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# Appendix A. Socio-demographic Questions and Sample Characteristics

Main Study: What is your gender?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Number | % |
|  |  |  |
| Man | 251 | 51.54 |
| Woman | 236 | 48.46 |
| Non-binary | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 487 | 100 |

Pilot: What is your sex?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Number | % |
|  |  |  |
| Man | 167 | 41.23 |
| Woman | 238 | 58.77 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: What is your age?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 39.57 | 12.10 | 20 | 78 | 487 |

Pilot: What is your age?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 40.15 | 13.19 | 19 | 82 | 405 |

Main Study: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Grade Sch | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.21 |
| 2 Some High Sch | 1 | 0.40 | 1 | 0.42 | 2 | 0.41 |
| 3 High Sch | 26 | 10.36 | 28 | 11.86 | 54 | 11.09 |
| 4 Trade Sch | 12 | 4.78 | 19 | 8.05 | 31 | 6.37 |
| 5 Some College | 39 | 15.54 | 45 | 19.07 | 84 | 17.25 |
| 6 4 Year Col/Uni | 127 | 50.60 | 94 | 39.83 | 221 | 45.38 |
| 7 Grad Sch | 40 | 15.94 | 40 | 16.95 | 80 | 16.43 |
| 8 Doc PhD, M.D | 6 | 2.39 | 8 | 3.39 | 14 | 2.87 |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 487 | 100 |

Pilot: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Grade Sch | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 Some High Sch | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.74 |
| 3 High Sch | 19 | 11.38 | 17 | 7.14 | 36 | 8.99 |
| 4 Trade Sch | 14 | 8.38 | 27 | 11.34 | 41 | 10.12 |
| 5 Some College | 50 | 29.94 | 66 | 27.73 | 116 | 28.64 |
| 6 4 Year Col/Uni | 61 | 36.53 | 88 | 36.97 | 149 | 36.79 |
| 7 Grad Sch | 17 | 10.18 | 30 | 12.61 | 47 | 11.60 |
| 8 Doc PhD, M.D | 6 | 3.59 | 7 | 2.94 | 13 | 3.21 |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: How would you identify your race/ethnicity?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 194 | 77.29 | 193 | 81.78 | 387 | 79.47 |
| Black (non-Hispanic) | 15 | 5.98 | 13 | 5.51 | 28 | 5.75 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 5.58 | 13 | 5.51 | 27 | 5.54 |
| Asian | 26 | 10.36 | 16 | 6.78 | 42 | 8.62 |
| First Nation/Inuit/Native American | 1 | 0.40 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.21 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 1 | 0.40 | 1 | 0.42 | 2 | 0.41 |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 1296 | 100 |

Pilot: How would you identify your race/ethnicity?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 127 | 76.05 | 201 | 84.45 | 328 | 80.99 |
| Black (non-Hispanic) | 10 | 5.99 | 11 | 4.62 | 21 | 5.19 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 8.98 | 7 | 2.94 | 22 | 5.43 |
| Asian | 14 | 8.38 | 12 | 5.04 | 26 | 6.42 |
| First Nation/Inuit/Native American | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.42 | 1 | 0.25 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brown | 1 | 0.60 | 6 | 2.52 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1.73 |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: What is your average household income?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Income | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-$15,000 | 15 | 5.98 | 10 | 4.24 | 25 | 5.13 |
| $15,001-$30,000 | 34 | 13.55 | 29 | 12.29 | 63 | 12.94 |
| $30,001-$45,000 | 30 | 11.95 | 35 | 14.83 | 65 | 13.35 |
| $45,001-$60,000 | 41 | 16.33 | 33 | 13.98 | 74 | 15.2 |
| $60,001-$75,000 | 42 | 16.73 | 36 | 15.25 | 78 | 16.02 |
| $75,001-$90,000 | 35 | 13.94 | 33 | 13.98 | 68 | 13.96 |
| $90,001-$105,000 | 16 | 6.37 | 24 | 10.17 | 40 | 8.21 |
| $105,001-$120,000 | 12 | 4.78 | 8 | 3.39 | 20 | 4.11 |
| $120,0001-$135,000 | 3 | 1.2 | 9 | 3.81 | 12 | 2.46 |
| $135,001-$150,000 | 14 | 5.58 | 11 | 4.66 | 25 | 5.13 |
| $150,001+ | 9 | 3.59 | 8 | 3.39 | 17 | 3.49 |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 487 | 100 |

Pilot Study: What is your average household income?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Income | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-$15,000 | 23 | 13.77 | 42 | 17.65 | 65 | 16.05 |
| $15,001-$30,000 | 35 | 20.96 | 54 | 22.69 | 89 | 21.98 |
| $30,001-$45,000 | 27 | 16.17 | 50 | 21.01 | 77 | 19.01 |
| $45,001-$60,000 | 24 | 14.37 | 37 | 15.55 | 61 | 15.06 |
| $60,001-$75,000 | 27 | 16.17 | 22 | 9.24 | 49 | 12.10 |
| $75,001-$90,000 | 17 | 10.18 | 16 | 6.72 | 33 | 8.15 |
| $90,001-$105,000 | 4 | 2.40 | 6 | 2.52 | 10 | 2.47 |
| $105,001-$120,000 | 1 | 0.60 | 6 | 2.52 | 7 | 1.73 |
| $120,0001-$135,000 | 5 | 2.99 | 2 | 0.84 | 7 | 1.73 |
| $135,001-$150,000 | 2 | 1.20 | 3 | 1.26 | 5 | 1.23 |
| $150,001+ | 2 | 1.20 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 0.49 |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: What is your sexual orientation?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Number | % |
|  |  |  |
| Heterosexual | 447 | 91.79 |
| Homosexual, Bisexual, Other, Prefer not | 40 | 8.21 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 487 | 100 |

Pilot Study: What is your sexual orientation?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Number | % |
|  |  |  |
| Heterosexual | 366 | 90.37 |
| Homosexual, Bisexual, Other, Prefer not | 39 | 9.63 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: How important would you say religion is in your life?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Very import | 46 | 18.33 | 69 | 29.24 | 115 | 23.61 |
| 2 Somewhat import | 86 | 33.86 | 63 | 26.69 | 148 | 30.39 |
| 3 Not very import | 27 | 10.76 | 32 | 13.56 | 59 | 12.11 |
| 4 Not import at all | 87 | 37.05 | 71 | 30.08 | 158 | 32.44 |
| 5 Don’t know | 6 | 2.39 | 1 | 0.42 | 7 | 1.44 |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 487 | 100 |

\*Note: Don’t know and Not important at all are combined into a single category during the analysis.

Pilot Study How many times do you attend religious service per month?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 6+ times | 8 | 4.79 | 10 | 4.20 | 18 | 4.44 |
| 2. 5-6 times | 22 | 13.17 | 46 | 19.33 | 68 | 16.79 |
| 3. 3-4 times | 12 | 7.19 | 19 | 7.98 | 31 | 7.65 |
| 4. 1-2 times | 36 | 21.56 | 52 | 21.85 | 88 | 21.73 |
| 5. 0 times | 89 | 53.29 | 111 | 46.64 | 200 | 49.38 |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 238 | 100 |

Main Study: Using the scale below, how would you describe your political orientation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Political orientation | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 26 | 10.36 | 24 | 10.17 | 50 | 10.27 |
| Liberal | 51 | 20.32 | 50 | 21.19 | 101 | 20.74 |
| Moderate liberal | 30 | 11.95 | 39 | 16.53 | 69 | 14.17 |
| Neutral | 48 | 19.12 | 33 | 13.98 | 81 | 16.63 |
| Moderate conservative | 36 | 14.34 | 30 | 12.71 | 66 | 13.55 |
| Conservative | 43 | 17.13 | 43 | 18.22 | 86 | 17.66 |
| Very conservative | 17 | 6.77 | 17 | 7.20 | 34 | 6.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 487 | 100 |

Pilot Study Using the scale below, how would you describe your political orientation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Political orientation | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very liberal | 20 | 11.98 | 29 | 12.18 | 49 | 12.10 |
| Liberal | 30 | 17.96 | 51 | 21.43 | 81 | 20.00 |
| Moderate liberal | 27 | 16.17 | 39 | 16.39 | 66 | 16.30 |
| Neutral | 41 | 24.55 | 49 | 20.59 | 90 | 22.22 |
| Moderate conservative | 20 | 11.98 | 34 | 14.29 | 54 | 13.33 |
| Conservative | 19 | 11.38 | 28 | 11.76 | 47 | 11.60 |
| Very conservative | 10 | 5.99 | 8 | 3.36 | 18 | 4.44 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 405 | 100 |

# Appendix B. Pilot Study

*Sample limitations:* The final sample size was lower than originally planned in our research design. The original design planned for a sample of 700 respondents. This sample size was calculated so as to allow for interaction effects based on a relatively high level of variation on implicit self-esteem scores. Besides not being able to recruit a sufficiently large initial sample (due to resource limitations), we also encountered a high dropout rate of 58.2%, a significant proportion of which occurred between the first and second IAT. These dropouts appear to be a consequence of either a random technical issue or length of time required to complete the study. The total study took over 20 minutes, with each IAT requiring 5 minutes (total of 10 minutes for both). Based on our review of the results and the low incentive provided by this study, we believe this dropout rate is likely due to the length of the study. While high dropout rates often occur in online studies, we understand that the dropout rate may be particularly relevant to the mechanisms we seek to investigate in the study. Specifically, our concern is that dropout may be correlated with participants’ dispositions toward anger, frustration, or impatience, personality traits associated with individuals who display defensive or unstable self-esteem. As a result, the pilot study may under-sample the population of interest. Importantly, based on the traits associated with this population—anger, aggression, frustration, and impatience—by under-sampling this population we may be underestimating the effect of defensive and unstable self-esteem on negative attitudes.

*IAT limitations:* A second and related issue is that a non-trivial number of observations (155) were dropped during the quality check cleaning process. These observations were dropped by the IATgen program due to excessive speeds while performing the IAT. This high number of dropped observations suggests that a significant number of participants may have rushed the completion of the study. While rushing may be linked to the low incentive, it is also possible that rushed responses may be disproportionately observed in the population of interest. A possible indicator of this is that the proportion of men and women in our study differs considerably between pre- and post- data cleaning. In the cleaned sample the breakdown by sex, 58.77% of respondents are women and 41.23% are men, while in the pre-cleaned sample the breakdown was more gender-balanced (53.65% women and 46.35% men).

*Self-esteem limitations:* As with the primary study, implicit and explicit self-esteem were also correlated in our pilot study (Coefficient=0.034; Std=0.013; P< 0.007).Additionally, while many individuals (191) in our study report high self-esteem, a 6 or 7 on the Likert-scale, the total number of individuals who display defensive self-esteem is relatively small (N=14; 11 men and 3 women). While our expectation is that individuals with defensive self-esteem should represent a small proportion of the total population, the small sample remains a limitation with the current study.

# Appendix C. Explicit Self-esteem Question Wordings and Measures

Main Study: Overall how would you describe your sense of self-esteem? Would you say you are person whose self-esteem is...

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Esteem | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very low | 4 | 1.59 | 8 | 3.39 | 12 | 2.46 |
| Low | 17 | 6.77 | 26 | 11.02 | 43 | 8.83 |
| Moderately low | 16 | 6.37 | 34 | 50 | 50 | 10.27 |
| Neither high nor low | 17 | 6.77 | 7 | 2.97 | 24 | 4.93 |
| Moderately high | 59 | 23.51 | 56 | 23.73 | 115 | 23.61 |
| High | 102 | 40.64 | 76 | 32.20 | 178 | 36.55 |
| Very high | 36 | 14.34 | 29 | 12.29 | 65 | 13.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 487 | 100 |

Pilot Study: Overall how would you describe your sense of self-esteem? Would you say you are person whose self-esteem is...

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Esteem | Men | % | Women | % | Total | % |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very low | 2 | 1.20 | 8 | 3.39 | 10 | 2.47 |
| Low | 9 | 5.39 | 13 | 11.02 | 22 | 5.43 |
| Moderately low | 10 | 5.99 | 25 | 50 | 35 | 8.64 |
| Neither high nor low | 16 | 9.58 | 17 | 2.97 | 33 | 8.15 |
| Moderately high | 40 | 23.95 | 74 | 23.73 | 114 | 28.15 |
| High | 67 | 40.12 | 76 | 32.20 | 143 | 35.31 |
| Very high | 23 | 13.77 | 25 | 12.29 | 48 | 11.85 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 167 | 100 | 238 | 100 | 405 | 100 |

Main Study: Score on Rosenberg Explicit Self-esteem Scale

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rosen Esteem | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 43.91 | 12.25 | 5 | 60 | 251 |
| Women | 44.08 | 13.10 | 0 | 60 | 236 |
| Total | 43.99 | 12.66 | 0 | 60 | 487 |

\*10 questions on 7-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-60

Pilot Study: Score on Rosenberg Explicit Self-esteem Scale

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rosen Esteem | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 20.77 | 5.75 | 0 | 30 | 167 |
| Women | 20.16 | 5.77 | 0 | 30 | 238 |
| Total | 20.41 | 5.76 | 0 | 30 | 405 |

\*10 questions on 4-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-30

# Appendix D. Implicit Self-Esteem Measure and t-tests

Table 1: Main Study IAT Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.517 | 0.362 | -1.023 | 1.416 | 487 |

Table 2: Pilot Study IAT Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.529 | 0.381 | -0.744 | 1.492 | 405 |

Table 3: Main Study Sktest. Skewness and kurtosis test for normality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | Pr(Skewness | Pr(Kurtosis) | Adj Chi(2) | Prob>Chi(2) | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.019 | 0.037 | 12.53 | .002 | 487 |

Table 4: Pilot Study. Sktest: Skewness and kurtosis test for normality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | Pr(Skewness | Pr(Kurtosis) | Adj Chi(2) | Prob>Chi(2) | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.014 | 0.124 | 7.93 | .019 | 405 |

Table 5: Main Study. Swilk Shapiro-Wilk test for normality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | W | V | Z | Prob>z | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.991 | 2.994 | 2.633 | .004 | 487 |

Table 6: Pilot Study. Swilk Shapiro-Wilk test for normality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | W | V | Z | Prob>z | Total |
| IAT1 Control | 0.992 | 2.333 | 2.017 | .022 | 405 |

# Appendix E. Comparing Measures of Implicit and Explicit Self-esteem

As discussed in text, we find a significant correlation between implicit self-esteem (as measured with the IAT) and explicit self-esteem. The correlation between implicit and explicit self-esteem is atypical of self-esteem research (Bosson et al., 2003; Greenwald, Farnham, et al., 2000; Karpinski, 2004) but is not without precedent (Johnson, 2016; Krizan & Suls, 2008; Oakes et al., 2008).

The most plausible explanation for this deviation is differences in sample characteristics. Most of the research on self-esteem utilizes student populations with comparatively small samples. Undergoing a university education is a stressful experience which is likely to have several effects on identity, including implicit and declarative self-esteem. The older and more demographically balanced nature of our sample is likely responsible for why we observe a correlation between implicit and explicit self-esteem which is absent from other studies. Importantly, the fact that implicit and explicit seem do correlate in our sample is consistent with the expectedly low number of respondents who display defensive self-esteem.

Table 7: Main Study. Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Intervals: Correlation between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicit Esteemc | 0.058 | 0.017 | .001\*\*\* | 0.025 | 0.091 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.517 | 0.016 | .0001 | 0.485 | 0.548 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.025 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 8: Pilot Study. Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Intervals: Correlation between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicit Esteemc | 0.029 | 0.019 | .131 | -0.009 | 0.067 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.529 | 0.019 | .0001 | 0.492 | 0.566 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.006 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix F. Reliability of Measure of Secure vs. Fragile Self-esteem

To demonstrate construct reliability we regress our measure of secure and fragile self-esteem on seven psychological measures associated with insecure, unstable or aggressive psychological characteristics: 1) affective cognition (anger rumination, displaced aggression, revenge planning) (Denson, Pedersen, and Miller 2006); 2) affective competitiveness (Newby and Klein 2014); 3) self-worth that is contingent on the perception by others, and self-worth that is contingent on competitive success (Crocker and Cooper 2003); and, 4) social dominance orientation (SDO) (Ho et al. 2015).

