ONLINE SUPPLEMENT

I. Study materials and measures, all studies

II. Power and sample size analyses for previous immigrant group labeling studies and the present studies

III. Items and factor loadings for factor analyses, Studies 2-5

IV. Analyses with regrouped DVs

V. MANOVAs and correlations between dependent variables, Studies 2-5

VI. Exploratory moderation by familiarity, Studies 4 and 5

VII. Additional meta-analysis: pairwise comparison of the effects of each label

VIII. Additional meta-analysis with regrouped DVs

IX. Additional meta-analysis: average effect size across studies measuring familiarity

I. STUDY MATERIALS AND MEASURES

STUDY 1

Study 1 Manipulation:

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the following group labels (sourced from Google Ngram that provided the 5 most frequently used labels for immigrants without authorization in the English language): *illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, and noncitizens.*

Introductory Study Prompt*: The following questions deal with your thoughts about the term* [*"**Group Label**"*]. *As you know, the issue of* [***Group Label***] *in the United States is hotly debated right now.*

For the label *noncitizen*, a line was added to the prompt above that clarified this group's legal status: "*who have come to the United States without documentation or visas*"

Study 1 Measures:

All dependent measures used the following response scale unless otherwise noted above:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					**Extremely**

Negativity (S1):

How positive is the term [**Group Label**]? _____

How negative is the term [**Group Label**]?_____

Perceived Illegality (S1):

In the United States, have [**Group Label**] who enter the U.S. violated immigration law?: Yes No

STUDIES 2-5

Studies 2-5 Manipulation:

(S2-5) As in Study 1, the randomly-assigned group label was piped into the prompt and the question text wherever [*Group Label*] is indicated.

(S2-4) Study Prompt*: The following questions deal with your thoughts about* [*Group Label*]. *As you know, the issue of* [*Group Label*] *in the United States is hotly debated right now. Please use the scale below to answer the following questions regarding* [*Group Label*].

For the label *noncitizen*, a line was added to the prompt above that clarified this group's legal status: "*who have come to the United States without documentation or visas*"

(S5) Study Prompt*: The following questions deal with your thoughts about* [*Group Label*] *who have come to the United States without documentation or visas. As you know, the issue of* [*Group Label*] *in the United States is hotly debated right now. Please use the scale below to answer the following questions regarding* [*Group Label*].

Study 2-5 Measures:

Perceived Illegality (S2):
In the United States, have [Group Label] who enter the U.S. violated immigration law?: Yes No

Prejudice Feeling Thermometer (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; S2-S4):
On a scale of 0° (very cold) to 100° (very warm), how warmly do you feel towards [Group Label]? _____(*0-100°*)

All dependent measures used the following response scale unless otherwise noted above:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Agree Somewhat**	**Disagree Somewhat**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Social Distance (Bogardus, 1967; S2-S4):
I would feel ok if [Group Label] were to move to this country. _____
I would feel ok if [Group Label] were to move into my neighborhood._____
I would feel ok if [Group Label] were to move onto my street. _____
I would feel ok if [Group Label] were to move in next door to me. _____

Negative Treatment (S2-S4):
I would be likely to help an [Group Label]. _____
I would be likely to protect an [Group Label]. _____
I would be likely to exclude an [Group Label]. _____
I would be likely to put down an [Group Label]. _____
I would be likely to report an [Group Label]. _____
I would be likely to turn in an [Group Label]. _____

Policy Support (S2-S4):
[Group Label] should be deported from the United States. _____
[Group Label] should not be punished and should be allowed to become citizens of the U.S. _____

Familiarity (S3-5):
Do you personally know an [Group Label]?: Yes No

II. PREVIOUS AND PRESENT RESEARCH POWER AND SAMPLE SIZE ANALYSES

Study	*n*	Observed power (1-β)	Effect size (R^2)
Three previous studies examining immigrant labelling effects			
Knoll et al., 2010 (*illegal immigrant, undocumented Mexican, undocumented immigrant*)	1497	1.0	.06
Pearson, 2010 (*undocumented worker, illegal alien*)	269	0.98	.02-.06
Ommundsen et al., 2014 (*illegal alien, illegal immigrant, undocumented immigrant*)	274	0.91	.06
Present research			
Study 2 (*illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, noncitizens*)	406	0.89	.03
Study 3 (*illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, noncitizens*)	512	0.95	.02
Study 4 (*illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, noncitizens, immigrants*)	523	1.0	.07
Study 5 (*illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, noncitizens, immigrants*)	438	.99	.02

