**Supplemental Details and Analyses for Main Studies**

**Participant Demographics**

Participant demographics from all studies are presented in Table S1.

**Supplemental Analyses: Role of Target Gender**

 To investigate whether target gender would moderate the effect of target SES on event ratings, we examined the interaction between target SES and gender in each study. As shown in Table S2, in no study did target gender moderate the effect of target SES. Thus, the thick skin bias generalizes across perceptions of both men and women.

**Supplemental Analyses: Participant SES and Self-Ratings of Events**

Across studies, participants completed measures of their own SES, including their personal income, household income, subjective social status (Adler et al., 2000), and education. For household income, we followed the OECD (2008) equivalence transformation by coding household income as the midpoint of the income bin and dividing it by the square root of the household size, after which we log-transformed this value. We also log-transformed personal income. Education was coded as “working class” if the participant did not have a B.A., and “middle class” if the participant did have a B.A. (Snibbe & Markus, 2005).

Contrary to what would be expected if the thick skin bias reflected a true phenomenon, participant SES was not positively correlated with ratings of how harmful the negative events would be for the self. Instead, participant SES rarely correlated with self-ratings, and when it did, the correlation was negative (see Table S3). The most reliable negative correlated emerged in the nationally representative sample (Study 14), which had the largest SES range.

**Supplemental Analyses: Participant SES and the Thick Skin Bias**

 Participant SES did not reliably moderate the effect of target SES across studies; thus, both lower-SES and higher-SES participants displayed the thick skin bias (see Table S4).

**Supplemental Analyses: Perceptions of Others in Relation to the Self**

 **Study 1a.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be less negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.62, *SD* = 1.31), *t*(105) = -4.23, *p* < .001, *d* = -.41, 95% CI [-.68, -.14], whereas they thought that the high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.51, *SD* = 1.17), *t*(107) = 11.09, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.07, 95% CI [.78, 1.35]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 212) = 94.23, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .31, 90% CI [.22, .38].

 **Study 1b.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be less negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.99, *SD* = 1.24), *t*(108) = -6.40, *p* < .001, *d* = -.61, 95% CI [-.88, -.34], whereas they thought the high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.94, *SD* = 1.14), *t*(99) = 7.10, *p* < .001, *d* = .71, 95% CI [.42, 1.00]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 207) = 86.47, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .29, 90% CI [.21, .37].

**Study 1c.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be less negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 7.06, *SD* = 1.25), *t*(105) = -7.70, *p* < .001, *d* = -.75, 95% CI [-1.03, -.47], whereas they thought that they high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.84, *SD* = 1.25), *t*(103) = 10.21, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.00, 95% CI [.71, 1.29]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 208) = 149.46, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .42, 90% CI [.34, .49].

**Study 1d.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be less negatively affected than they would be (M = 6.83, SD = 1.12), *t*(107) = -5.04, *p* < .001, *d* = -.48, 95% CI [.-76, -.21], whereas they thought that they high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.82, *SD* = 1.04), *t*(113) = 8.16, *p* < .001, *d* = .76, 95% CI [.50, 1.03]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 220) = 86.35, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .28, 90% CI [.20, .36].

 **Study 2.** Participants thought that they would be less affected by the negative events (*M* = 6.92, *SD* = 1.34) than the low-SES target, *t*(109) = -6.04, *p* < .001, *d* = -.58, 95% CI [-.85, -.31], whereas they thought they would be more affected by the events (*M* = 7.11, *SD* = 1.16) than the high-SES target, *t*(110) = 5.38, *p* < .001, *d* =.51, 95% CI [.24, .78]. Participants thought they would affected by the negative events to the same degree (*M* = 6.92, *SD* = 1.25) as the neutral target, *t*(114) = .62, *p* = .534, *d* = .06, 95% CI [-.20, .32]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 333) = 42.90, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .20, 90% CI [.07, .17].