**Question Wordings and Measures**

## Affective Competitiveness

The following scale measures aspects of competitiveness. Please read each question carefully and try to answer as honestly as possible. Do not spend too much time on any one item; if trying to decide between two responses, choose the one that first comes to mind.  5-point Likert Scale, Strongly disagree – Strongly agree

1. I do not care if other people are better at things than I am.
2. Being the best makes me feel powerful.
3. I do not really care if I get beat in a competition.
4. Losing in a competition would not bother me.
5. I would not mind finishing in last place in a competition.
6. Winning makes me feel superior to others.
7. I like being the best compared to other people.
8. Winning does not make me feel superior to others.

## Anger Rumination

The following questions are meant to capture variations in individual personalities. Please indicate below the extent to which you agree with or disagree with the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers. 7-point Likert Scale, Extremely uncharacteristic – Extremely characteristic

1. I keep thinking about events that angered me for a long time.
2. I get “worked up” just thinking about things that have upset me in the past.
3. I often find myself thinking over and over about things that have made me angry.
4. Whenever I experience anger, I keep thinking about it for a while.
5. I think about certain events from a long time ago and they still make me angry.

## Contingent Competitiveness (Self-Worth)

Below you will read a series of statements. Please indicate how you feel about each statement: 7-point Likert Scale, Disagree strongly – Agree strongly.

1. Doing better than others gives me a sense of self-respect.
2. Knowing that I am better than others on a task raises my self-esteem.
3. My self-worth is affected by how well I do when I am competing with others.
4. My self-worth is influenced by how well I do on competitive tasks.
5. I feel worthwhile when I perform better than others on a task or skill.

## Displaced Aggression

## The following questions are meant to capture variations in individual personalities. Please indicate below the extent to which you agree with or disagree with the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers. 7-point Likert Scale, Extremely uncharacteristic – Extremely characteristic

1. When someone or something makes me angry I am likely to take it out on another person.
2. When feeling bad, I take it out on others.
3. When angry, I have taken it out on people close to me.
4. Sometimes I get upset with a friend or family member even though that person is not the cause of my anger or frustration.
5. I take my anger out on innocent others

## Contingent Competitiveness (Self-worth)

Below you will read a series of statements. Please indicate how you feel about each statement: 7-point Likert Scale, Disagree strongly – Agree strongly.

1. I don’t care what other people think of me.
2. What others think of me has no effect on what I think about myself.
3. I don’t care if other people have a negative opinion about me.
4. My self-esteem depends on the opinions others hold of me.
5. I can’t respect myself if others don’t respect me.

## Revenge Planning

The following questions are meant to capture variations in individual personalities. Please indicate below the extent to which you agree with or disagree with the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers. 7-point Likert Scale, Extremely uncharacteristic – Extremely characteristic

1. When someone makes me angry I can’t stop thinking about how to get back at this person.
2. If somebody harms me, I am not at peace until I can retaliate.
3. I often daydream about situations where I’m getting back at people.
4. I would get frustrated if I could not think of a way to get even with someone who deserves it.
5. I think about ways of getting back at people who have made me angry long after the event has happened.

## Social Dominance Orientation

On a scale ranging from "strongly oppose" to "strongly favor" please express the extent to which you agree with each idea below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best. &-point Likert-scale. Strongly oppose – Strongly favor

1. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.
2. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
3. No one group should dominate in society.
4. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.
5. Group equality should not be our primary goal.
6. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.
7. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
8. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.

**Results**

## Affective Competitiveness

Table 9: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on affective competitiveness.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.681 | 1.442 | .637 | -3.515 | 2.152 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.768 | 0.406 | .060† | -1.566 | 0.031 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.289 | 1.367 | .346 | -1.398 | 3.976 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.079 | 0.028 | .005\*\* | -0.135 | -0.024 |
| Educationc | 0.751 | 0.316 | .018\*\* | 0.131 | 1.371 |
| Incomec | 0.466 | 0.169 | .006\*\* | 0.133 | 0.798 |
| Femalei | -1.719 | 0.728 | .019\*\* | -3.149 | -0.289 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.688 | 0.904 | .062† | -3.465 | 0.088 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.366 | 1.513 | .367 | -4.340 | 1.608 |
| Religiosityc | 0.029 | 0.317 | .928 | -0.595 | 0.652 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 22.605 | 2.276 | .0001 | 18.133 | 27.077 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.089 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 10: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on affective competition.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.065 | 2.233 | .977 | -4.324 | 4.453 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.350 | 0.599 | .559 | -1.526 | 0.826 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.208 | 1.631 | .050\*\* | 0.004 | 6.412 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.657 | 0.752 | .028\*\* | -3.136 | -0.179 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.457 | 2.800 | .603 | -6.958 | 4.044 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.798 | 0.789 | .312 | -2.347 | 0.752 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -3.984 | 2.287 | .082† | -8.478 | 0.510 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.076 | 0.029 | .009\*\* | -0.133 | -0.019 |
| Educationc | 0.796 | 0.313 | .011\*\* | 0.182 | 1.411 |
| Incomec | 0.440 | 0.169 | .010\*\* | 0.108 | 0.772 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.693 | 0.893 | .058† | -3.447 | 0.061 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.661 | 1.525 | .276 | -4.657 | 1.334 |
| Religiosityc | 0.010 | 0.318 | .976 | -0.615 | 0.634 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 22.392 | 2.296 | .0001 | 17.881 | 26.904 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.101 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Anger Rumination

Table 11: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on anger rumination.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.302 | 1.441 | .367 | -4.133 | 1.529 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -4.014 | 0.327 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.657 | -3.372 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.187 | 1.181 | .315 | -1.133 | 3.507 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.072 | 0.026 | .007\*\* | -0.124 | -0.020 |
| Educationc | 0.105 | 0.285 | .711 | -0.454 | 0.665 |
| Incomec | 0.167 | 0.142 | .242 | -0.113 | 0.447 |
| Femalei | 0.744 | 0.676 | .272 | -0.585 | 2.072 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.894 | 0.820 | .276 | -2.506 | 0.718 |
| Non-Heteroi | 0.580 | 1.346 | .667 | -2.064 | 3.224 |
| Religiosityc | -0.279 | 0.296 | .347 | -0.859 | 0.302 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 19.325 | 2.155 | .0001 | 15.090 | 23.560 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.243 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 12: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on anger rumination.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.068 | 2.384 | .386 | -6.753 | 2.617 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -4.069 | 0.452 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.956 | -3.181 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.783 | 1.400 | .007\*\* | 1.032 | 6.535 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.619 | 0.697 | .375 | -0.751 | 1.989 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.918 | 2.812 | .744 | -4.608 | 6.443 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.099 | 0.632 | .876 | -1.144 | 1.341 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -5.272 | 1.833 | .004\*\* | -8.874 | -1.671 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.067 | 0.027 | .012\*\* | -0.119 | -0.015 |
| Educationc | 0.165 | 0.285 | .564 | -0.395 | 0.724 |
| Incomec | 0.151 | 0.143 | .290 | -0.129 | 0.431 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.941 | 0.800 | .240 | -2.513 | 0.630 |
| Non-Heteroi | 0.332 | 1.367 | .808 | -2.354 | 3.019 |
| Religiosityc | -0.288 | 0.294 | .328 | -0.867 | 0.290 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 19.007 | 2.187 | .0001 | 14.711 | 23.304 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.255 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Contingent Competitiveness (Self-worth)

Table 13: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on contingent competitveness.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.832 | 1.294 | .521 | -1.710 | 3.374 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.386 | 0.373 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.119 | -0.652 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.821 | 1.406 | .196 | -0.942 | 4.584 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.086 | 0.026 | .001\*\*\* | -0.138 | -0.034 |
| Educationc | 0.329 | 0.275 | .232 | -0.211 | 0.868 |
| Incomec | 0.236 | 0.154 | .127 | -0.067 | 0.540 |
| Femalei | -2.154 | 0.644 | .001\*\*\* | -3.419 | -0.889 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.315 | 0.826 | .703 | -1.938 | 1.307 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.739 | 1.481 | .241 | -4.649 | 1.171 |
| Religiosityc | -0.548 | 0.270 | .043\*\* | -1.079 | -0.017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 24.670 | 1.904 | .0001 | 20.928 | 28.411 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.106 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<0.100; \*\*P<0.050; \*\*\*P<0.001

Table 14: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on contingent competitiveness.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.093 | 1.387 | .947 | -2.633 | 2.818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.800 | 0.512 | .118 | -1.806 | 0.205 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.015 | 0.885 | .0001\*\*\* | 3.276 | 6.754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -2.270 | 0.660 | .001\*\*\* | -3.567 | -0.973 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.701 | 2.016 | .728 | -3.260 | 4.662 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -1.118 | 0.719 | .121 | -2.530 | 0.294 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -6.582 | 1.776 | .0001\*\*\* | -10.072 | -3.092 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.079 | 0.027 | .003\*\* | -0.132 | -0.027 |
| Educationc | 0.401 | 0.271 | .139 | -0.131 | 0.934 |
| Incomec | 0.195 | 0.153 | .203 | -0.105 | 0.495 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.328 | 0.812 | .687 | -1.924 | 1.269 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.199 | 1.458 | .132 | -5.064 | 0.666 |
| Religiosityc | -0.566 | 0.268 | .035\*\* | -1.093 | -0.039 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 24.346 | 1.895 | .0001 | 20.622 | 28.069 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.144 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Displaced Aggression

Table 15: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on displaced aggression.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.566 | 1.072 | .598 | -2.674 | 1.541 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.907 | 0.345 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.584 | -2.230 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.256 | 0.929 | .783 | -1.569 | 2.081 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.085 | 0.022 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.128 | -0.041 |
| Educationc | 0.294 | 0.263 | .263 | -0.222 | 0.810 |
| Incomec | 0.246 | 0.121 | .044\*\* | 0.007 | 0.484 |
| Femalei | 0.349 | 0.579 | .547 | -0.788 | 1.486 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.661 | 0.723 | .361 | -2.081 | 0.759 |
| Non-Heteroi | 0.025 | 1.199 | .983 | -2.330 | 2.381 |
| Religiosityc | -0.545 | 0.255 | .033\*\* | -1.046 | -0.044 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 15.084 | 1.942 | .000 | 11.269 | 18.900 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.210 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 16: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on displaced aggression.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.666 | 1.296 | .199 | -4.213 | 0.880 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -3.249 | 0.488 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.207 | -2.291 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.072 | 0.900 | .022\*\* | 0.303 | 3.840 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.193 | 0.607 | .751 | -1.000 | 1.386 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.577 | 1.874 | .400 | -2.105 | 5.259 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.647 | 0.684 | .344 | -0.696 | 1.990 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -3.635 | 1.599 | .023\*\* | -6.777 | -0.492 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.082 | 0.022 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.125 | -0.038 |
| Educationc | 0.335 | 0.265 | .207 | -0.186 | 0.856 |
| Incomec | 0.244 | 0.122 | .045\*\* | 0.005 | 0.483 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.715 | 0.717 | .319 | -2.123 | 0.693 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.074 | 1.228 | .952 | -2.487 | 2.339 |
| Religiosityc | -0.546 | 0.254 | .032\*\* | -1.044 | -0.047 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 14.841 | 1.965 | .0001 | 10.980 | 18.701 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.218 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Externally Contingent Esteem (Self-worth)

Table 17: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on externally contingent self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.384 | 1.003 | .702 | -2.355 | 1.587 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.865 | 0.305 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.465 | -2.266 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.416 | 0.846 | .623 | -1.246 | 2.078 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.034 | 0.024 | .159 | -0.081 | 0.013 |
| Educationc | 0.999 | 0.254 | .0001\*\*\* | 0.500 | 1.498 |
| Incomec | -0.004 | 0.140 | .976 | -0.279 | 0.270 |
| Femalei | 1.443 | 0.604 | .017\*\* | 0.256 | 2.629 |
| Non-Whitei | -2.604 | 0.708 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.996 | -1.212 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.870 | 1.021 | .005\*\* | -4.877 | -0.863 |
| Religiosityc | -0.174 | 0.261 | .505 | -0.686 | 0.338 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 13.628 | 1.821 | .0001 | 10.049 | 17.207 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.217 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 18: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on externally contingent self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.312 | 1.530 | .392 | -4.318 | 1.695 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.311 | 0.444 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.184 | -1.438 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.056 | 0.868 | .948 | -1.762 | 1.650 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 1.362 | 0.632 | .032\*\* | 0.120 | 2.604 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.416 | 1.949 | .468 | -2.414 | 5.245 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -1.052 | 0.595 | .078† | -2.220 | 0.117 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.901 | 1.705 | .597 | -2.450 | 4.251 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.033 | 0.024 | .175 | -0.081 | 0.015 |
| Educationc | 0.987 | 0.257 | .0001\*\*\* | 0.481 | 1.492 |
| Incomec | -0.021 | 0.141 | .884 | -0.297 | 0.256 |
| Non-Whitei | -2.555 | 0.708 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.946 | -1.163 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.951 | 1.039 | .005\*\* | -4.992 | -0.910 |
| Religiosityc | -0.169 | 0.261 | .518 | -0.683 | 0.344 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 13.768 | 1.838 | .0001 | 10.155 | 17.380 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.223 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Revenge Planning

Table 19: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on revenge planning.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.926 | 1.326 | .485 | -1.680 | 3.532 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.950 | 0.353 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.644 | -2.256 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.391 | 1.195 | .046\*\* | 0.044 | 4.739 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.074 | 0.022 | .001\*\*\* | -0.117 | -0.031 |
| Educationc | 0.182 | 0.260 | .483 | -0.328 | 0.692 |
| Incomec | 0.105 | 0.125 | .401 | -0.140 | 0.350 |
| Femalei | -2.792 | 0.585 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.941 | -1.643 |
| Non-Whitei | 0.488 | 0.733 | .506 | -0.952 | 1.929 |
| Non-Heteroi | 0.753 | 1.179 | .523 | -1.564 | 3.070 |
| Religiosityc | 0.046 | 0.256 | .856 | -0.456 | 0.549 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 15.086 | 1.871 | .0001 | 11.411 | 18.762 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.223 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 20: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on externally contingent self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.012 | 2.092 | .995 | -4.124 | 4.099 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -3.206 | 0.511 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.210 | -2.202 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.055 | 1.269 | .0001\*\*\* | 2.561 | 7.550 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -2.941 | 0.605 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.130 | -1.752 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.213 | 2.522 | .631 | -3.743 | 6.170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.483 | 0.700 | .491 | -0.893 | 1.859 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -5.378 | 1.919 | .005\*\* | -9.149 | -1.607 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.070 | 0.022 | .001\*\*\* | -0.113 | -0.027 |
| Educationc | 0.243 | 0.259 | .350 | -0.267 | 0.752 |
| Incomec | 0.095 | 0.126 | .449 | -0.152 | 0.342 |
| Non-Whitei | 0.426 | 0.711 | .549 | -0.971 | 1.823 |
| Non-Heteroi | 0.547 | 1.213 | .652 | -1.837 | 2.931 |
| Religiosityc | 0.039 | 0.254 | .878 | -0.459 | 0.537 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 14.742 | 1.881 | .0001 | 11.045 | 18.438 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.238 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Social Dominance Orientation

Table 21: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on social dominance orientation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.646 | 1.727 | .708 | -2.747 | 4.039 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.091 | 0.647 | .001\*\*\* | -3.363 | -0.820 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.265 | 1.417 | .003\*\* | 1.481 | 7.049 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.052 | 0.040 | .188 | -0.130 | 0.026 |
| Educationc | 0.897 | 0.445 | .044\*\* | 0.023 | 1.771 |
| Incomec | 0.355 | 0.230 | .123 | -0.097 | 0.807 |
| Femalei | -3.734 | 1.012 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.723 | -1.745 |
| Non-Whitei | -4.510 | 1.180 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.828 | -2.192 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.137 | 1.671 | .202 | -5.421 | 1.146 |
| Religiosityc | -1.396 | 0.437 | .001\*\*\* | -2.254 | -0.538 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 23.837 | 3.157 | .0001 | 17.633 | 30.041 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.118 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 22: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on social dominance orientation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.387 | 2.601 | .359 | -7.499 | 2.724 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.225 | 0.902 | .014\*\* | -3.998 | -0.452 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.150 | 1.610 | .010\*\* | 0.987 | 7.313 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -4.066 | 1.060 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.149 | -1.983 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.793 | 3.424 | .162 | -1.935 | 11.522 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.255 | 1.283 | .843 | -2.266 | 2.775 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.308 | 2.739 | .911 | -5.074 | 5.691 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.051 | 0.040 | .199 | -0.128 | 0.027 |
| Educationc | 0.890 | 0.448 | .048\*\* | 0.009 | 1.771 |
| Incomec | 0.358 | 0.233 | .125 | -0.100 | 0.815 |
| Non-Whitei | -4.512 | 1.185 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.841 | -2.184 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.085 | 1.693 | .219 | -5.411 | 1.241 |
| Religiosityc | -1.375 | 0.439 | .002\*\* | -2.238 | -0.512 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 23.900 | 3.174 | .0001 | 17.664 | 30.136 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.121 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix G. Correlations between Psychological Scales and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