III. ITEMS AND FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTOR ANALYSES: STUDIES 2-5

Study 2:

[Link Supplementary Table 1]

Study 3:

[Link Supplementary Table 2]

Study 4:

[Link Supplementary Table 3]

Study 5:

[Link Supplementary Table 4]

IV. ANALYSES WITH REGROUPED DVs: STUDIES 2-5

Study 2:

Prejudice. An omnibus ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected prejudice, $F(4, 417) = 2.65$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. The planned comparison revealed that participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative labels ($M = 51.73$, $SD = 25.31$) compared to neutral labels ($M = 45.63$, $SD = 21.61$), $t(417) = 2.56$, $p = .01$, 95% CI [4.26, 32.28].

Social Distance. An omnibus ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected desired social distance, $F(4, 417) = 3.40$, $p = .009$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. As anticipated, participants desired more social distance from immigrants referenced with negative labels ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.50$) than with neutral labels ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.40$), $t(417) = 2.47$, $p = .014$, 95% CI [.22, 1.93].

Negative Treatment. An omnibus ANOVA also revealed that group label significantly affected negative behavioral intentions, $F(4, 417) = 2.87$, $p = .023$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Participants reported more negative behavioral intentions toward immigrants referenced with negative labels ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.25$) compared with neutral labels ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.15$; $t(417) = 2.25$, $p = .025$, 95% CI [.10, 1.51]).

Study 3:

Prejudice. A 2 (negative vs. neutral labels) x 2 (familiarity: yes vs. no) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 508) = 8.92$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Consistent with Study 2, participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative ($M = 34.69$, $SD = 24.69$) vs. neutral labels ($M = 28.20$, $SD = 22.47$). A main effect of familiarity also emerged, $F(1, 508) = 103.75$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member reported significantly less prejudice toward the group overall ($M = 22.67$, $SD = 19.11$ vs. $M = 43.53$, $SD = 24.39$). The predicted 2-way interaction was also significant, $F(1, 508) = 3.91$, $p = .049$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$ (Figure 3). Simple effects tests revealed no effect of label among participants familiar with the referenced group, $F(1, 508) = .58$, $p = .45$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, 95% CI [-3.10, 7.03]. In contrast, those *unfamiliar* with a referenced group member reported more prejudice toward immigrants characterized by negative ($M = 47.19$, $SD = 24.50$), vs. neutral group labels ($M = 37.53$, $SD = 21.12$), $F(1, 508) = 10.98$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, 95% CI [3.93, 15.39].

Social Distance (α = .97). An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 508) = 4.04$, $p = .045$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, such that participants desired greater social distance from immigrants referenced with negative ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.43$) vs. neutral labels ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.34$); and the anticipated main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 508) = 74.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member desired less social distance than did those with no familiarity ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 1.24$ vs. $M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.41$). The interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 508) = .01$, $p = .91$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$ (Figure 3).

Negative Treatment (α = .88). An ANOVA also revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 508) = 9.40$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, such that participants intended to treat immigrants more negatively when they were characterized by negative ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.04$) vs. neutral labels ($M = 2.30$, $SD = .96$); as well as the expected main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 508) = 87.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$, such that those familiar with a member of the referenced group intended to treat the group significantly less negatively ($M = 2.10$, $SD = .86$) than did those who were unfamiliar ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.02$).

Contrary to predictions, the 2-way interaction did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 508) = 2.54$, $p = .11$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$ (Figure 3). Exploratory simple effects tests, however, revealed that group label had no effect among participants *familiar* with the referenced group, $F(1, 508) = 1.24$, $p = .28$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$, 95% CI [-.34, 1.00], while those *unfamiliar* reported significantly

greater negative behavioral intentions toward immigrants characterized by negative (M = 3.07, SD = 1.03) vs. neutral labels (M = 2.68, SD = .94), $F(1, 508) = 9.67$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, 95% CI [.14, .64].

Study 4:

Prejudice. As in Studies 2 and 3, an ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected prejudice, $F(5, 518) = 7.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. As expected, participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative labels (M = 48.67, SD = 19.86) vs. neutral labels (M = 38.31, SD = 20.09), $t(518) = 5.90$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [20.63, 41.22].

