1996; Woods & Marciniak, 2017), might in part explain the non-significant effects of racism for these participants. Conservatives low in anti-Black prejudice showed an enormous effect of target race; Figure S5 shows that these participants’ hate crime designation scores (which ranged from 1 to 5) were at ceiling for the Black target act and were below the midpoint of the scale for the White target act. These responses might represent a hypervigilance due to fears of being labeled “racist” in situations where one’s responses could be construed as reflecting levels of racial bias; in a recent article in *The Atlantic*, Peter Beinart (2017) describes this phenomenon, stating that “Conservatives are fearful of discussing politics, because they dread being called a bigot.” In this case, it might be that this fear of being called a “bigot” motivates conservatives to steer clear of any opinion that could possibly be viewed as anti-Black and to instead express a clear pro-Black bias.

*Figure S4*. Study 1 Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias Interaction for Hate Crime Designation Among Liberals

*Figure S5*. Study 1 Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias Interaction for Hate Crime Designation Among Conservatives

Table S25

*Study 1 Simple Effects of Vignette Type and Anti-Black Bias Predicting Hate Crime Designation Among Liberals and Conservatives*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Effect** | **B** | **SE** | **β** | **P** | **95% CI** |
| **Liberals** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | .23 | .14 | .228 | .098 | -.04, .51 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.19 | .13 | -.190 | .144 | -.45, .07 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | .72 | .29 | .269 | .014 | .15, 1.30 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | -.40 | .45 | -.150 | .373 | -1.29, .49 |
| **Conservatives** | White Target: Simple effect of Bias | .51 | .16 | .501 | .002 | .19, .83 |
| Black Target: Simple effect of Bias | -.59 | .20 | -.582 | .004 | -.99, -.19 |
| Low Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type  | 2.37 | .63 | .882 | <.001 | 1.13, 3.61 |
| High Bias: Simple effect of Vignette Type | -.55 | .28 | -.205 | .053 | -1.11, .01 |

*Note*. All numbers come from step 3 of the model containing Vignette Type, Act Severity, Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias in step 1; Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias, Vignette Type x Political Ideology, and Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology in step 2; and Vignette Type x Anti-Black Bias x Political Ideology in step 3. Interactions for liberals and conservatives were probed at 1 SD below and 1 SD above the mean, respectively.

# **References**

Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Reno, R. R. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. London, England: Sage Publications.

Amodio, D. M., Devine, P. G., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2007). A dynamic model of guilt: Implications for motivation and self-regulation in the context of prejudice. *Psychological Science*, *18*(6), 524-530. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01933.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01933.x)

Boston, N. (2004). The slave experience: Living conditions. *Educational Broadcasting Corporation*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/slavery/experience/living/history.html>

Beinart, P. (December 2017). Republican is not a synonym for racist. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/12/conservatism-without-bigotry/544128/

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising White privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 34*(4), 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280701700250>

D’Alonzo, K. T. (2004). The Johnson-Neyman procedure as an alternative to ANCOVA. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *26*(7), 804-812. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945904266733

Domonoske, C. (2016, October 19). Interactive redlining map zooms in on America’s history of discrimination. *National Public Radio.* Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/10/19/498536077/interactive-redlining-map-zooms-in-on-americas-history-of-discrimination>

Fabry, M. (2016, November 8). A brief history of voting problems on election day. *Time Magazine.* Retrieved from <http://time.com/4531415/history-voting-problems-election-day/>

Gage, B. (2014, November 11). What an uncensored letter to MLK reveals. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/16/magazine/what-an-uncensored-letter-to-mlk-reveals.html?_r=1>

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., ... & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO₇ scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*(6), 1003-1028. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000033>

Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Understanding Libertarian morality: The psychological dispositions of self-identified Libertarians. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8), e42366. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042366>

Johnson, P. O., & Fay, L. C. (1950). The Johnson-Neyman technique, its theory and application. *Psychometrika*, *15*(4), 349-367. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02288864

Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., & Carvallo, M. R. (2002). Non-conscious forms of system justification: Implicit and behavioral preferences for higher status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*(6), 586–602. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00505-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031%2802%2900505-X)

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(6), 893–905. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.6.893>

Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of “poor but happy” and “poor but honest” stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 823–837. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823>

Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites’ motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(9), 1237–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207303016>

Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological Science*, *24*(2), 213-218. doi: 10.1177/0956797612451466

Newman, T. & Papa, A. (2016, March 23). Top adviser to Richard Nixon admitted that 'war on drugs' was policy tool to go after anti-war protesters and 'Black people'. *Drug Policy Alliance*. Retrieved from <http://www.drugpolicy.org/news/2016/03/top-adviser-richard-nixon-admitted-war-drugs-was-policy-tool-go-after-anti-war-proteste>

Perry, S. P., Dovidio, J. F., Murphy, M. C., & van Ryn, M. (2015). The joint effect of bias awareness and self-reported prejudice on intergroup anxiety and intentions for intergroup contact. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21(1), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037147>

Pietri, E. S., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Guha, D., Roussos, G.,Brescoll, V. L., & Handelsman, J. (2016). Using video to increase gender bias literacy toward women in science. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *41*(2), 1-22. doi: 10.1177/0361684316674721

Pinterits, E. J., Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The White Privilege Attitudes Scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(3), 417. doi:

10.1037/a0016274

Pope, D. G., Price, J., & Wolfers, J. (2013). Awareness reduces racial bias (No. w19765). *National Bureau of Economic Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19765>

Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(4), 508-521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271713>

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 476-490.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.476](http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.476)

Siemaszko, C. (2012, May 3). Birmingham erupted into chaos in 1963 as battle for civil rights exploded in South. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/birmingham-erupted-chaos-1963-battle-civil-rights-exploded-south-article-1.1071793>

Tafari, T. (2002). The rise and fall of Jim Crow: The Congress. *Educational Broadcasting Corporation*. Retrieved from <https://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/print/p_struggle_congress.html>

Theoharis, J. (2016, July 15). MLK would never shut down a freeway, and 6 other myths about the civil rights movement and Black Lives Matter. *The Root*. Retrieved from <http://www.theroot.com/mlk-would-never-shut-down-a-freeway-and-6-other-myths-1790856033>

United States Department of Justice. (2017). *History of federal voting rights laws*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/crt/history-federal-voting-rights-laws>

Wetherell, G. A., Brandt, M. J., & Reyna, C. (2013). Discrimination across the ideological divide: The role of value violations and abstract values in discrimination by liberals and conservatives. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *4*(6), 658-667. doi:

10.1177/1948550613476096

Woods, J., & Marciniak, A. (2017). The effects of perceived threat, political orientation, and framing on public reactions to punitive immigration law enforcement practices. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *3*(2), 202-217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649216660117>

Wyatt-Nichol, H. & Seabrook, R. (2016). The ugly side of America: Institutional oppression and race. *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy*, 23(1), 20-46.

Yzerbyt, V. Y., Muller, D., & Judd, C. M. (2004). Adjusting researchers’ approach to adjustment: On the use of covariates when testing interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 424–431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.10.001