## Affective Competitiveness

Table 23: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between affective competitiveness and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Affective  Competitiveness | 3.888 | 0.991 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.941 | 5.834 |
| Agec | -0.156 | 0.068 | .023\*\* | -0.290 | -0.022 |
| Educationc | -0.489 | 0.753 | .517 | -1.968 | 0.991 |
| Incomec | -0.509 | 0.356 | .154 | -1.209 | 0.191 |
| Female | -9.875 | 1.768 | .0001\*\*\* | -13.348 | -6.402 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.299 | 2.099 | .117 | -0.826 | 7.423 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.417 | 3.289 | .004\*\* | -15.880 | -2.953 |
| Religiosityc | -6.586 | 0.720 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.000 | -5.172 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 78.482 | 5.478 | .0001 | 67.718 | 89.245 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.253 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of affective competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 24: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between affective competitiveness and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Affective  Competitiveness | 2.251 | 0.639 | .0001\*\*\* | 0.995 | 3.508 |
| Agec | -0.071 | 0.045 | .115 | -0.160 | 0.017 |
| Educationc | -0.032 | 0.489 | .949 | -0.992 | 0.929 |
| Incomec | -0.395 | 0.241 | .102 | -0.870 | 0.079 |
| Female | -6.320 | 1.132 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.543 | -4.096 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.144 | 1.380 | .917 | -2.856 | 2.569 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.193 | 2.176 | .055† | -8.467 | 0.082 |
| Religiosityc | -2.714 | 0.474 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.644 | -1.783 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 36.036 | 3.522 | .0001 | 29.116 | 42.956 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.164 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of affective competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 25: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between affective competitiveness and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Affective  Competitiveness | 1.636 | 0.566 | .004\*\* | 0.524 | 2.749 |
| Agec | -0.085 | 0.040 | .033\*\* | -0.163 | -0.007 |
| Educationc | -0.457 | 0.439 | .298 | -1.319 | 0.405 |
| Incomec | -0.114 | 0.199 | .569 | -0.505 | 0.278 |
| Female | -3.555 | 1.005 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.529 | -1.581 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.442 | 1.228 | .005\*\* | 1.029 | 5.856 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.224 | 1.826 | .004\*\* | -8.812 | -1.636 |
| Religiosityc | -3.873 | 0.416 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.690 | -3.055 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 42.446 | 3.194 | .0001 | 36.170 | 48.722 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.227 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of affective competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Anger Rumination

Table 26: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between anger rumination and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anger Rumination | 3.571 | 0.965 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.675 | 5.468 |
| Agec | -0.145 | 0.068 | .032\*\* | -0.279 | -0.012 |
| Educationc | -0.192 | 0.756 | .799 | -1.679 | 1.294 |
| Incomec | -0.284 | 0.353 | .421 | -0.977 | 0.409 |
| Female | -11.038 | 1.741 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.459 | -7.616 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.878 | 2.029 | .157 | -1.109 | 6.865 |
| Non-Heteroi | -10.152 | 3.298 | .002\*\*\* | -16.633 | -3.671 |
| Religiosityc | -6.481 | 0.720 | .0001\*\*\* | -7.896 | -5.066 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.740 | 5.585 | .0001 | 64.766 | 86.715 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.250 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of anger rumination. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 27: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between anger rumination and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anger Rumination | 2.340 | 0.636 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.090 | 3.590 |
| Agec | -0.061 | 0.044 | .170 | -0.148 | 0.026 |
| Educationc | 0.135 | 0.489 | .782 | -0.826 | 1.096 |
| Incomec | -0.264 | 0.238 | .268 | -0.731 | 0.203 |
| Female | -7.019 | 1.130 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.239 | -4.798 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.359 | 1.327 | .787 | -2.967 | 2.250 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.615 | 2.162 | .033\*\* | -8.864 | -0.366 |
| Religiosityc | -2.646 | 0.470 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.569 | -1.723 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.299 | 3.558 | .0001 | 27.307 | 41.291 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.168 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of anger rumination. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 28: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between anger rumination and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anger Rumination | 1.231 | 0.541 | .023\*\* | 0.169 | 2.293 |
| Agec | -0.084 | 0.040 | .035\*\* | -0.163 | -0.006 |
| Educationc | -0.328 | 0.440 | .456 | -1.192 | 0.536 |
| Incomec | -0.020 | 0.199 | .919 | -0.412 | 0.371 |
| Female | -4.019 | 0.996 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.975 | -2.063 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.237 | 1.225 | .009\*\* | 0.830 | 5.644 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.537 | 1.820 | .002\*\* | -9.112 | -1.961 |
| Religiosityc | -3.835 | 0.419 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.659 | -3.011 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.441 | 3.247 | .0001 | 35.060 | 47.822 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.220 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of anger rumination. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Contingent Competitiveness (Self-worth)

Table 29: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between contingent competitiveness (self-worth) and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Competitiveness | 5.811 | 0.962 | .0001\*\*\* | 3.920 | 7.702 |
| Agec | -0.117 | 0.066 | .077† | -0.247 | 0.013 |
| Educationc | -0.406 | 0.747 | .587 | -1.874 | 1.063 |
| Incomec | -0.432 | 0.347 | .215 | -1.114 | 0.251 |
| Female | -9.029 | 1.751 | .0001\*\*\* | -12.470 | -5.588 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.708 | 1.975 | .171 | -1.173 | 6.589 |
| Non-Heteroi | -8.542 | 3.008 | .005\*\* | -14.454 | -2.631 |
| Religiosityc | -6.171 | 0.725 | .0001\*\*\* | -7.595 | -4.747 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 74.685 | 5.619 | .0001 | 63.643 | 85.726 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.290 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 30: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between affective competitiveness (self-worth) and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Competitiveness | 2.839 | 0.629 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.604 | 4.075 |
| Agec | -0.056 | 0.045 | .211 | -0.144 | 0.032 |
| Educationc | 0.041 | 0.489 | .933 | -0.920 | 1.003 |
| Incomec | -0.339 | 0.238 | .155 | -0.806 | 0.128 |
| Female | -5.981 | 1.131 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.204 | -3.759 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.504 | 1.346 | .708 | -3.150 | 2.142 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.836 | 2.128 | .072† | -8.017 | 0.345 |
| Religiosityc | -2.509 | 0.481 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.454 | -1.564 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.111 | 3.605 | .0001 | 27.026 | 41.194 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.180 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 31: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between affective competitiveness (self-worth) and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Competitiveness | 2.972 | 0.554 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.882 | 4.061 |
| Agec | -0.061 | 0.038 | .111 | -0.137 | 0.014 |
| Educationc | -0.447 | 0.434 | .303 | -1.300 | 0.406 |
| Incomec | -0.093 | 0.194 | .633 | -0.475 | 0.289 |
| Female | -3.047 | 0.996 | .002\*\* | -5.004 | -1.091 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.212 | 1.168 | .006\*\* | 0.917 | 5.507 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.706 | 1.650 | .005\*\* | -7.949 | -1.464 |
| Religiosityc | -3.662 | 0.415 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.478 | -2.847 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 40.575 | 3.238 | .0001 | 34.213 | 46.937 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.266 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent competitiveness. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Displaced Aggression

Table 32: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between displaced aggression and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Displaced Aggression | 3.735 | 0.973 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.824 | 5.646 |
| Agec | -0.134 | 0.068 | .048\*\* | -0.267 | -0.001 |
| Educationc | -0.303 | 0.754 | .688 | -1.784 | 1.178 |
| Incomec | -0.347 | 0.351 | .322 | -1.036 | 0.341 |
| Female | -10.914 | 1.734 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.321 | -7.507 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.845 | 2.053 | .167 | -1.190 | 6.880 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.996 | 3.276 | .002\*\* | -16.434 | -3.558 |
| Religiosityc | -6.311 | 0.728 | .0001\*\*\* | -7.741 | -4.881 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.714 | 5.535 | .0001 | 64.837 | 86.591 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.252 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of displaced aggression. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 33: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between displaced aggression and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Displaced Aggression | 2.445 | 0.636 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.196 | 3.694 |
| Agec | -0.054 | 0.045 | .230 | -0.141 | 0.034 |
| Educationc | 0.063 | 0.487 | .897 | -0.894 | 1.020 |
| Incomec | -0.305 | 0.235 | .195 | -0.767 | 0.157 |
| Female | -6.938 | 1.118 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.135 | -4.741 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.381 | 1.354 | .779 | -3.041 | 2.280 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.513 | 2.153 | .037\*\* | -8.744 | -0.282 |
| Religiosityc | -2.535 | 0.478 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.475 | -1.595 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.283 | 3.542 | .0001 | 27.324 | 41.243 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.170 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of displaced aggression. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 34: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between displaced and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Displaced Aggression | 1.290 | 0.511 | .012\*\* | 0.285 | 2.294 |
| Agec | -0.080 | 0.040 | .047\*\* | -0.160 | -0.001 |
| Educationc | -0.366 | 0.440 | .405 | -1.230 | 0.498 |
| Incomec | -0.042 | 0.200 | .833 | -0.434 | 0.350 |
| Female | -3.976 | 0.995 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.931 | -2.022 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.226 | 1.224 | .009\*\* | 0.821 | 5.630 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.483 | 1.813 | .003\*\* | -9.046 | -1.920 |
| Religiosityc | -3.776 | 0.422 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.606 | -2.947 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.431 | 3.253 | .0001 | 35.039 | 47.823 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.221 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of displaced aggression. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Externally Contingent Esteem (self-worth)

Table 35: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between continent self-worth and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Esteem | 2.535 | 0.969 | .009\*\* | 0.631 | 4.439 |
| Agec | -0.174 | 0.068 | .011\*\* | -0.308 | -0.039 |
| Educationc | -0.488 | 0.748 | .515 | -1.959 | 0.983 |
| Incomec | -0.245 | 0.352 | .487 | -0.938 | 0.447 |
| Female | -11.223 | 1.740 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.643 | -7.803 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.399 | 2.138 | .113 | -0.803 | 7.600 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.061 | 3.454 | .009\*\* | -15.848 | -2.274 |
| Religiosityc | -6.528 | 0.725 | .0001\*\*\* | -7.953 | -5.103 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 78.329 | 5.490 | .0001 | 67.541 | 89.117 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.236 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent esteem. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 36: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between continent self-worth and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Esteem | 0.386 | 0.650 | .552 | -0.890 | 1.663 |
| Agec | -0.092 | 0.045 | .043\*\* | -0.181 | -0.003 |
| Educationc | 0.121 | 0.496 | .807 | -0.854 | 1.096 |
| Incomec | -0.266 | 0.239 | .266 | -0.735 | 0.203 |
| Female | -6.879 | 1.146 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.131 | -4.627 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.467 | 1.413 | .741 | -3.245 | 2.310 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.471 | 2.302 | .053† | -8.995 | 0.053 |
| Religiosityc | -2.696 | 0.480 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.640 | -1.752 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 35.679 | 3.579 | .0001 | 28.647 | 42.711 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.139 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent esteem. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 37: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between continent self-worth and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingent Esteem | 2.148 | 0.539 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.090 | 3.207 |
| Agec | -0.082 | 0.039 | .038\*\* | -0.160 | -0.005 |
| Educationc | -0.609 | 0.434 | .161 | -1.462 | 0.244 |
| Incomec | 0.021 | 0.198 | .916 | -0.368 | 0.410 |
| Female | -4.344 | 0.975 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.260 | -2.428 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.866 | 1.236 | .002\*\* | 1.437 | 6.295 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.590 | 1.800 | .011\*\* | -8.126 | -1.053 |
| Religiosityc | -3.832 | 0.410 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.638 | -3.026 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 42.650 | 3.130 | .0001 | 36.499 | 48.801 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.239 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of contingent esteem. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Revenge Planning

Table 38: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenge Planning | 5.707 | 0.962 | .0001\*\*\* | 3.817 | 7.597 |
| Agec | -0.113 | 0.065 | .083† | -0.242 | 0.015 |
| Educationc | -0.298 | 0.745 | .689 | -1.763 | 1.166 |
| Incomec | -0.259 | 0.347 | .455 | -0.940 | 0.422 |
| Female | -8.591 | 1.777 | .0001\*\*\* | -12.083 | -5.098 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.053 | 1.968 | .297 | -1.814 | 5.919 |
| Non-Heteroi | -10.341 | 2.977 | .001\*\*\* | -16.189 | -4.492 |
| Religiosityc | -6.679 | 0.706 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.065 | -5.292 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 74.442 | 5.516 | .0001 | 63.603 | 85.280 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.288 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of revenge planning. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 39: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenge Planning | 4.100 | 0.605 | .0001\*\*\* | 2.911 | 5.290 |
| Agec | -0.035 | 0.042 | .413 | -0.118 | 0.048 |
| Educationc | 0.055 | 0.476 | .908 | -0.880 | 0.991 |
| Incomec | -0.245 | 0.232 | .291 | -0.700 | 0.210 |
| Female | -5.282 | 1.127 | .0001\*\*\* | -7.496 | -3.068 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.928 | 1.300 | .476 | -3.483 | 1.626 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.748 | 1.915 | .014\*\* | -8.512 | -0.985 |
| Religiosityc | -2.783 | 0.458 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.683 | -1.882 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 33.242 | 3.480 | .0001 | 26.405 | 40.079 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.225 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of revenge planning. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 40: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenge Planning | 1.606 | 0.546 | .003\*\* | 0.533 | 2.680 |
| Agec | -0.079 | 0.040 | .048\*\* | -0.157 | -0.001 |
| Educationc | -0.354 | 0.440 | .422 | -1.218 | 0.511 |
| Incomec | -0.014 | 0.199 | .943 | -0.405 | 0.377 |
| Female | -3.309 | 1.026 | .001\*\*\* | -5.325 | -1.293 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.981 | 1.209 | .014\*\* | 0.604 | 5.357 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.593 | 1.768 | .002\*\* | -9.068 | -2.118 |
| Religiosityc | -3.896 | 0.416 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.714 | -3.078 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.200 | 3.259 | .0001 | 34.796 | 47.603 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.226 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of revenge planning. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

## Social Dominance Orientation

Table 41: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Dominance | 8.958 | 0.979 | .0001\*\*\* | 7.035 | 10.881 |
| Agec | -0.141 | 0.062 | .024\*\* | -0.263 | -0.019 |
| Educationc | -0.842 | 0.720 | .243 | -2.256 | 0.572 |
| Incomec | -0.506 | 0.308 | .101 | -1.112 | 0.099 |
| Female | -7.826 | 1.662 | .0001\*\*\* | -11.091 | -4.560 |
| Non-Whitei | 5.945 | 1.875 | .002\*\* | 2.260 | 9.629 |
| Non-Heteroi | -7.982 | 2.823 | .005\*\* | -13.528 | -2.436 |
| Religiosityc | -5.538 | 0.712 | .0001 | -6.938 | -4.139 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.492 | 5.309 | .000 | 65.059 | 85.924 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.381 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of social dominance orientation. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 42: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Dominance | 6.756 | 0.620 | .0001\*\*\* | 5.538 | 7.974 |
| Agec | -0.052 | 0.041 | .199 | -0.132 | 0.028 |
| Educationc | -0.360 | 0.443 | .416 | -1.231 | 0.510 |
| Incomec | -0.430 | 0.195 | .028\*\* | -0.814 | -0.046 |
| Female | -4.629 | 1.032 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.656 | -2.602 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.991 | 1.145 | .083† | -0.259 | 4.242 |
| Non-Heteroi | -2.974 | 1.802 | .099† | -6.515 | 0.566 |
| Religiosityc | -1.927 | 0.456 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.822 | -1.032 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 33.918 | 3.254 | .0001 | 27.524 | 40.312 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.373 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of social dominance orientation. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 43: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Correlation between social dominance orientation and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Dominance | 2.202 | 0.578 | .0001\*\*\* | 1.066 | 3.337 |
| Agec | -0.088 | 0.039 | .022\*\* | -0.164 | -0.013 |
| Educationc | -0.481 | 0.437 | .272 | -1.341 | 0.378 |
| Incomec | -0.076 | 0.197 | .698 | -0.463 | 0.310 |
| Female | -3.196 | 1.000 | .001\*\*\* | -5.162 | -1.231 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.953 | 1.217 | .001\*\*\* | 1.561 | 6.345 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.008 | 1.758 | .005\*\* | -8.463 | -1.553 |
| Religiosityc | -3.612 | 0.429 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.454 | -2.770 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.574 | 3.238 | .0001 | 35.212 | 47.936 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.240 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized measure of social dominance orientation. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix H. Fragile Self-esteem and Religiosity