Social Distance (α = .96). An ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected social distance, $F(5, 527) = 10.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. Participants desired more social distance from immigrants referenced with negative labels (M = 3.89, SD = 1.30) vs. neutral labels (M = 3.14, SD = 1.30), $t(527) = 6.70$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.60, 2.92].

Negative Treatment (α = .87). An ANOVA also revealed that group label significantly affected behavioral intentions, $F(5, 529) = 9.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. Again, participants reported more negative behavioral intentions toward immigrants referenced with negative (M = 3.10, SD = 1.00) vs. neutral labels (M = 2.57, SD = .87), $t(529) = 6.58$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.12, 2.07].

Study 5:

Prejudice. As in the previous studies, an omnibus ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected prejudice, $F(5, 431) = 3.27$, $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Replicating Studies 2-4, participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative labels (M = 46.72, SD = 24.94) vs. neutral labels (M = 39.37, SD = 27.18), $t(432) = 2.98$, p = .003, 95% CI [7.55, 36.87].

Social Distance (α = .98). An omnibus ANOVA revealed that group label significantly affected social distance, $F(5, 432) = 5.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Participants desired more social distance from immigrants depicted with negative labels (M = 3.49, SD = 1.43) vs. neutral labels, (M = 3.08, SD = 1.56), $t(432) = 3.00$, $p = .003$, 95% CI [.44, 2.09].

Negative Treatment (α = .91). An omnibus ANOVA revealed that group label marginally affected behavioral intentions, $F(5, 432) =$, $p = .08$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Again, participants reported more negative behavioral intentions toward immigrants referenced with negative (M = 2.83, SD = 1.10) vs. neutral labels (M = 2.60, SD = 1.24), $t(432) = 2.04$, $p = .04$, 95% CI [.025, 1.35].

V. MANOVA AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DEPENDENT VARIABLES: STUDIES 2-5

Study 2: A multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effect of group label on prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences. The multivariate effect of group label was significant, $F(3, 418) = 2.73$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.

See Supplementary Table 5 for the correlations between prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences in Study 2.

[Link Supplementary Table 5]

Study 3: A 2 (Label Negativity) x 2 (Familiarity) MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of group label negativity, familiarity, and their interaction on prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences. The multivariate effect of group label negativity was significant, $F(3, 505) = 3.46$, $p = .016$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The multivariate effect of familiarity was also significant, $F(3, 505) = 36.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$. The multivariate interactive effect was not significant, $F(3, 505) = 1.29$, $p = .28$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

See Supplementary Table 6 for correlations between prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences in Study 3.

[Link Supplementary Table 6]

Study 4: A MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of group label on prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences. The multivariate effect of group label was significant, $F(3, 529) = 18.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$.

See Supplementary Table 7 for correlations between prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences in Study 4.

[Link Supplementary Table 7]

Study 5: A MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of group label on prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences. The multivariate effect of group label was significant, $F(3, 434) = 3.50$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.

See Supplementary Table 8 for correlations between prejudice, punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences in Study 5.

[Link Supplementary Table 8]

VI. EXPLORATORY MODERATION BY FAMILIARITY: STUDIES 4 & 5

Study 4:

In the Study 4 sample (N = 536), only 160 participants (~30%) reported being familiar with a referenced group member and, of those, only 60 participants (~11%) reported being familiar with a group member referenced with a negative (v. neutral) label. To explore moderation by familiarity, the dependent variables were re-analyzed via a 2 (label: negative vs. neutral) x 2 (familiarity: yes vs. no) ANOVA.

Prejudice. A 2 (negativity) x 2 (familiarity) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 530) = 33.14$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative ($M = 0.26$, $SD = 0.87$) vs. neutral labels ($M = -0.27$, $SD = 0.85$). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 530) = 37.17$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member showed significantly less prejudice toward the group overall ($M = -0.41$, $SD = 0.95$ vs. $M = 0.17$, $SD = 0.82$). The two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 530) = 0.10$, $p = .76$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$.

Intended Behavior. An ANOVA also revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 530) = 27.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. Participants reported significantly greater punitive behavioral intentions toward immigrants referenced with negative ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.00$) vs. neutral labels ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.87$). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 530) = 25.22$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member intended to treat the group significantly less negatively ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.04$) than did those who were unfamiliar ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.90$). The two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 530) = 0.01$, $p = .94$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$.