Table 44: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction between between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and religiosity. Symmetric coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.334 | 0.209 | .110 | -0.076 | 0.745 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.044 | 0.057 | .434 | -0.156 | 0.067 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.132 | 0.163 | .421 | -0.189 | 0.452 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.010 | 0.004 | .032\*\* | -0.018 | -0.001 |
| Educationc | -0.039 | 0.045 | .379 | -0.127 | 0.048 |
| Incomec | 0.036 | 0.023 | .115 | -0.009 | 0.081 |
| Femalei | -0.244 | 0.108 | .024\*\* | -0.457 | -0.032 |
| Ethnicityi | -0.200 | 0.132 | .130 | -0.460 | 0.059 |
| Orienti | 0.505 | 0.173 | .004\*\* | 0.165 | 0.844 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 3.078 | 0.318 | .0001 | 2.454 | 3.702 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.041 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 45: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and probably of being non-white. Asymmetric Coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.342 | 0.444 | .441 | -0.528 | 1.212 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.041 | 0.125 | .742 | -0.285 | 0.203 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.191 | 0.372 | .609 | -0.539 | 0.920 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.058 | 0.012 | .0001 | -0.082 | -0.034 |
| Educationc | 0.101 | 0.107 | .347 | -0.109 | 0.310 |
| Incomec | 0.078 | 0.052 | .134 | -0.024 | 0.180 |
| Femalei | -0.267 | 0.241 | .267 | -0.739 | 0.205 |
| Orienti | 0.343 | 0.398 | .388 | -0.437 | 1.123 |
| Ethnicityi | -0.134 | 0.099 | .177 | -0.327 | 0.060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.246 | 0.790 | .756 | -1.302 | 1.793 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.001 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix I. Dependent and Control Variables – Question Wordings

## Hostile Sexism

1. Many women are actually seeking special favours, such as hiring policies that favour them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality".
2. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
3. Women are too easily offended.
4. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
5. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
6. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
7. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
8. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
9. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
10. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
11. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

* Items 4, 10, 11 are reverse-coded.

## Benevolent Sexism

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
3. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
4. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
5. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
6. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
7. Men are complete without women.
8. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
9. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
10. Women, as compared to men, tend to have more refined sense of culture and taste.
11. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

* Items 2, 3, 7 are reverse-coded.

## Political Leadership

1. Men are naturally better politicians than women
2. Women are too emotional for politics
3. Women are too nice for politics

## Leadership as Masculine

1. Men are naturally better leaders than women
2. Men are naturally better business leaders than women
3. Men are naturally better religious leaders than women

## Gender Balance

1. How much do you agree with initiatives for greater gender balance in all levels of government?
2. How much do you believe in the need for greater gender balance at all levels of business?

## Vote Preferences

1. In politics, if two equally qualified candidates were running for office, one a man and the other a woman, do you think you would be more inclined to vote for the male or the female candidate?
   * Strongly inclined to vote for the female candidate
   * Somewhat inclined to vote for the female candidate
   * Unsure/Not leaning toward either
   * Somewhat inclined to vote for the male candidate
   * Strongly inclined to vote for the male candidate
2. In politics, if two equally qualified candidates were running for president, one a man and the other a woman, do you think you would prefer to be governed by a man or a woman?

* Strongly prefer to be governed by a female president
* Somewhat prefer to be governed by a female president
* Unsure/Not leaning particularly toward either
* Somewhat prefer to be governed by a male president
* Strongly prefer to be governed by a male president

1. At work, if two equally qualified candidates were being considered for a promotion to lead your team, one a man and the other a woman, do you think you would prefer to have a male or female boss?

* Strongly prefer to have a female boss
* Somewhat prefer to have a female boss
* Unsure/Not leaning particularly toward either
* Somewhat prefer to have a male boss
* Strongly prefer to have a male boss

## Approval Trump

Since January 2017, Donald Trump has been the president of the United States. On a scale of 0 to 10, in which 0 corresponds to terrible and 10 to excellent, how do you evaluate Donald Trump’s leadership?

## Approval Pelosi

As Speaker of the US House of Representatives and one of the proponents of the Donald Trump’s impeachment, Nancy Pelosi had a key role in the process. On a scale of 0 to 10, in which 0 corresponds to terrible and 10 to excellent, how do you evaluate Nancy Pelosi’s leadership?

## Impeachment Agreement

On December 2019, the US House of Representatives impeached President Donald Trump. Overall, do you agree with Trump’s impeachment?

* Yes, Trump deserved to be impeached because he committed a serious crime.
* Yes, it was the right thing for the country, but any crimes he committed were not serious.
* No, Trump did overstep the law, but he should not have been impeached.
* No, the impeachment was wrong, as Trump did not commit any crime of responsibility.

*Republican Partisanship*

Traditionally which political party do you most identify with?

* Democrat
* Republican
* Other

*Republican Vote*

In 2020, do you plan on voting? If so, for a candidate from which party?

* Democrat
* Republican
* Candidate from another party
* I do not plan on voting

# Appendix J. Dependent and Control Variables: Measures

## Sexism

Main Study: Score on Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sexism | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 50.20 | 19.30 | 0 | 91 | 251 |
| Women | 40.09 | 22.58 | 0 | 98 | 236 |
| Total | 45.30 | 21.53 | 0 | 98 | 487 |

\*22 questions on 6-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-110

Main Study: Scores on Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Subscales

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Hostile |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 23.88 | 12.63 | 0 | 53 | 251 |
| Women | 17.30 | 13.21 | 0 | 50 | 236 |
| Total | 20.69 | 13.32 | 0 | 53 | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benevolent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 26.32 | 11.40 | 0 | 52 | 251 |
| Women | 22.79 | 12.61 | 0 | 53 | 236 |
| Total | 24.61 | 12.12 | 0 | 53 | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*22 questions on 6-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-55

Pilot Study: Score on Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sexism | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 52.25 | 17.41 | 10 | 89 | 167 |
| Women | 46.45 | 18.98 | 10 | 83 | 238 |
| Total | 48.84 | 18.55 | 10 | 89 | 405 |

\*22 questions on 6-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-110

Pilot Study: Scores on Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Subscales

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Hostile |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 25.74 | 10.13 | 3 | 46 | 167 |
| Women | 22.65 | 11.04 | 3 | 51 | 238 |
| Total | 23.93 | 10.77 | 3 | 51 | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benevolent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 26.51 | 8.61 | 7 | 44 | 167 |
| Women | 23.79 | 9.23 | 7 | 44 | 238 |
| Total | 24.91 | 9.07 | 7 | 46 | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*22 questions on 6-point Likert-scale

\*Range 0-55

## Gendered Preferences

Political Leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 6.75 | 3.35 | 3 | 15 | 251 |
| Women | 5.47 | 3.13 | 3 | 15 | 236 |
| Total | 6.13 | 3.31 | 3 | 15 | 487 |

\*3 questions on 5-point Likert-scale. Range 3-15

Leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 7.50 | 3.72 | 3 | 15 | 251 |
| Women | 5.88 | 3.49 | 3 | 15 | 236 |
| Total | 6.71 | 3.70 | 3 | 15 | 487 |

\*3 questions on 5-point Likert-scale. Range 3-15

Gendered Voter Preference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 8.62 | 2.52 | 3 | 15 | 251 |
| Women | 9.18 | 2.31 | 3 | 15 | 236 |
| Total | 8.03 | 2.60 | 3 | 15 | 487 |

\*2 questions on 5-point Likert-scale. Range 3-15

Preference for Gender Balance in Government

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 4.75 | 2.27 | 2 | 10 | 251 |
| Women | 3.89 | 2.13 | 2 | 10 | 236 |
| Total | 4.33 | 2.24 | 2 | 10 | 487 |

\*2 questions on 5-point Likert-scale. Range 3-15

## Non-explicitly Gendered Preferences

Trump Approval

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 3.86 | 3.48 | 0 | 10 | 251 |
| Women | 3.69 | 3.47 | 0 | 10 | 236 |
| Total | 3.78 | 3.47 | 0 | 10 | 487 |

\*1 question on 11-point Slider-scale. Range 0-10

Pelosi Approval

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 4.38 | 3.21 | 0 | 10 | 251 |
| Women | 4.41 | 3.16 | 0 | 10 | 236 |
| Total | 4.40 | 3.18 | 0 | 10 | 487 |

\*1 question on 11-point Slider-scale. Range 0-10

Disagreement with Trump’s Impeachment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 2.31 | 1.29 | 1 | 4 | 251 |
| Women | 2.19 | 1.25 | 1 | 4 | 236 |
| Total | 2.25 | 1.27 | 1 | 4 | 487 |

\*1 question on 4-point scale. Range 1-4.

Republican Partisanship

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 0.38 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 251 |
| Women | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 236 |
| Total | 0.39 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 | 487 |

\*1 question. Democrat/Other =0, Republican =1

Republican Partisanship

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Frequency in Men | Percent. | Frequency in Women | Percent |
| Democrat | 117 | 46.61 | 112 | 47.46 |
| Republican | 95 | 37.85 | 94 | 39.83.75 |
| Other | 39 | 15.54 | 30 | 12.71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 |

Republican Vote

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean | Std. | Min | Max | Total |
| Men | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 | 251 |
| Women | 0.35 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 | 236 |
| Total | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 | 487 |

\*1 question. Democrat/Other/I do not intend to vote =0, Republican =1

Republican Vote

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Frequency in Men | Percent. | Frequency in Women | Percent |
| Democrat | 119 | 47.41 | 124 | 52.54 |
| Republican | 92 | 36.65 | 82 | 34.75 |
| Other | 24 | 9.56 | 16 | 6.78 |
| I do not plan on voting | 16 | 6.37 | 14 | 5.93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 251 | 100 | 236 | 100 |

# Appendix K. Dependent and Control Variables: Reliability Scores

Main Study: Coefficient Alpha Reliability Scales

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Number of Questions | Scale | AIC | Alpha |
| H&B Sexism | 22 | 6-point Likert-scale | 0.887 | 0.926 |
| Hostile Sexism | 11 | 6-point Likert-scale | 1.366 | 0.932 |
| Benevolent Sexism | 11 | 6-point Likert-scale | 1.092 | 0.899 |
| Rosenberg Scale | 10 | 7-point Likert-scale | 1.507 | 0.941 |
| Political Leadership as Masculine | 3 | 5-point Likert-scale | 1.071 | 0.883 |
| Leadership as Masculine | 3 | 5-point Likert-scale | 1.459 | 0.941 |
| Gendered Vote Preference | 3 | 5-point Likert-scale | 0.593 | 0.842 |
| Gender Balance in Gov | 2 | 5-point Likert-scale | 1.169 | 0.929 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Pilot Study: Coefficient Alpha Reliability Scales

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Number of Question | Scale | AIC | Alpha |
| H&B Sexism | 22 | 6-point Likert-scale | 0.683 | 0.889 |
| Hostile Sexism | 11 | 6-point Likert-scale | 0.804 | 0.839 |
| Benevolent Sexism | 11 | 6-point Likert-scale | 0.662 | 0.788 |
| Rosenberg Scale | 10 | 4-point Likert-scale | 0.306 | 0.922 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Main Study: Coefficient Alpha Reliability Scales for the Additional Psychological Measures

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Number of Question | Scale | AIC | Alpha |
| Affective Competitiveness | 8 | 5-point Likert-scale | 0.963 | 0.919 |
| Anger Rumination | 5 | 7-point Likert-scale | 2.601 | 0.944 |
| Displaced Aggression | 5 | 7-point Likert-scale | 1.863 | 0.932 |
| Revenge Planning | 5 | 7-point Likert-scale | 1.938 | 0.922 |
| Continent Self-worth (Competitiveness) | 5 | 7-point Likert-scale | 1.821 | 0.851 |
| Continent Self-worth (Perception by others) | 5 | 7-point Likert-scale | 1.891 | 0.899 |
| Social Dominance Orientation | 8 | 7-point Likert Scale | 1.775 | 0.908 |

# Appendix L. Post-hoc Power Analyses

Table 46: Post-hoc power analysis. Exact test for a linear multiple regression in a random model.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statistical Values | Sexism | Hostile | Benevolent | Sexism: Gender Interaction | Hostile: Gender Interaction | Benevolent: Gender Interaction |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effect Size | 0.215 | 0.340 | 0.005 | -0.351 | -0.552 | -0.017 |
| Prob Err | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sample Size | 487 | 487 | 487 | 487 | 487 | 487 |
| Predictors | 10 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Critical R2 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 | 0.0457 | 0.0457 | 0.0457 |
| Power | 1 | 1 | 0.137 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistical Values | Political Leadership | Leadership as Masculine | Gender Balance | Vote Preference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effect Size | 0.366 | 0.406 | 0.240 | 0.130 |  |  |
| Prob Err | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |  |  |
| Sample Size | 487 | 487 | 487 | 487 |  |  |
| Predictors | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| Critical R2 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 |  |  |
| Power | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.999 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statistical Values | Approval Trump | Approval Pelosi | Impeach |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effect Size | 0.333 | -0.047 | 0.248 |  |  |  |
| Prob Err | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Sample Size | 487 | 487 | 487 |  |  |  |
| Predictors | 10 | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Critical R2 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 | 0.0374 |  |  |  |
| Power | 1 | 0.939 | 1 |  |  |  |

Power analysis is run in G\*Power 3.1.9.4. As required by G\*Power, the effect sizes are standardized prior to the analysis.

Table 47: Post-hoc power analysis. Analysis based on a Z-distribution for a logistic Regression.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Statistical Values | Partisanship | Republican Vote 2020 |
|  |  |  |
| Odds Ratio | 2.423 | 2.611 |
| Pr(Y=1|X=1) H0 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| err prob | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sample size | 487 | 487 |
| Critical z | 1.644854 | 1.644854 |
| Power | 0.99654 | 0.999041 |

Power analysis is run in G\*Power 3.1.9. As required by G\*Power, the effect sizes are reported as odds ratios.