Policy Preferences. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 528) = 24.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, such that participants endorsed more punitive policies toward immigrants characterized with negative labels ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.11$) vs. neutral labels, ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 1.18$). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 528) = 23.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, such that participants familiar with a referenced group member endorsed less punitive policy preferences relative to those unfamiliar ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.28$ vs. $M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.08$). The two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 528) = 1.06$, $p = .30$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$.

Study 5:

In the Study 5 sample (N = 438), only 109 participants (~25%) reported being familiar with a referenced group member and, of those, only 40 participants (~9%) reported being familiar with a group member referenced with a negative (v. neutral) label. To explore moderation by familiarity, the dependent variables were re-analyzed via a 2 (label: negative vs. neutral) x 2 (familiarity: yes vs. no) ANOVA.

Prejudice. A 2 (negativity) x 2 (familiarity) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 433) = 12.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Participants reported significantly more prejudice toward immigrants referenced with negative ($M = .014$, $SD = 0.87$) vs. neutral labels ($M = -0.14$, $SD = 0.96$). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 433) = 14.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member showed significantly less prejudice toward the group overall ($M = -0.36$, $SD = 0.94$ vs. $M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.89$).

The two-way interaction was also statistically significant, $F(1, 433) = 6.82$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Simple effects tests revealed those *familiar* with a referenced group member reported more prejudice toward immigrants characterized by negative ($M = 0.04$, $SD = 0.86$), vs. neutral group

labels (M = -0.59, SD = 0.91), $F(1, 433) = 12.31$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, 95% CI [-0.97, -0.27]. In contrast, no effect of label among participants unfamiliar with the referenced group, $F(1, 433) = 0.86$, $p = .35$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.10].

Intended Behavior. An ANOVA also revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 433) = 6.07$, $p = .014$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. Participants reported significantly greater punitive behavioral intentions toward immigrants referenced with negative (M = 2.84, SD = 1.10) vs. neutral labels (M = 2.60, SD = 1.24). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 433) = 9.42$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, such that those familiar with a referenced group member intended to treat the group significantly less negatively (M = 2.35, SD = 1.20) than did those who were unfamiliar (M = 2.84, SD = 1.15). The two-way interaction was significant, $F(1, 433) = 4.81$, $p = .029$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. Simple effects tests revealed those familiar with a referenced group member reported more punitive behavioral intentions toward immigrants characterized by negative (M = 2.74, SD = 1.21) vs. neutral labels (M = 2.13, SD = 1.14), $F(1, 433) = 8.52$, p = .004, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, 95% CI [.16, 1.06]. In contrast, there was no effect of label among participants unfamiliar with the referenced group, $F(1, 433) = .08$, p = .78, $\eta_p^2 = .000$, 95% CI [-.22, .29].

Policy Preferences. An ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of group label, $F(1, 433) = 4.81$, $p = .029$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, such that participants endorsed more punitive policies toward immigrants characterized with negative labels (M = 3.41, SD = 1.36) vs. neutral labels, (M = 3.13, SD = 1.52). There was also a main effect of familiarity, $F(1, 433) = 7.46$, $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, such that participants familiar with a referenced group member endorsed less punitive policy preferences relative to those unfamiliar (M = 2.87, SD = 1.45 vs. M = 3.40, SD = 1.43). The two-way interaction was not significant, $F(1, 433) = 2.56$, $p = .11$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

VII. META-ANALYSIS OF PAIRWISE COMPARISONS OF THE EFFECTS OF EACH LABEL, STUDIES 2-5

Some readers might wonder to what extent the effects of each of the labels, relative to the other labels. This meta-analysis compares the effects of all of the labels, across the four experiments. Results of this meta-analysis reveal that, generally, there is not much difference in the effects of the negative labels, relative to each other differ. That is, the negative labels affect the dependent variables similarly. However, the differences between *illegal immigrants* and *undocumented immigrants* on prejudice and punitive behavioral intentions; and all negative labels, relative to *noncitizens* and *immigrants* (the neutral labels examined in Studies 2-5) across all measures were robust.

Prejudice. The meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal aliens*, did not significantly differ from that of *illegal immigrants*, ME = 0.04, p = .63, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.18], *undocumented aliens*, ME = 0.0003, p = .99, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.13], or *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.09, p = .20, 95% CI [-0.22, 0.04]. However, *illegal aliens* did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.39, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.52, -0.26], such that participants expressed more prejudice towards immigrants described as *illegal aliens* than *noncitizens*. Similarly, in Studies 4 and 5 (i.e., the only studies featuring the label *immigrants*), *illegal aliens* did significantly differ from *immigrants*, ME = -0.62, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.80, -0.43], such that participants expressed more prejudice towards immigrants described as *illegal aliens* than *immigrants*.