# Appendix M. Correlations between Implicit Self-esteem and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Table 48: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of implicit self-esteem on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicitc | -2.349 | 2.626 | .372 | -7.509 | 2.812 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.197 | 0.068 | .004\*\* | -0.330 | -0.063 |
| Educationc | -0.146 | 0.762 | .848 | -1.643 | 1.351 |
| Incomec | -0.269 | 0.359 | .455 | -0.974 | 0.437 |
| Femalei | -10.946 | 1.786 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.455 | -7.436 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.452 | 2.104 | .244 | -1.681 | 6.586 |
| Non-Heteroi | -10.471 | 3.458 | .003\*\* | -17.266 | -3.676 |
| Religiosityc | -6.622 | 0.724 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.044 | -5.200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 79.070 | 5.683 | .0001 | 67.903 | 90.238 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.225 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit self-esteem is measured using the other-self self-esteem IAT.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 49: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of implicit self-esteem on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicitc | -1.868 | 1.718 | .277 | -5.244 | 1.507 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.094 | 0.045 | .038\*\* | -0.183 | -0.005 |
| Educationc | 0.164 | 0.494 | .741 | -0.807 | 1.135 |
| Incomec | -0.249 | 0.243 | .306 | -0.728 | 0.229 |
| Femalei | -6.992 | 1.158 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.267 | -4.718 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.645 | 1.379 | .640 | -3.354 | 2.064 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.863 | 2.295 | .035\*\* | -9.372 | -0.353 |
| Religiosityc | -2.746 | 0.478 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.687 | -1.806 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 36.673 | 3.663 | .0001 | 29.476 | 43.871 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.141 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit self-esteem is measured using the other-self self-esteem IAT.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 50: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of implicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicitc | -0.480 | 1.431 | .737 | -3.293 | 2.332 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.102 | 0.039 | .009\*\* | -0.179 | -0.025 |
| Educationc | -0.310 | 0.440 | .482 | -1.175 | 0.555 |
| Incomec | -0.019 | 0.201 | .924 | -0.415 | 0.376 |
| Femalei | -3.953 | 1.004 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.926 | -1.980 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.097 | 1.238 | .013\*\* | 0.665 | 5.529 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.608 | 1.853 | .003\*\* | -9.250 | -1.967 |
| Religiosityc | -3.876 | 0.417 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.695 | -3.057 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 42.397 | 3.310 | .0001 | 35.892 | 48.902 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.210 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit self-esteem is measured using the other-self self-esteem IAT.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix N. Correlations between Explicit Self-esteem and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Table 51: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of explicit self-esteem on sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -3.671 | 0.919 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.477 | -1.866 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.152 | 0.066 | .022\*\* | -1.630 | 1.283 |
| Educationc | -0.174 | 0.741 | .815 | -0.794 | 0.609 |
| Incomec | -0.092 | 0.357 | .796 | -14.215 | -7.400 |
| Femalei | -10.807 | 1.734 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.621 | 6.569 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.474 | 2.084 | .236 | -16.380 | -3.147 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.763 | 3.367 | .0004\*\* | -8.076 | -5.231 |
| Religiosityc | -6.654 | 0.724 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.477 | -1.866 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.339 | 5.530 | .0001 | 64.472 | 86.206 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.251 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 52: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of explicit self-esteem on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.043 | 0.632 | .001\*\*\* | -3.286 | -0.800 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.070 | 0.044 | .113 | -0.157 | 0.017 |
| Educationc | 0.152 | 0.485 | .754 | -0.800 | 1.104 |
| Incomec | -0.159 | 0.242 | .511 | -0.634 | 0.316 |
| Femalei | -6.857 | 1.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.067 | -4.648 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.620 | 1.360 | .649 | -3.294 | 2.053 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.403 | 2.260 | .052† | -8.845 | 0.038 |
| Religiosityc | -2.751 | 0.476 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.686 | -1.815 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.270 | 3.533 | .0001 | 27.328 | 41.211 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.161 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 53: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of explicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.628 | 0.506 | .001\*\*\* | -2.623 | -0.633 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.082 | 0.039 | .036\*\* | -0.159 | -0.005 |
| Educationc | -0.325 | 0.434 | .454 | -1.178 | 0.527 |
| Incomec | 0.066 | 0.200 | .740 | -0.327 | 0.460 |
| Femalei | -3.950 | 0.991 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.896 | -2.003 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.095 | 1.241 | .013\*\* | 0.656 | 5.534 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.360 | 1.788 | .003\*\* | -8.873 | -1.847 |
| Religiosityc | -3.903 | 0.417 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.722 | -3.084 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.069 | 3.226 | .0001 | 34.730 | 47.409 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.227 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale.

†P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix O. Testing H1 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 54: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.913 | 3.441 | .154 | -1.847 | 11.674 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -4.155 | 0.989 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.099 | -2.211 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.635 | 2.461 | .060† | -0.201 | 9.471 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.157 | 0.067 | .019\*\* | -0.288 | -0.026 |
| Educationc | -0.186 | 0.747 | .804 | -1.653 | 1.281 |
| Incomec | -0.051 | 0.358 | .886 | -0.755 | 0.653 |
| Femalei | -11.031 | 1.736 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.442 | -7.620 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.284 | 2.065 | .269 | -1.773 | 6.340 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.454 | 3.445 | .006\*\* | -16.222 | -2.685 |
| Religiosityc | -6.766 | 0.724 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.189 | -5.343 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.489 | 5.590 | .0001 | 64.504 | 86.473 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.258 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix P. Testing H2 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 55: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.218 | 2.233 | .321 | -2.171 | 6.606 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.555 | 0.667 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.866 | -1.245 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.574 | 1.784 | .011\*\* | 1.069 | 8.079 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.071 | 0.044 | .111 | -0.158 | 0.016 |
| Educationc | 0.151 | 0.489 | .758 | -0.810 | 1.112 |
| Incomec | -0.143 | 0.242 | .554 | -0.618 | 0.332 |
| Femalei | -6.941 | 1.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.150 | -4.732 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.751 | 1.336 | .574 | -3.377 | 1.875 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.945 | 2.328 | .091† | -8.520 | 0.631 |
| Religiosityc | -2.820 | 0.476 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.754 | -1.885 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.327 | 3.588 | .0001 | 27.278 | 41.377 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.173 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 56: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.695 | 1.720 | .118 | -0.684 | 6.075 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.600 | 0.557 | .004\*\* | -2.695 | -0.505 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.061 | 1.082 | .955 | -2.066 | 2.188 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.086 | 0.039 | .029\*\* | -0.164 | -0.009 |
| Educationc | -0.337 | 0.433 | .437 | -1.188 | 0.514 |
| Incomec | 0.092 | 0.202 | .649 | -0.305 | 0.489 |
| Femalei | -4.090 | 0.994 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.042 | -2.137 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.035 | 1.245 | .015\*\* | 0.588 | 5.482 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.509 | 1.809 | .002\*\* | -9.064 | -1.954 |
| Religiosityc | -3.946 | 0.418 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.768 | -3.125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.161 | 3.234 | .0001 | 34.807 | 47.515 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.231 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix Q. Testing H3 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 57: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.311 | 3.629 | .525 | -4.820 | 9.443 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.908 | 0.982 | .003\*\* | -4.837 | -0.978 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 8.206 | 2.066 | .0001\*\*\* | 4.147 | 12.265 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -6.995 | 1.163 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.281 | -4.710 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.498 | 4.460 | .911 | -9.263 | 8.266 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.663 | 1.331 | .619 | -1.953 | 3.278 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -7.357 | 3.061 | .017\*\* | -13.372 | -1.342 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.066 | 0.044 | .138 | -0.153 | 0.021 |
| Educationc | 0.235 | 0.486 | .628 | -0.719 | 1.190 |
| Incomec | -0.155 | 0.246 | .528 | -0.638 | 0.328 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.839 | 1.343 | .533 | -3.478 | 1.800 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.229 | 2.362 | .074† | -8.870 | 0.412 |
| Religiosityc | -2.839 | 0.474 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.770 | -1.907 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 33.828 | 3.602 | .0001 | 26.750 | 40.906 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.181 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 58: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on benevolent sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.020 | 2.239 | .368 | -2.381 | 6.420 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.569 | 0.722 | .030\*\* | -2.988 | -0.149 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.163 | 1.369 | .905 | -2.528 | 2.853 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -4.164 | 1.043 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.213 | -2.116 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.044 | 3.205 | .745 | -5.255 | 7.342 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.059 | 1.103 | .957 | -2.227 | 2.109 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.200 | 2.113 | .925 | -4.353 | 3.953 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.086 | 0.040 | .031\*\* | -0.163 | -0.008 |
| Educationc | -0.335 | 0.436 | .442 | -1.191 | 0.521 |
| Incomec | 0.090 | 0.205 | .662 | -0.314 | 0.493 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.037 | 1.255 | .016\*\* | 0.570 | 5.503 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.525 | 1.822 | .003\*\* | -9.105 | -1.944 |
| Religiosityc | -3.943 | 0.419 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.767 | -3.119 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.166 | 3.259 | .0001 | 34.763 | 47.569 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.231 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix R. Testing H4 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 59: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on preference for men in political leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.394 | 0.673 | .039\*\* | 0.071 | 2.717 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.455 | 0.150 | .003\*\* | -0.750 | -0.161 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.209 | 0.522 | .021\*\* | 0.183 | 2.234 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.035 | 0.011 | .001\*\*\* | -0.056 | -0.014 |
| Educationc | 0.200 | 0.120 | .096† | -0.035 | 0.435 |
| Incomec | -0.027 | 0.062 | .656 | -0.149 | 0.094 |
| Female | -1.394 | 0.268 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.921 | -0.867 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.273 | 0.352 | .439 | -0.966 | 0.419 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.669 | 0.492 | .174 | -1.634 | 0.297 |
| Religiosityc | -0.836 | 0.116 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.064 | -0.607 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 9.379 | 0.832 | .0001 | 7.745 | 11.013 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.177 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 60: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on general preference for men in leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.609 | 0.735 | .029\*\* | 0.165 | 3.054 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.527 | 0.180 | .004\*\* | -0.882 | -0.173 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.502 | 0.535 | .005\*\* | 0.451 | 2.552 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.045 | 0.012 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.069 | -0.021 |
| Educationc | 0.143 | 0.134 | .284 | -0.119 | 0.406 |
| Incomec | 0.010 | 0.069 | .885 | -0.125 | 0.145 |
| Female | -1.751 | 0.302 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.345 | -1.158 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.333 | 0.390 | .393 | -1.099 | 0.432 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.106 | 0.480 | .022\*\* | -2.049 | -0.162 |
| Religiosityc | -0.890 | 0.132 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.150 | -0.630 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.844 | 0.948 | .0001 | 8.981 | 12.708 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.199 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 61: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on disagreement with initiatives for greater gender balance in government.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.075 | 0.335 | .822 | -0.734 | 0.583 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.144 | 0.126 | .251 | -0.391 | 0.102 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.539 | 0.305 | .078† | -0.060 | 1.137 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.008 | 0.009 | .369 | -0.009 | 0.025 |
| Educationc | -0.060 | 0.097 | .539 | -0.251 | 0.131 |
| Incomec | 0.055 | 0.047 | .244 | -0.038 | 0.148 |
| Female | -0.900 | 0.198 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.290 | -0.511 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.534 | 0.246 | .030\*\* | -1.017 | -0.051 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.845 | 0.243 | .001\*\*\* | -1.321 | -0.368 |
| Religiosityc | -0.149 | 0.086 | .085† | -0.318 | 0.020 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 5.085 | 0.661 | .0001 | 3.787 | 6.384 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.080 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 62: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on preference to vote for a male political candidate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.627 | 0.446 | .160 | -0.249 | 1.504 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.171 | 0.133 | .201 | -0.091 | 0.433 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.340 | 0.305 | .266 | -0.260 | 0.939 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.002 | 0.008 | .798 | -0.019 | 0.014 |
| Educationc | -0.210 | 0.092 | .023\*\* | -0.391 | -0.028 |
| Incomec | 0.116 | 0.046 | .012\*\* | 0.026 | 0.207 |
| Female | -1.202 | 0.220 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.634 | -0.770 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.098 | 0.278 | .725 | -0.645 | 0.449 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.613 | 0.388 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.376 | -0.851 |
| Religiosityc | -0.129 | 0.095 | .175 | -0.316 | 0.058 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.316 | 0.682 | .0001 | 8.976 | 11.655 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.121 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix S. Testing H5 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 63: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference for men in political leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.784 | 0.831 | .346 | -0.849 | 2.416 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.683 | 0.233 | .004\*\* | -1.141 | -0.224 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.921 | 0.493 | .0001\*\*\* | 0.952 | 2.890 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.477 | 0.274 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.016 | -0.938 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.915 | 1.238 | .460 | -1.517 | 3.346 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.431 | 0.299 | .151 | -0.157 | 1.019 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.409 | 0.987 | .154 | -3.348 | 0.529 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.034 | 0.011 | .001\*\*\* | -0.055 | -0.013 |
| Educationc | 0.216 | 0.120 | .072† | -0.019 | 0.450 |
| Incomec | -0.025 | 0.062 | .688 | -0.147 | 0.097 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.300 | 0.355 | .398 | -0.999 | 0.398 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.685 | 0.508 | .179 | -1.684 | 0.314 |
| Religiosityc | -0.834 | 0.115 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.061 | -0.608 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 9.277 | 0.830 | .0001 | 7.646 | 10.909 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.185 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 64: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference for men in leadership in general.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.425 | 1.162 | .221 | -0.859 | 3.709 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.688 | 0.264 | .009\*\* | -1.206 | -0.170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.941 | 0.662 | .004\*\* | 0.639 | 3.242 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.782 | 0.308 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.388 | -1.176 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.266 | 1.494 | .859 | -2.670 | 3.202 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.305 | 0.356 | .392 | -0.395 | 1.005 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.869 | 1.057 | .412 | -2.945 | 1.208 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.045 | 0.012 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.069 | -0.021 |
| Educationc | 0.153 | 0.134 | .254 | -0.110 | 0.417 |
| Incomec | 0.012 | 0.070 | .860 | -0.125 | 0.149 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.352 | 0.392 | .371 | -1.123 | 0.419 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.111 | 0.489 | .024\*\* | -2.073 | -0.150 |
| Religiosityc | -0.890 | 0.132 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.149 | -0.631 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.775 | 0.955 | .0001 | 8.898 | 12.653 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.192 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 65: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on belief in the need for greater gender balance in government

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.015 | 0.577 | .980 | -1.148 | 1.119 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.046 | 0.193 | .810 | -0.425 | 0.332 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.278 | 0.413 | .501 | -0.533 | 1.090 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.887 | 0.207 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.293 | -0.481 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.082 | 0.713 | .908 | -1.483 | 1.318 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.185 | 0.254 | .466 | -0.685 | 0.314 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.516 | 0.608 | .396 | -0.678 | 1.710 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.008 | 0.009 | .385 | -0.010 | 0.025 |
| Educationc | -0.066 | 0.097 | .499 | -0.257 | 0.125 |
| Incomec | 0.054 | 0.048 | .267 | -0.041 | 0.148 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.523 | 0.248 | .035\*\* | -1.009 | -0.036 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.842 | 0.242 | .001\*\*\* | -1.316 | -0.367 |
| Religiosityc | -0.149 | 0.087 | .087† | -0.319 | 0.022 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 5.127 | 0.664 | .0001 | 3.822 | 6.433 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.082 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 66: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference to vote for a male political candidate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.925 | 0.681 | .175 | -0.413 | 2.262 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.280 | 0.189 | .140 | -0.092 | 0.652 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.187 | 0.325 | .566 | -0.453 | 0.826 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.165 | 0.228 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.612 | -0.717 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.467 | 0.890 | .600 | -2.216 | 1.282 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.207 | 0.268 | .439 | -0.733 | 0.319 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.291 | 0.621 | .640 | -0.930 | 1.512 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.002 | 0.008 | .781 | -0.019 | 0.014 |
| Educationc | -0.213 | 0.092 | .021\*\* | -0.394 | -0.032 |
| Incomec | 0.114 | 0.047 | .016\*\* | 0.022 | 0.206 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.088 | 0.281 | .754 | -0.641 | 0.465 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.625 | 0.389 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.390 | -0.860 |
| Religiosityc | -0.131 | 0.096 | .171 | -0.319 | 0.057 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.341 | 0.689 | .0001 | 8.986 | 11.695 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.123 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix T. Testing H6 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 67: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on approval of President Trump’s leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.252 | 0.549 | .646 | -0.826 | 1.331 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.068 | 0.165 | .680 | -0.391 | 0.255 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.156 | 0.418 | .006\*\* | 0.335 | 1.977 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.017 | 0.012 | .173 | -0.041 | 0.007 |
| Educationc | 0.032 | 0.127 | .802 | -0.218 | 0.282 |
| Incomec | -0.010 | 0.063 | .871 | -0.134 | 0.114 |
| Femalei | -0.401 | 0.297 | .178 | -0.984 | 0.183 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.038 | 0.364 | .005\*\* | -1.752 | -0.323 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.775 | 0.486 | .112 | -1.730 | 0.180 |
| Religiosityc | -1.121 | 0.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.364 | -0.878 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 7.659 | 0.898 | .0001 | 5.896 | 9.423 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.172 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 68: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on disagreement with the impeachment of President Trump.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.122 | 0.213 | .566 | -0.540 | 0.296 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.043 | 0.059 | .472 | -0.074 | 0.159 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.314 | 0.158 | .048\*\* | 0.003 | 0.625 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.002 | 0.005 | .758 | -0.008 | 0.011 |
| Educationc | -0.058 | 0.047 | .225 | -0.151 | 0.036 |
| Incomec | 0.032 | 0.024 | .173 | -0.014 | 0.079 |
| Female | -0.171 | 0.110 | .121 | -0.388 | 0.045 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.389 | 0.132 | .003\*\* | -0.649 | -0.130 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.600 | 0.147 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.889 | -0.310 |
| Religiosityc | -0.252 | 0.047 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.344 | -0.160 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 3.224 | 0.355 | .0001 | 2.527 | 3.921 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.118 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 69: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on approval of minority house leader Nancy Pelosi’s leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.371 | 0.518 | .474 | -0.647 | 1.388 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.044 | 0.165 | .791 | -0.368 | 0.281 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.150 | 0.496 | .762 | -1.124 | 0.824 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.013 | 0.013 | .311 | -0.038 | 0.012 |
| Educationc | 0.287 | 0.118 | .016\*\* | 0.055 | 0.518 |
| Incomec | -0.107 | 0.066 | .105 | -0.236 | 0.022 |
| Female | 0.146 | 0.287 | .610 | -0.417 | 0.710 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.004 | 0.354 | .005\*\* | 0.308 | 1.701 |
| Non-Heteroi | 1.533 | 0.490 | .002\*\* | 0.570 | 2.497 |
| Religiosityc | 0.278 | 0.122 | .023\*\* | 0.038 | 0.518 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 2.698 | 0.896 | .003 | 0.938 | 4.458 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.074 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 70: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: Interaction effect of implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on probability of identifying as a Republican Party supporter.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.136 | 0.412 | .742 | -0.672 | 0.943 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.052 | 0.113 | .647 | -0.274 | 0.170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.885 | 0.423 | .036\*\* | 0.057 | 1.714 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.002 | 0.008 | .761 | -0.014 | 0.019 |
| Educationc | -0.011 | 0.089 | .901 | -0.186 | 0.164 |
| Incomec | 0.141 | 0.043 | .001\*\* | 0.058 | 0.224 |
| Female | -0.116 | 0.204 | .571 | -0.516 | 0.284 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.888 | 0.281 | .002\*\* | -1.439 | -0.336 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.080 | 0.383 | .834 | -0.831 | 0.670 |
| Religiosityc | -0.599 | 0.089 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.773 | -0.425 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.501 | 0.639 | .433 | -0.752 | 1.754 |
| P-Chi(2) |  |  |  |  | 0.110 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 71: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect of implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on the probability of voting Republican in the 2020 election.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.052 | 0.465 | .910 | -0.860 | 0.965 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.029 | 0.108 | .785 | -0.182 | 0.241 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.960 | 0.509 | .059† | -0.038 | 1.957 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.005 | 0.008 | .588 | -0.021 | 0.012 |
| Educationc | 0.016 | 0.089 | .859 | -0.159 | 0.190 |
| Incomec | 0.048 | 0.042 | .252 | -0.034 | 0.129 |
| Female | -0.233 | 0.204 | .255 | -0.634 | 0.168 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.684 | 0.279 | .014\*\* | -1.231 | -0.138 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.520 | 0.414 | .209 | -1.331 | 0.291 |
| Religiosityc | -0.518 | 0.089 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.692 | -0.345 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.814 | 0.650 | .211 | -0.460 | 2.089 |
| P-Chi(2) |  |  |  |  | 0.083 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix U. Testing H7 - Main Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

## Main Study: Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/0.00 : 0.001/+2.00)

Table 72: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on approval of President Donald Trump’s leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.088 | 0.962 | .927 | -1.802 | 1.978 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.255 | 0.219 | .245 | -0.685 | 0.176 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.522 | 0.586 | .010\*\* | 0.370 | 2.673 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.429 | 0.308 | .165 | -1.034 | 0.177 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.248 | 1.152 | .830 | -2.017 | 2.512 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.354 | 0.327 | .280 | -0.289 | 0.998 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.716 | 0.828 | .388 | -2.342 | 0.911 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.017 | 0.012 | .178 | -0.041 | 0.008 |
| Educationc | 0.040 | 0.128 | .753 | -0.211 | 0.292 |
| Incomec | -0.006 | 0.064 | .919 | -0.132 | 0.119 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.057 | 0.368 | .004\*\* | -1.779 | -0.334 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.767 | 0.499 | .125 | -1.747 | 0.213 |
| Religiosityc | -1.120 | 0.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.364 | -0.877 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 7.596 | 0.900 | .0001 | 5.828 | 9.364 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.175 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 73: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on approval of majority House Leader Nancy Pelosi’s leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.691 | 0.925 | .455 | -1.125 | 2.508 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.241 | 0.237 | .309 | -0.706 | 0.224 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.252 | 0.756 | .739 | -1.234 | 1.738 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.170 | 0.297 | .567 | -0.413 | 0.754 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.515 | 1.098 | .639 | -2.673 | 1.642 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.374 | 0.327 | .253 | -0.268 | 1.016 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.797 | 0.972 | .413 | -2.708 | 1.113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.013 | 0.013 | .316 | -0.038 | 0.012 |
| Educationc | 0.296 | 0.118 | .013\*\* | 0.064 | 0.529 |
| Incomec | -0.103 | 0.066 | .122 | -0.233 | 0.027 |
| Non-Whitei | 0.983 | 0.353 | .006\*\* | 0.288 | 1.678 |
| Non-Heteroi | 1.538 | 0.486 | .002\*\* | 0.584 | 2.493 |
| Religiosityc | 0.275 | 0.122 | .025\*\* | 0.034 | 0.515 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 2.619 | 0.900 | .004 | 0.850 | 4.388 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.078 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 74: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on disagreement with the impeachment of President Donald Trump.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.073 | 0.367 | .842 | -0.795 | 0.648 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.044 | 0.088 | .614 | -0.128 | 0.217 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.256 | 0.210 | .223 | -0.156 | 0.669 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.165 | 0.114 | .150 | -0.390 | 0.060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.070 | 0.447 | .875 | -0.948 | 0.807 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.003 | 0.118 | .981 | -0.234 | 0.228 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.118 | 0.317 | .711 | -0.505 | 0.740 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.001 | 0.005 | .778 | -0.008 | 0.011 |
| Educationc | -0.059 | 0.048 | .217 | -0.152 | 0.035 |
| Incomec | 0.033 | 0.024 | .173 | -0.014 | 0.080 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.388 | 0.133 | .004\*\* | -0.649 | -0.128 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.594 | 0.150 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.889 | -0.299 |
| Religiosityc | -0.252 | 0.047 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.345 | -0.159 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 3.231 | 0.356 | .0001 | 2.531 | 3.930 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.118 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 75: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on the probability of identifying as a Republican Party supporter.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.143 | 0.671 | .832 | -1.173 | 1.458 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.154 | 0.153 | .314 | -0.453 | 0.146 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.734 | 0.449 | .102 | -0.146 | 1.614 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.127 | 0.211 | .546 | -0.541 | 0.287 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.003 | 0.850 | .998 | -1.663 | 1.668 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.198 | 0.229 | .387 | -0.251 | 0.646 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.325 | 0.823 | .693 | -1.287 | 1.938 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.002 | 0.008 | .807 | -0.014 | 0.018 |
| Educationc | -0.010 | 0.090 | .907 | -0.187 | 0.166 |
| Incomec | 0.145 | 0.043 | .001\*\*\* | 0.060 | 0.229 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.902 | 0.283 | .001\*\*\* | -1.458 | -0.346 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.047 | 0.385 | .903 | -0.802 | 0.708 |
| Religiosityc | -0.601 | 0.090 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.778 | -0.424 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.507 | 0.637 | .426 | -0.742 | 1.755 |
| Ps.R2 |  |  |  |  | 0.112 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 76: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on the probability of planning to vote for the Republican Party in the 2020 presidential election.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.122 | 0.679 | .857 | -1.208 | 1.453 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.084 | 0.147 | .571 | -0.372 | 0.205 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.641 | 0.444 | .149 | -0.229 | 1.511 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.250 | 0.211 | .234 | -0.663 | 0.162 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.136 | 0.952 | .886 | -2.002 | 1.729 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.226 | 0.217 | .296 | -0.198 | 0.651 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.749 | 1.060 | .480 | -1.329 | 2.827 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.005 | 0.008 | .526 | -0.022 | 0.011 |
| Educationc | 0.017 | 0.090 | .851 | -0.159 | 0.192 |
| Incomec | 0.052 | 0.042 | .215 | -0.030 | 0.134 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.701 | 0.280 | .012 | -1.250 | -0.152 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.483 | 0.416 | .246 | -1.297 | 0.332 |
| Religiosityc | -0.522 | 0.091 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.700 | -0.345 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.832 | 0.646 | .198 | -0.434 | 2.098 |
| Ps.R2 |  |  |  |  | 0.087 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix V. Testing H1 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 77: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.572 | 2.803 | .203 | -1.935 | 9.079 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -4.523 | 0.994 | .0001\*\*\* | -6.477 | -2.570 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.972 | 2.375 | .012\*\* | 1.304 | 10.640 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.165 | 0.066 | .014\*\* | -0.295 | -0.034 |
| Educationc | -0.137 | 0.738 | .853 | -1.587 | 1.313 |
| Incomec | -0.059 | 0.360 | .870 | -0.766 | 0.649 |
| Femalei | -11.036 | 1.728 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.432 | -7.640 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.464 | 2.063 | .233 | -1.591 | 6.518 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.235 | 3.457 | .008\*\* | -16.029 | -2.441 |
| Religiosityc | -6.707 | 0.722 | .0001\*\* | -8.126 | -5.288 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cons | 75.371 | 5.536 | .0001 | 64.494 | 86.248 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.262 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<0.100; \*\*P<0.050; \*\*\*P<0.001

# Appendix W. Testing H2 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 78: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.897 | 1.904 | .129 | -0.845 | 6.638 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.781 | 0.673 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.103 | -1.458 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.148 | 1.680 | .002\*\* | 1.846 | 8.449 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.080 | 0.044 | .069† | -0.167 | 0.006 |
| Educationc | 0.184 | 0.481 | .701 | -0.760 | 1.129 |
| Incomec | -0.132 | 0.243 | .586 | -0.609 | 0.344 |
| Femalei | -7.042 | 1.122 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.248 | -4.837 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.629 | 1.333 | .637 | -3.248 | 1.990 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.930 | 2.329 | .092† | -8.507 | 0.648 |
| Religiosityc | -2.795 | 0.474 | .0001\*\*\*\* | -3.727 | -1.864 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.301 | 3.553 | .0001 | 27.320 | 41.281 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.182 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 79: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.676 | 1.523 | .657 | -2.317 | 3.668 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.743 | 0.560 | .002\*\* | -2.843 | -0.642 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.824 | 1.232 | .504 | -1.597 | 3.246 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.084 | 0.040 | .033\*\* | -0.162 | -0.007 |
| Educationc | -0.321 | 0.434 | .459 | -1.174 | 0.531 |
| Incomec | 0.073 | 0.202 | .717 | -0.324 | 0.471 |
| Femalei | -3.994 | 0.993 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.944 | -2.043 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.093 | 1.244 | .013\*\* | 0.648 | 5.537 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.305 | 1.832 | .004\*\* | -8.905 | -1.706 |
| Religiosityc | -3.912 | 0.418 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.733 | -3.090 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.071 | 3.230 | .0001 | 34.724 | 47.417 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.228 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix X. Testing H3 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 80: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.555 | 4.048 | .380 | -4.399 | 11.509 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -4.334 | 1.349 | .001\*\*\* | -6.985 | -1.684 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 6.444 | 2.861 | .025\*\* | 0.822 | 12.067 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -11.056 | 1.829 | .0001\*\*\* | -14.650 | -7.462 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.043 | 5.566 | .994 | -10.894 | 10.979 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female#Explicit | -0.366 | 1.987 | .854 | -4.271 | 3.539 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.837 | 4.694 | .859 | -10.061 | 8.387 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.164 | 0.067 | .015\*\* | -0.295 | -0.033 |
| Educationc | -0.128 | 0.740 | .862 | -1.583 | 1.326 |
| Incomec | -0.067 | 0.366 | .854 | -0.787 | 0.652 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.450 | 2.116 | .248 | -1.708 | 6.607 |
| Non-Heteroi | -9.316 | 3.486 | .008\*\* | -16.166 | -2.467 |
| Religiosityc | -6.714 | 0.724 | .0001\*\*\* | -8.137 | -5.290 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 75.365 | 5.569 | .0001 | 64.423 | 86.308 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.262 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 81: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.626 | 3.377 | .630 | -5.011 | 8.262 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -2.752 | 0.994 | .006\*\* | -4.704 | -0.799 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 6.031 | 2.538 | .018\*\* | 1.044 | 11.018 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -7.295 | 1.172 | .0001\*\*\* | -9.599 | -4.991 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.073 | 4.091 | .613 | -5.967 | 10.112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female#Explicit | -0.056 | 1.350 | .967 | -2.710 | 2.597 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.658 | 3.390 | .625 | -8.319 | 5.004 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.079 | 0.044 | .077† | -0.166 | 0.008 |
| Educationc | 0.211 | 0.481 | .661 | -0.734 | 1.157 |
| Incomec | -0.141 | 0.247 | .568 | -0.627 | 0.344 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.710 | 1.356 | .601 | -3.374 | 1.955 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.020 | 2.334 | .086† | -8.605 | 0.566 |
| Religiosityc | -2.803 | 0.476 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.738 | -1.868 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 34.292 | 3.570 | .0001 | 27.276 | 41.308 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.184 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 82: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.929 | 2.071 | .352 | -2.141 | 5.999 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -1.583 | 0.732 | .031\*\* | -3.021 | -0.144 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.413 | 1.350 | .760 | -2.239 | 3.065 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -3.761 | 1.059 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.841 | -1.681 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.030 | 2.913 | .486 | -7.755 | 3.694 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female#Explicit | -0.310 | 1.122 | .783 | -2.515 | 1.895 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.821 | 2.397 | .732 | -3.890 | 5.531 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.085 | 0.040 | .033\*\* | -0.163 | -0.007 |
| Educationc | -0.340 | 0.438 | .439 | -1.201 | 0.521 |
| Incomec | 0.074 | 0.205 | .719 | -0.329 | 0.477 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.159 | 1.267 | .013\*\* | 0.670 | 5.648 |
| Non-Heteroi | -5.296 | 1.860 | .005\*\* | -8.952 | -1.641 |
| Religiosityc | -3.911 | 0.419 | .0001\*\*\* | -4.734 | -3.088 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 41.073 | 3.261 | .0001 | 34.666 | 47.480 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.229 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix Y. Testing H4 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 83: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on political sexism