Further, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal immigrants*, did not significantly differ from that of *undocumented aliens*, ME = -0.04, p = .56, 95% CI [-0.18, 0.10]. However, *illegal immigrants* did significantly differ from *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.14, p = .04, 95% CI [-0.27, -0.01], *noncitizens*, ME = -0.44, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.57, -0.31], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.67, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.86, -0.49], such that participants expressed more prejudice towards immigrants described as *illegal immigrants* than *undocumented immigrants* and far more prejudice towards *illegal immigrants* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Moreover, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *undocumented aliens*, did not differ from that of *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.11, p = .12, 95% CI [-0.24, 0.03]. However, *undocumented aliens* did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.41, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.54, -0.28], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.59, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.77, -0.40], such that participants expressed far more prejudice towards *undocumented aliens* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Undocumented immigrants did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.30, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.43, -0.17], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.45, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.64, -0.26], such that participants expressed far more prejudice towards *undocumented immigrants* than *noncitizens* and *immigrants*. Lastly, *noncitizens* marginally differed from *immigrants*, ME = -0.19, p = .05, 95% CI [-0.38, 0.002], such that participants expressed marginally more prejudice towards *noncitizens* than *immigrants*.

Intended Behavior. Regarding negative treatment intentions, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal aliens*, did not significantly differ from that of *illegal immigrants*, ME = 0.09, *p* = .29, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.25], *undocumented aliens*, ME = 0.06, *p* = .43, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.22], or *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.09, *p* = .24 95% CI [-0.24, 0.06]. However, *illegal aliens* did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.26, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.61, -0.31], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.52, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.74, -0.29], such that participants expressed more punitive behavioral intentions towards immigrants described as *illegal aliens* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Further, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal immigrants*, did not significantly differ from that of *undocumented aliens*, ME = -0.03, *p* = .74, 95% CI [-0.19, 0.14]. However, *illegal immigrants* did significantly differ from *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.19, *p* = .02, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.03], *noncitizens*, ME = -0.55, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.71, -0.40], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.49, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.72, -0.27], such that participants expressed more punitive behavioral intentions towards immigrants described as *illegal immigrants* than *undocumented immigrants* and far more punitive behavioral intentions towards *illegal immigrants* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Moreover, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *undocumented aliens*, significantly differed from that of *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.16, *p* = .04, 95% CI [-0.32, -0.01], *noncitizens*, ME = -0.53, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.68, -0.37], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.47, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.70, -0.24], such that participants expressed more punitive behavioral intentions towards immigrants described as *undocumented aliens* than *undocumented immigrants* and far more punitive behavioral intentions towards *undocumented aliens* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Undocumented immigrants did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.37, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.51, -0.22], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.25, p = .02, 95% CI [-0.47, -0.03], such that participants expressed more punitive behavioral intentions towards *undocumented immigrants* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*. Lastly, the effect of the label *noncitizens* on participants' punitive behavioral intentions did not significantly differ from that of *immigrants*, ME = -0.05, p = .64, 95% CI [-0.16, 0.27].

Policy Preferences. Regarding policy preferences, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal aliens*, did not significantly differ from that of *illegal immigrants*, ME = 0.03, *p* = .74, 95% CI [-0.16, 0.24], *undocumented aliens*, ME = 0.05, *p* = .63, 95% CI [-0.14, 0.23], or *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.10, *p* = .31, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.09]. However, *illegal aliens* did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.49, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.68, -0.29], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.69, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.97, -0.41], such that participants expressed more punitive policy preferences towards immigrants described as *illegal aliens* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Further, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *illegal immigrants*, did not significantly differ from that of *undocumented aliens*, ME = 0.02, *p* = .88, 95% CI [-0.18, 0.21], or *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.13, *p* = .17, 95% CI [-0.33, 0.06]. *Illegal immigrants*, however, significantly differed from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.52, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.72, -0.33], and *immigrants*, ME = -0.71, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.99, -0.43], such that participants expressed marginally more punitive policy preferences towards immigrants described as *illegal immigrants* than *undocumented immigrants* and significantly more negative behavioral intentions towards *illegal immigrants* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Moreover, the meta-analysis revealed that the effect of the label, *undocumented aliens*, did not significantly differ from that of *undocumented immigrants*, ME = -0.15, *p* = .11, 95% CI [-0.34, 0.03], but did significantly differ from that of *noncitizens*, ME = -0.54, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.73, -0.35], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.72, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.99, -0.45], such that participants expressed far more punitive policy preferences towards *undocumented aliens* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*.