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.174 | 0.518 | .024\*\* | 0.157 | 2.192 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.464 | 0.153 | .003\*\* | -0.764 | -0.164 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.007 | 0.452 | .026\*\* | 0.119 | 1.894 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.037 | 0.011 | .001\*\*\* | -0.058 | -0.016 |
| Educationc | 0.207 | 0.119 | .084† | -0.028 | 0.441 |
| Incomec | -0.026 | 0.062 | .673 | -0.147 | 0.095 |
| Female | -1.407 | 0.269 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.936 | -0.878 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.225 | 0.351 | .523 | -0.915 | 0.466 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.710 | 0.495 | .152 | -1.683 | 0.262 |
| Religiosityc | -0.817 | 0.117 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.046 | -0.588 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 9.331 | 0.835 | .0001 | 7.691 | 10.971 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.176 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 84: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on sexism towards women as leaders.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.434 | 0.601 | .018\*\* | 0.252 | 2.616 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.557 | 0.182 | .002\*\* | -0.914 | -0.199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.382 | 0.494 | .005\*\* | 0.412 | 2.352 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.048 | 0.012 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.072 | -0.023 |
| Educationc | 0.153 | 0.132 | .249 | -0.107 | 0.413 |
| Incomec | 0.012 | 0.069 | .861 | -0.123 | 0.148 |
| Female | -1.772 | 0.301 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.363 | -1.180 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.275 | 0.389 | .479 | -1.039 | 0.489 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.143 | 0.484 | .019\*\* | -2.094 | -0.192 |
| Religiosityc | -0.869 | 0.132 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.129 | -0.610 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.792 | 0.951 | .0001 | 8.923 | 12.661 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.193 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 85: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and belief in the need for greater gender balance in government.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.414 | 0.325 | .203 | -0.224 | 1.051 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.140 | 0.129 | .278 | -0.393 | 0.113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.443 | 0.283 | .117 | -0.112 | 0.999 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.006 | 0.009 | .466 | -0.011 | 0.024 |
| Educationc | -0.059 | 0.097 | .542 | -0.249 | 0.131 |
| Incomec | 0.061 | 0.048 | .200 | -0.032 | 0.154 |
| Female | -0.935 | 0.197 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.322 | -0.548 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.527 | 0.245 | .032\*\* | -1.008 | -0.046 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.894 | 0.243 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.370 | -0.417 |
| Religiosityc | -0.151 | 0.086 | .081† | -0.321 | 0.019 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 5.090 | 0.660 | .0001 | 3.793 | 6.386 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.081 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 86: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and preference to vote for a male political candidate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.762 | 0.362 | .036\*\* | 0.052 | 1.473 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.168 | 0.137 | .221 | -0.102 | 0.438 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.317 | 0.283 | .263 | -0.239 | 0.873 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.003 | 0.008 | .712 | -0.020 | 0.013 |
| Educationc | -0.209 | 0.092 | .024\*\* | -0.390 | -0.028 |
| Incomec | 0.120 | 0.046 | .010\*\* | 0.029 | 0.211 |
| Female | -1.222 | 0.220 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.654 | -0.790 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.080 | 0.278 | .772 | -0.626 | 0.465 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.649 | 0.394 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.423 | -0.875 |
| Religiosityc | -0.123 | 0.095 | .197 | -0.311 | 0.064 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.287 | 0.682 | .0001 | 8.947 | 11.627 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.081 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix Z. Testing H5 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 87: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference for men in political leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.965 | 0.697 | .167 | -0.405 | 2.335 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.645 | 0.237 | .007\*\* | -1.111 | -0.180 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.473 | 0.554 | .008\*\* | 0.384 | 2.562 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.464 | 0.281 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.015 | -0.913 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.354 | 0.997 | .723 | -1.605 | 2.313 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.350 | 0.307 | .255 | -0.253 | 0.953 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.877 | 0.867 | .312 | -2.581 | 0.826 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.036 | 0.011 | .001\*\*\* | -0.057 | -0.016 |
| Educationc | 0.218 | 0.120 | .069† | -0.017 | 0.453 |
| Incomec | -0.023 | 0.062 | .712 | -0.146 | 0.100 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.271 | 0.357 | .449 | -0.972 | 0.431 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.712 | 0.506 | .160 | -1.707 | 0.283 |
| Religiosityc | -0.821 | 0.116 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.049 | -0.592 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 9.284 | 0.840 | .0001 | 7.633 | 10.936 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.179 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 88: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference for men in leadership in general.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.189 | 0.972 | .222 | -0.721 | 3.099 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.654 | 0.267 | .015\*\* | -1.179 | -0.129 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.508 | 0.713 | .035\*\* | 0.107 | 2.909 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.820 | 0.310 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.429 | -1.211 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.399 | 1.239 | .747 | -2.036 | 2.834 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.187 | 0.362 | .605 | -0.525 | 0.899 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.251 | 0.997 | .801 | -2.211 | 1.709 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.048 | 0.012 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.072 | -0.023 |
| Educationc | 0.157 | 0.133 | .237 | -0.104 | 0.419 |
| Incomec | 0.014 | 0.070 | .842 | -0.124 | 0.152 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.296 | 0.394 | .453 | -1.071 | 0.479 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.134 | 0.490 | .021\*\* | -2.097 | -0.172 |
| Religiosityc | -0.870 | 0.133 | .0001 | -1.130 | -0.609 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.780 | 0.958 | .0001 | 8.897 | 12.662 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.194 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 89: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on belief in the need for greater gender balance in government

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.158 | 0.465 | .735 | -1.071 | 0.756 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.020 | 0.196 | .918 | -0.405 | 0.365 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.041 | 0.406 | .919 | -0.756 | 0.838 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.014 | 0.208 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.424 | -0.605 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.903 | 0.630 | .152 | -0.335 | 2.140 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.230 | 0.263 | .382 | -0.746 | 0.286 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.719 | 0.561 | .200 | -0.383 | 1.821 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.006 | 0.009 | .470 | -0.011 | 0.023 |
| Educationc | -0.063 | 0.097 | .515 | -0.253 | 0.127 |
| Incomec | 0.057 | 0.049 | .240 | -0.038 | 0.153 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.509 | 0.249 | .042\*\* | -0.998 | -0.019 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.889 | 0.242 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.364 | -0.414 |
| Religiosityc | -0.146 | 0.086 | .091† | -0.316 | 0.023 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 5.153 | 0.660 | .0001 | 3.856 | 6.450 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.088 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 90: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on preference to vote for a male political candidate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.622 | 0.571 | .277 | -0.500 | 1.745 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.307 | 0.193 | .113 | -0.073 | 0.686 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.009 | 0.375 | .981 | -0.728 | 0.746 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -1.232 | 0.233 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.689 | -0.774 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.213 | 0.732 | .771 | -1.226 | 1.651 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.267 | 0.277 | .336 | -0.812 | 0.278 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.569 | 0.571 | .319 | -0.552 | 1.691 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.003 | 0.008 | .706 | -0.020 | 0.013 |
| Educationc | -0.214 | 0.092 | .021\*\* | -0.396 | -0.032 |
| Incomec | 0.117 | 0.048 | .015\*\* | 0.023 | 0.210 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.056 | 0.283 | .845 | -0.612 | 0.501 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.654 | 0.393 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.427 | -0.881 |
| Religiosityc | -0.121 | 0.096 | .209 | -0.309 | 0.068 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 10.330 | 0.686 | .0001 | 8.983 | 11.678 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.128 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AA. Testing H6 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 91: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on support for President Donald Trump’s leadership.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.724 | 0.503 | .151 | -0.265 | 1.713 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.070 | 0.166 | .673 | -0.397 | 0.257 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.970 | 0.413 | .019\*\* | 0.158 | 1.781 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.019 | 0.013 | .122 | -0.044 | 0.005 |
| Educationc | 0.036 | 0.127 | .776 | -0.213 | 0.285 |
| Incomec | -0.004 | 0.063 | .950 | -0.128 | 0.120 |
| Female | -0.442 | 0.298 | .139 | -1.028 | 0.143 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.013 | 0.363 | .005\*\* | -1.727 | -0.300 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.837 | 0.479 | .081† | -1.778 | 0.104 |
| Religiosityc | -1.118 | 0.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.361 | -0.875 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 7.658 | 0.900 | .0001 | 5.889 | 9.426 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.174 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 92: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and disagreement with the first impeachment of President Donald Trump.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.052 | 0.185 | .781 | -0.312 | 0.416 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.035 | 0.060 | .561 | -0.084 | 0.154 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.308 | 0.145 | .034\*\* | 0.024 | 0.592 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.001 | 0.005 | .878 | -0.009 | 0.010 |
| Educationc | -0.056 | 0.047 | .237 | -0.149 | 0.037 |
| Incomec | 0.034 | 0.024 | .155 | -0.013 | 0.080 |
| Female | -0.183 | 0.111 | .099† | -0.400 | 0.035 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.387 | 0.132 | .004\*\* | -0.646 | -0.127 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.607 | 0.147 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.896 | -0.317 |
| Religiosityc | -0.253 | 0.047 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.346 | -0.161 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 3.234 | 0.355 | .0001\*\*\* | 2.536 | 3.931 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.118 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 93: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on probability of identifying with the Republican Party.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.364 | 0.328 | .268 | -0.280 | 1.007 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.064 | 0.115 | .578 | -0.290 | 0.162 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.722 | 0.320 | .024\*\* | 0.094 | 1.349 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.001 | 0.008 | .899 | -0.015 | 0.017 |
| Educationc | -0.010 | 0.088 | .910 | -0.183 | 0.163 |
| Incomec | 0.144 | 0.043 | .001\*\*\* | 0.060 | 0.227 |
| Female | -0.145 | 0.205 | .479 | -0.546 | 0.257 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.879 | 0.283 | .002\*\* | -1.434 | -0.325 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.098 | 0.380 | .797 | -0.843 | 0.647 |
| Religiosityc | -0.598 | 0.089 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.773 | -0.423 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.522 | 0.635 | .412 | -0.723 | 1.766 |
| P-Chi(2) |  |  |  |  | 0.111 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 94: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on probability of voting Republican in the 2020 election.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.319 | 0.341 | .348 | -0.348 | 0.987 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.040 | 0.110 | .717 | -0.176 | 0.256 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.552 | 0.317 | .082† | -0.070 | 1.173 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.006 | 0.008 | .490 | -0.023 | 0.011 |
| Educationc | 0.014 | 0.088 | .874 | -0.159 | 0.187 |
| Incomec | 0.050 | 0.042 | .232 | -0.032 | 0.132 |
| Female | -0.260 | 0.205 | .204 | -0.662 | 0.141 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.672 | 0.279 | .016\*\* | -1.219 | -0.125 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.559 | 0.414 | .176 | -1.370 | 0.252 |
| Religiosityc | -0.513 | 0.088 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.685 | -0.340 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.840 | 0.651 | .197 | -0.435 | 2.115 |
| P-Chi(2) |  |  |  |  | 0.080 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AB. Testing H7 - Main Study, Asymmetric IAT Coding (-2.00/+0.075 : +0.07501/+2.00)

Table 95: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on approval of President Donald Trump’s leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.167 | 0.909 | .854 | -1.618 | 1.953 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.181 | 0.219 | .407 | -0.611 | 0.248 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.817 | 0.682 | .231 | -0.523 | 2.157 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.532 | 0.311 | .087† | -1.143 | 0.078 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.891 | 1.069 | .405 | -1.210 | 2.992 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.216 | 0.332 | .516 | -0.437 | 0.869 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.239 | 0.857 | .780 | -1.445 | 1.923 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.020 | 0.013 | .117 | -0.044 | 0.005 |
| Educationc | 0.038 | 0.127 | .767 | -0.212 | 0.288 |
| Incomec | -0.001 | 0.064 | .987 | -0.127 | 0.125 |
| Non-Whitei | -1.026 | 0.366 | .005\*\* | -1.746 | -0.306 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.804 | 0.485 | .098† | -1.757 | 0.150 |
| Religiosityc | -1.114 | 0.124 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.358 | -0.870 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 7.674 | 0.903 | .0001 | 5.899 | 9.449 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.177 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 96: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on approval of majority House Leader Nancy Pelosi’s leadership

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.328 | 0.739 | .658 | -1.124 | 1.779 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.254 | 0.241 | .292 | -0.728 | 0.220 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.305 | 0.668 | .648 | -1.007 | 1.617 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.249 | 0.305 | .414 | -0.350 | 0.848 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.879 | 0.881 | .319 | -2.610 | 0.853 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.444 | 0.338 | .190 | -0.221 | 1.108 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.114 | 0.825 | .177 | -2.734 | 0.506 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.011 | 0.013 | .376 | -0.037 | 0.014 |
| Educationc | 0.295 | 0.118 | .013\*\* | 0.064 | 0.526 |
| Incomec | -0.107 | 0.066 | .108 | -0.237 | 0.024 |
| Non-Whitei | 0.971 | 0.353 | .006\*\* | 0.277 | 1.665 |
| Non-Heteroi | 1.553 | 0.489 | .002\*\* | 0.592 | 2.514 |
| Religiosityc | 0.279 | 0.122 | .022\*\* | 0.040 | 0.519 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 2.593 | 0.902 | .004 | 0.820 | 4.366 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.081 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 97: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on disagreement with the impeachment of President Donald Trump.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.196 | 0.329 | .551 | -0.844 | 0.451 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.054 | 0.088 | .538 | -0.119 | 0.227 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.131 | 0.218 | .548 | -0.297 | 0.559 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.217 | 0.116 | .062† | -0.445 | 0.011 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.392 | 0.388 | .313 | -0.370 | 1.155 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -0.036 | 0.120 | .762 | -0.272 | 0.199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.313 | 0.287 | .276 | -0.251 | 0.877 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.001 | 0.005 | .894 | -0.009 | 0.010 |
| Educationc | -0.058 | 0.047 | .225 | -0.151 | 0.036 |
| Incomec | 0.033 | 0.024 | .166 | -0.014 | 0.080 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.381 | 0.133 | .004\*\* | -0.642 | -0.120 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.597 | 0.148 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.888 | -0.307 |
| Religiosityc | -0.251 | 0.047 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.343 | -0.159 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 3.257 | 0.354 | .0001 | 2.562 | 3.952 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.122 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 98: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on the probability of identifying as a Republican Party supporter.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.062 | 0.533 | .908 | -0.983 | 1.107 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.115 | 0.154 | .455 | -0.417 | 0.187 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.292 | 0.403 | .469 | -0.498 | 1.081 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.186 | 0.215 | .387 | -0.607 | 0.235 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.407 | 0.703 | .562 | -0.971 | 1.785 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.100 | 0.232 | .664 | -0.353 | 0.554 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.856 | 0.684 | .211 | -0.484 | 2.196 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.000 | 0.008 | .964 | -0.016 | 0.017 |
| Educationc | -0.012 | 0.089 | .896 | -0.187 | 0.163 |
| Incomec | 0.146 | 0.043 | .001\*\*\* | 0.061 | 0.230 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.878 | 0.286 | .002\*\* | -1.439 | -0.317 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.057 | 0.385 | .882 | -0.812 | 0.698 |
| Religiosityc | -0.598 | 0.090 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.774 | -0.422 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.564 | 0.637 | .376 | -0.684 | 1.813 |
| Ps.R2 |  |  |  |  | 0.116 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 99: Logistic Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on the probability of planning to vote for the Republican Party in the 2020 presidential election.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|z| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.333 | 0.534 | .533 | -0.713 | 1.378 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | -0.027 | 0.149 | .857 | -0.319 | 0.266 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.139 | 0.391 | .723 | -0.628 | 0.905 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | -0.251 | 0.214 | .240 | -0.670 | 0.168 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.203 | 0.762 | .790 | -1.696 | 1.291 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | 0.135 | 0.219 | .539 | -0.295 | 0.565 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.996 | 0.782 | .202 | -0.536 | 2.528 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.007 | 0.008 | .437 | -0.023 | 0.010 |
| Educationc | 0.012 | 0.089 | .891 | -0.162 | 0.186 |
| Incomec | 0.053 | 0.042 | .204 | -0.029 | 0.136 |
| Non-Whitei | -0.664 | 0.280 | .018\*\* | -1.214 | -0.115 |
| Non-Heteroi | -0.518 | 0.418 | .215 | -1.338 | 0.302 |
| Religiosityc | -0.515 | 0.089 | .0001\*\*\* | -0.689 | -0.340 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 0.859 | 0.650 | .187 | -0.416 | 2.134 |
| Ps.R2 |  |  |  |  | 0.086 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AC. Testing H1 - Pilot Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00:0.00 / +0.001/+2.00)

Table 100: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.773 | 2.496 | .267 | -7.681 | 2.135 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 1.183 | 1.048 | .260 | -0.878 | 3.244 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.172 | 2.435 | .034\*\* | 0.385 | 9.959 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.076 | 0.069 | .270 | -0.211 | 0.059 |
| Educationc | -3.879 | 0.727 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.308 | -2.450 |
| Incomec | 0.903 | 0.443 | .042\*\* | 0.031 | 1.774 |
| Womeni | -4.763 | 1.781 | .008\*\* | -8.265 | -1.261 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.975 | 2.076 | .056† | -0.106 | 8.056 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.343 | 3.300 | .189 | -10.831 | 2.144 |
| Religiosityc | -2.508 | 0.595 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.677 | -1.339 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cons | 84.718 | 6.303 | .0001 | 72.326 | 97.111 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.126 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AD. Testing H2 - Pilot Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00:0.00 / +0.001/+2.00)

Table 101: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.932 | 1.433 | .178 | -4.750 | 0.886 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.346 | 0.615 | .574 | -0.862 | 1.554 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.300 | 1.295 | .011\*\* | 0.753 | 5.847 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.055 | 0.038 | .149 | -0.130 | 0.020 |
| Educationc | -2.443 | 0.440 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.308 | -1.579 |
| Incomec | 0.444 | 0.255 | .082† | -0.057 | 0.946 |
| Womeni | -2.591 | 1.037 | .013\*\* | -4.630 | -0.551 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.230 | 1.216 | .312 | -1.161 | 3.620 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.101 | 1.903 | .104 | -6.842 | 0.640 |
| Religiosityc | -1.390 | 0.343 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.065 | -0.715 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 46.367 | 3.597 | .0001 | 39.295 | 53.438 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.152 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 102: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.841 | 1.509 | .578 | -3.808 | 2.126 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.837 | 0.499 | .094† | -0.144 | 1.819 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.872 | 1.452 | .198 | -0.982 | 4.726 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.021 | 0.035 | .546 | -0.090 | 0.048 |
| Educationc | -1.436 | 0.354 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.132 | -0.740 |
| Incomec | 0.458 | 0.217 | .036\*\* | 0.031 | 0.885 |
| Womeni | -2.172 | 0.878 | .014\*\* | -3.898 | -0.447 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.746 | 1.058 | .010\*\* | 0.665 | 4.826 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.242 | 1.575 | .431 | -4.339 | 1.855 |
| Religiosityc | -1.118 | 0.301 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.709 | -0.526 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 38.352 | 3.203 | .0001 | 32.054 | 44.649 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.134 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AE. Testing H3 - Pilot Study, Symmetric IAT Coding (-2.00:0.00 / +0.001/+2.00)

Table 103: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.960 | 2.799 | .291 | -2.544 | 8.463 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.967 | 1.565 | .537 | -2.109 | 4.043 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.617 | 3.128 | .844 | -6.767 | 5.532 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -3.787 | 1.884 | .045\*\* | -7.490 | -0.084 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -10.158 | 5.544 | .068† | -21.057 | 0.742 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | 0.370 | 2.100 | .860 | -3.759 | 4.500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 8.154 | 4.529 | .073† | -0.750 | 17.059 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.085 | 0.069 | .222 | -0.221 | 0.051 |
| Educationc | -3.778 | 0.732 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.217 | -2.338 |
| Incomec | 0.923 | 0.445 | .039\*\* | 0.049 | 1.798 |
| Non-Whitei | 4.607 | 2.100 | .029\*\* | 0.479 | 8.735 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.668 | 3.320 | .161 | -11.194 | 1.859 |
| Religiosityc | -2.465 | 0.603 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.650 | -1.281 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 83.567 | 6.377 | .0001 | 71.029 | 96.105 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.171 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 104: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.889 | 1.800 | .622 | -2.650 | 4.429 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.378 | 0.970 | .697 | -1.529 | 2.284 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.427 | 1.898 | .822 | -3.305 | 4.159 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -2.104 | 1.105 | .058† | -4.277 | 0.070 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -5.107 | 2.924 | .081† | -10.856 | 0.642 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | -0.050 | 1.252 | .968 | -2.512 | 2.412 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.004 | 2.488 | .108 | -0.888 | 8.896 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.059 | 0.038 | .124 | -0.134 | 0.016 |
| Educationc | -2.390 | 0.443 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.262 | -1.519 |
| Incomec | 0.451 | 0.256 | .079† | -0.053 | 0.954 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.538 | 1.237 | .215 | -0.895 | 3.970 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.261 | 1.921 | .090† | -7.038 | 0.516 |
| Religiosityc | -1.371 | 0.347 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.054 | -0.688 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 45.786 | 3.643 | .0001 | 38.624 | 52.947 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.160 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 105: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.070 | 1.595 | .195 | -1.065 | 5.206 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.589 | 0.705 | .403 | -0.796 | 1.975 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.045 | 1.972 | .596 | -4.921 | 2.831 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -1.683 | 0.919 | .068† | -3.490 | 0.123 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -5.051 | 3.123 | .107 | -11.191 | 1.089 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | 0.420 | 0.975 | .667 | -1.496 | 2.337 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.150 | 2.628 | .115 | -1.017 | 9.317 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.026 | 0.035 | .462 | -0.095 | 0.043 |
| Educationc | -1.388 | 0.357 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.090 | -0.685 |
| Incomec | 0.472 | 0.218 | .031\*\* | 0.043 | 0.902 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.070 | 1.069 | .004\*\* | 0.968 | 5.172 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.406 | 1.576 | .373 | -4.506 | 1.693 |
| Religiosityc | -1.094 | 0.304 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.691 | -0.497 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 37.781 | 3.253 | .0001 | 31.385 | 44.178 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.148 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AF. Testing H1 - Pilot Study, Asymmetric Coding Model (-2.00:+0.075 / +0.07501:+2.00)

Table 106: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.707 | 2.301 | .759 | -5.231 | 3.817 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.994 | 1.047 | .343 | -1.065 | 3.053 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.480 | 2.572 | .034\*\* | 0.423 | 10.536 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.075 | 0.068 | .271 | -0.210 | 0.059 |
| Educationc | -3.904 | 0.732 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.342 | -2.466 |
| Incomec | 0.904 | 0.441 | .041\*\* | 0.037 | 1.770 |
| Womeni | -4.453 | 1.762 | .012\*\* | -7.917 | -0.989 |
| Non-Whitei | 4.457 | 2.053 | .030\*\* | 0.422 | 8.492 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.458 | 3.286 | .176 | -10.918 | 2.001 |
| Religiosityc | -2.378 | 0.598 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.555 | -1.202 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 83.813 | 6.275 | .0001 | 71.476 | 96.149 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.159 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AG. Testing H2 - Pilot Study, Asymmetric Coding Model (-2.00:+0.075 / +0.07501:+2.00)

Table 107: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.228 | 1.377 | .869 | -2.936 | 2.480 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.253 | 0.612 | .679 | -0.950 | 1.456 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.365 | 1.493 | .025\*\* | 0.430 | 6.299 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.054 | 0.038 | .153 | -0.128 | 0.020 |
| Educationc | -2.463 | 0.442 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.333 | -1.593 |
| Incomec | 0.447 | 0.253 | .078† | -0.050 | 0.943 |
| Womeni | -2.384 | 1.029 | .021\*\* | -4.407 | -0.360 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.513 | 1.199 | .208 | -0.844 | 3.869 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.148 | 1.894 | .097† | -6.871 | 0.576 |
| Religiosityc | -1.300 | 0.347 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.982 | -0.617 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 45.699 | 3.593 | .0001 | 38.636 | 52.762 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.151 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 108: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.479 | 1.262 | .704 | -2.961 | 2.002 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.741 | 0.504 | .142 | -0.249 | 1.732 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 2.115 | 1.317 | .109 | -0.475 | 4.705 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.021 | 0.035 | .538 | -0.090 | 0.047 |
| Educationc | -1.441 | 0.354 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.137 | -0.746 |
| Incomec | 0.457 | 0.217 | .036\*\* | 0.030 | 0.884 |
| Womeni | -2.070 | 0.870 | .018\*\* | -3.780 | -0.359 |
| Non-Whitei | 2.944 | 1.056 | .006\*\* | 0.868 | 5.020 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.311 | 1.569 | .404 | -4.395 | 1.774 |
| Religiosityc | -1.078 | 0.302 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.673 | -0.484 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 38.114 | 3.181 | .0001 | 31.859 | 44.369 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.136 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AH. Testing H3 - Pilot Study, Asymmetric Coding Model (-2.00:+0.075 / +0.07501:+2.00)

Table 109: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile and benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 3.460 | 2.634 | .190 | -1.720 | 8.639 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 1.075 | 1.569 | .494 | -2.010 | 4.160 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.410 | 3.013 | .640 | -7.335 | 4.514 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -3.616 | 1.914 | .060† | -7.379 | 0.147 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -5.329 | 4.519 | .239 | -14.214 | 3.556 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | -0.149 | 2.094 | .943 | -4.265 | 3.967 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 10.235 | 4.559 | .025\*\* | 1.272 | 19.198 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.087 | 0.069 | .209 | -0.222 | 0.049 |
| Educationc | -3.790 | 0.749 | .0001\*\*\* | -5.262 | -2.318 |
| Incomec | 0.931 | 0.442 | .036\*\* | 0.061 | 1.801 |
| Non-Whitei | 5.273 | 2.021 | .009\*\* | 1.299 | 9.246 |
| Non-Heteroi | -4.887 | 3.305 | .140 | -11.385 | 1.611 |
| Religiosityc | -2.228 | 0.604 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.415 | -1.041 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 82.201 | 6.396 | .0001 | 69.626 | 94.777 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.171 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 110: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on hostile sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.499 | 1.628 | .358 | -1.702 | 4.701 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.411 | 0.974 | .673 | -1.504 | 2.327 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.113 | 1.835 | .951 | -3.495 | 3.721 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -2.037 | 1.119 | .070† | -4.237 | 0.163 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.048 | 2.702 | .449 | -7.361 | 3.265 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | -0.279 | 1.244 | .823 | -2.723 | 2.166 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 4.942 | 2.748 | 0.073† | -0.460 | 10.344 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.059 | 0.038 | .123 | -0.133 | 0.016 |
| Educationc | -2.413 | 0.452 | .0001\*\*\* | -3.302 | -1.524 |
| Incomec | 0.459 | 0.254 | .071† | -0.040 | 0.957 |
| Non-Whitei | 1.900 | 1.191 | .112 | -0.442 | 4.241 |
| Non-Heteroi | -3.339 | 1.908 | .081† | -7.091 | 0.412 |
| Religiosityc | -1.229 | 0.350 | .0001\*\*\* | -1.917 | -0.541 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 44.966 | 3.669 | .0001 | 37.753 | 52.179 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.158 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

Table 111: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on benevolent sexism.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.960 | 1.444 | .175 | -0.878 | 4.799 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.664 | 0.706 | .348 | -0.725 | 2.053 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.524 | 1.858 | .413 | -5.177 | 2.130 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni | -1.579 | 0.936 | .092† | -3.419 | 0.261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Womeni#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -3.281 | 2.393 | .171 | -7.987 | 1.425 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Women#Explicit | 0.130 | 0.982 | .895 | -1.801 | 2.061 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Women#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 5.293 | 2.423 | .030\*\* | 0.529 | 10.057 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | -0.028 | 0.035 | .425 | -0.096 | 0.041 |
| Educationc | -1.377 | 0.361 | .0001\*\*\* | -2.087 | -0.667 |
| Incomec | 0.472 | 0.219 | .032\*\* | 0.041 | 0.903 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.373 | 1.050 | .001\*\* | 1.309 | 5.437 |
| Non-Heteroi | -1.547 | 1.573 | .326 | -4.640 | 1.545 |
| Religiosityc | -0.999 | 0.304 | .001\*\* | -1.598 | -0.400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 37.235 | 3.251 | .0001\*\*\* | 30.843 | 43.628 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.151 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001

# Appendix AI. Exploratory Analyses: Attitudes towards Immigration

We administered 6 questions measuring participants attitudes towards immigrants. The questions are modified versions of questions from the European Social Values Survey, which ask participants to indicate whether immigrants have positively, or negative contributed across six social domains. These questions are presented below.

Below we will ask you as series of questions about individuals who move to the US from other countries. Please indicate your response using the scale provided.

1. Job: Would you say that people who come to live in the US generally take jobs away from workers in the US, or generally help to create new jobs? (Label: 0-Take away, 10-Create)
2. Tax: Most people who come to live in the US work and pay taxes. They also use health and social services. On balance, do you think people who come here take out more than they put in or put in more than they take out? (Label: 0-Take away, 10-Put in)
3. Bad: Would you say it is generally bad or good for the US's economy that people come to live here from other countries? (Label: 0-Bad, 10-Good)
4. Enrich: Would you say that the US's cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries? (Label: 0-Undermined, 10-Enriched)
5. Worse: Is the US made a worse or a better place to live by people coming to live here from other countries? (Label: 0-Worse, 10-Better)
6. Crime: Are the US's crime problems made worse or better by people coming to live here from other countries? (Label: 0-Worse, 10-Better)

To construct our scale, we administered an exploratory factor analysis within an oblimin (oblique) rotation to all six items. Following best practices for an EFA we retained all items with factor loadings above 0.7. Using this method we retain five of the six items, with the item on crime being omitted from our scale. We collapse these 5 questions into a single composite measure which runs from 0-50, mean (31.42) std (11.27), coefficient alpha (α 0.978).

Table 112: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on negative attitudes towards immigrants. Symmetric Coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.109 | 1.855 | .953 | -3.537 | 3.755 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.360 | 0.593 | .544 | -0.806 | 1.526 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.267 | 1.313 | .085† | -4.847 | 0.314 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.007 | 0.043 | .880 | -0.079 | 0.092 |
| Educationc | 1.015 | 0.429 | .018\*\* | 0.171 | 1.858 |
| Incomec | -0.276 | 0.219 | .208 | -0.707 | 0.154 |
| Femalei | 0.348 | 1.034 | .737 | -1.683 | 2.379 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.992 | 1.185 | .001\*\*\* | 1.664 | 6.320 |
| Non-Heteroi | 4.364 | 1.630 | .008\*\* | 1.161 | 7.567 |
| Religiosityc | 1.375 | 0.443 | .002\*\* | 0.505 | 2.245 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 21.982 | 3.127 | .0001 | 15.838 | 28.127 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.073 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001
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Table 113: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on negative attitude towards immigrants. Symmetric Coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 1.036 | 3.131 | .741 | -5.116 | 7.188 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 1.207 | 0.795 | .130 | -0.356 | 2.770 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.974 | 1.377 | .152 | -4.680 | 0.731 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.464 | 1.068 | .664 | -1.633 | 2.562 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -1.628 | 3.867 | .674 | -9.227 | 5.970 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -1.610 | 1.178 | .173 | -3.925 | 0.706 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.732 | 2.610 | .779 | -5.860 | 4.396 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.008 | 0.043 | .847 | -0.076 | 0.093 |
| Educationc | 1.022 | 0.433 | .019\*\* | 0.172 | 1.872 |
| Incomec | -0.306 | 0.221 | .167 | -0.740 | 0.128 |
| Non-Whitei | 4.046 | 1.186 | .001\*\*\* | 1.716 | 6.376 |
| Non-Heteroi | 4.131 | 1.611 | .011\*\*\* | 0.966 | 7.296 |
| Religiosityc | 1.361 | 0.442 | .002\*\* | 0.491 | 2.230 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 22.018 | 3.141 | .0001 | 15.846 | 28.191 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.079 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001
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Table 115: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The interaction effect between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem on negative attitudes towards immigrants. Asymmetric Coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.082 | 1.742 | .232 | -5.505 | 1.340 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 0.488 | 0.600 | .417 | -0.692 | 1.668 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -2.836 | 1.398 | .043\*\* | -5.584 | -0.088 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.014 | 0.043 | .738 | -0.070 | 0.099 |
| Educationc | 1.004 | 0.425 | .019\*\* | 0.169 | 1.839 |
| Incomec | -0.301 | 0.220 | .171 | -0.733 | 0.131 |
| Femalei | 0.504 | 1.032 | .626 | -1.524 | 2.531 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.960 | 1.186 | .001\*\*\* | 1.628 | 6.291 |
| Non-Heteroi | 4.449 | 1.638 | .007\*\* | 1.230 | 7.668 |
| Religiosityc | 1.388 | 0.443 | .002\*\* | 0.517 | 2.258 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 21.961 | 3.136 | .0001 | 15.800 | 28.123 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.079 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001
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Table 116: Linear Regression with Robust Confidence Internals: The effect of a three-way interaction between implicit self-esteem and explicit self-esteem and gender on affective competition. Asymmetric Coding of Implicit self-esteem.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coef. | Std. Rob | P>|t| | [95% | Conf. Inter] |
| Implicit Esti |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | 0.275 | 2.720 | .919 | -5.069 | 5.620 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explicitc | 1.050 | 0.804 | .192 | -0.530 | 2.629 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implict#Explicitc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -0.654 | 1.745 | .708 | -4.083 | 2.775 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Femalei | 0.823 | 1.077 | .445 | -1.293 | 2.939 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -3.721 | 3.428 | .278 | -10.457 | 3.014 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female#Explicit | -1.092 | 1.199 | .363 | -3.447 | 1.263 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implicit#Female#Explicit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low/Negative | -3.793 | 2.647 | .152 | -8.994 | 1.408 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agec | 0.018 | 0.043 | .684 | -0.067 | 0.102 |
| Educationc | 1.026 | 0.427 | .017\*\* | 0.186 | 1.866 |
| Incomec | -0.324 | 0.222 | .146 | -0.761 | 0.113 |
| Non-Whitei | 3.930 | 1.195 | .001\*\*\* | 1.583 | 6.278 |
| Non-Heteroi | 4.158 | 1.614 | .010\*\* | 0.986 | 7.330 |
| Religiosityc | 1.353 | 0.443 | .002\*\* | 0.484 | 2.223 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cons | 21.804 | 3.125 | .0001 | 15.664 | 27.944 |
| R |  |  |  |  | 0.089 |
| N |  |  |  |  | 487 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implicit Esteem is coded as a two-tier categorical measure High/Positive; Low/negative esteem. High esteem is coded as the reference. Standardized Explicit self-esteem is measured using the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. †P<.100; \*\*P<.050; \*\*\*P<.001
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