Undocumented immigrants did significantly differ from *noncitizens*, ME = -0.40, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.59, -0.21], and *immigrants* (in Studies 4 and 5), ME = -0.50, p < .001, 95% CI [-0.78, -0.22], such that participants expressed more punitive policy preferences towards *undocumented immigrants* than *noncitizens* or *immigrants*. Lastly, the effect of the label *noncitizens* on participants' punitive policy preferences did not significantly differ from that of *immigrants*, ME = -0.20, p = .17, 95% CI [-0.49, 0.09].

VIII. META-ANALYSIS OF LABEL EFFECTS ON REGROUPED DVs

Prejudice. The meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on prejudice was robust, ME = -7.98, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-10.08, -5.90]; participants expressed more prejudice towards immigrants described with negative (vs. neutral) labels.

Social Distance. The meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on social distance was robust, ME = -0.48, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.61, -0.35]; participants desired greater social distance from immigrants described with negative (vs. neutral) labels.

Negative Treatment. The meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on negative behavioral intentions was robust, ME = -0.36, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.45, -0.26]; participants reported more negative behavioral intentions towards immigrants described with negative (vs. neutral) labels.

IX. META-ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS ACROSS STUDIES MEASURING FAMILIARITY: STUDIES 3-5

Some readers may be curious as to the average effects across all of the studies in which participants' level of familiarity with members of the labeled group was measured (i.e., Studies 3-5). This meta-analysis compares the effects of group label and personal familiarity with labeled group members on prejudice, negative behavioral intentions and punitive policy preferences, across Studies 3-4. For each of these outcomes, we also separately report the meta-analytic effect of group label among participants familiar with labeled group members and among participants unfamiliar with labeled group members. Results of this meta-analysis reveal that the effects of immigrant label and personal familiarity were robust across all three studies. In addition, the effect of negative (vs. neutral) group labels on prejudice punitive behavioral intentions and policy preferences was robust among both those familiar, and those unfamiliar, with members of the referenced immigrant group.

Prejudice. The meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on prejudice was robust, ME = -0.33, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.41, -0.24]; participants expressed more prejudice towards immigrants described with negative labels (*e.g., illegal aliens*) compared to neutral labels (*e.g., noncitizens*). The meta-analyzed effect of familiarity on prejudice was also robust, ME = 0.62, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.53, 0.72]; participants who were familiar with labeled group members, relative to those who were unfamiliar, expressed less prejudice towards labeled immigrant groups, overall.

Furthermore, among participants who were familiar with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on prejudice was still robust, ME = -0.32, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.46, -0.17]. Likewise, among participants who were *unfamiliar* with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on prejudice was still robust, ME = -0.28, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.39, -0.17]

Intended Behavior. The meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on punitive behavioral intentions was also robust, ME = -0.36, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.46, -0.26]; participants endorsed greater punitive behavioral intentions toward immigrants described with negative (vs. neutral) labels. The meta-analyzed effect of familiarity on negative behavioral intentions was also robust, ME = 0.65, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.54, 0.76]; participants who were familiar with labeled group members, relative to those who were unfamiliar, expressed less punitive behavioral towards labeled immigrant groups, overall.

Moreover, among participants who were familiar with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed effect on punitive behavioral intentions was still robust, ME = -0.26, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.42, -0.10]. Likewise, among participants who were *unfamiliar* with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed effect on punitive behavioral intentions was still robust, ME = -0.35, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.47, -0.22]

Policy Preferences. Finally, the meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on support for more punitive immigration policies was also robust, ME = -0.39, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.51, -0.27];

participants supported more punitive immigration policies when immigrants were described with negative (vs. neutral) labels. The meta-analyzed effect of familiarity on negative behavioral intentions was also robust, ME = 0.66, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.52, 0.79]; participants who were familiar with labeled group members, relative to those who were unfamiliar, expressed less support for punitive immigration policies, overall.

Moreover, among participants who were familiar with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed effect on support for more punitive immigration policies was still robust, ME = -0.26, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.42, -0.10]. Likewise, among participants who were *unfamiliar* with labeled group members, the meta-analyzed immigrant labeling effect on negative behavioral intentions was still robust, ME = -0.35, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.47, -0.22]