 **Study 3.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be marginally more positively affected by the events than they would be (*M* = 7.99, *SD* = .94), *t*(97) = 1.84, *p* = .069, *d* = .19, 95% CI [-.09, .47], whereas they thought that the high-SES target would be less positively affected by the events than they would (*M* = 7.94, *SD* = 1.15), *t*(96) = -4.87, *p* < .001, *d* = -.49, 95% CI [-.78, -.21]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 193) = 24.18, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .11, 90% CI [.05, .18].

 **Study 4.** For the equally unexpected events, participants thought that the negative events would be as harmful for themselves (*M* = 6.79, *SD* = 1.16) as for the low-SES target, *t*(143) = -1.39, *p* = .168, *d* = -.12, 95% CI [-.35, .12], whereas they thought that the high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.42, *SD* = 1.10), *t*(141) = 13.31, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.17, 95% CI [.87, 1.37]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 284) = 100.97, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .26, 90% CI [.19, .33]. For the differentially expected events, participants thought that the low-SES target would be less negatively affected by the events than they would be (*M* = 7.43, *SD* = 1.25), *t*(143) = -3.76, *p* < .001, *d* = -.31, 95% CI [-.55, -.08], whereas they thought that the high-SES target would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 7.01, *SD* = 1.39), *t*(141) = 12.03, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.01, 95% CI [.76, 1.26]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was again significant, *F*(1, 284) = 123.37, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .30, 90% CI [.23, .37].

 **Study 5a.** There was a three-way interaction between past SES, present SES, and participants’ ratings of the effect of the events for themselves and the target, *F*(1, 200) = 9.96, *p* = .002, *ηp2* = .05, 90% CI [.01, .10]. The only target for whom participants thought the negative events would be worse than for themselves (*Mself*= 6.68, *SDself*= 1.25) was the target who was high-SES in both the past and present, *t*(51) = 3.60, *p* = .001, *d* = .50, 95% CI [.11, .89]. Participants thought the events would be worse for themselves when they rated the target who was previously high-SES but was now low-SES (*Mself* = 6.98, *SDself* = .96), *t*(52) = -4.84, *p* < .001, *d* = -.67, 95% CI [-1.06, -.27], the target who was previously low-SES but was now high-SES (*Mself* = 6.87, *SDself*= .97), *t*(46) = -6.43, *p* < .001, *d* = -.94, 95% CI [-1.36, -.51], and the target who was low-SES in both the past and the present (*Mself*= 6.81, *SDself* = 1.22), *t*(51) = -9.21, *p* < .001, *d* = -1.28, 95% CI [-1.70, -.86]. This latter difference was also the largest self-other difference.

 **Study 5b.** There was a three-way interaction between past SES, present SES, and participants’ ratings of the effect of the events for themselves and the target, *F*(1, 219) = 57.89, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .21, 90% CI [.13, .28]. The only target for whom participants thought the negative events would be worse than for themselves (*Mself*= 6.89, *SDself*= 1.21) was the target who was high-SES in both the past and present, *t*(58) = 6.78, *p* < .001, *d* = .88, 95% CI [.51, 1.26]. Participants thought the events would be worse for themselves when they rated the target who was previously high-SES but was now low-SES (*Mself* = 6.76, *SDself* = 1.00), *t*(57) = -9.76, *p* < .001, *d* = -1.28, 95% C( [-1.68, .88], the target who was previously low-SES but was now high-SES (*Mself* = 4.49, *SDself*= 1.43), *t*(52) = -6.33, *p* < .001, *d* = -.87, 95% CI [-1.27, -.47], and the target who was low-SES in both the past and the present (*Mself*= 6.83, *SDself* = 1.17), *t*(52) = -6.83, *p* < .001, *d* = -.94, 95% CI [-1.34, -.54].

 **Study 6.** Despite the fact that they were adults rating the effect of the negative events on a child, participants thought that the low-SES child would be less affected than they would be (*M* = 6.63, *SD* = 1.21), *t*(171) = -8.38, *p* < .001, *d* = -.64, 95% CI [-.86, -.42], whereas they thought that the high-SES child would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.67, *SD* = 1.23), *t*(183) = 7.87, *p* < .001, *d* = .58, 95% CI [.37, .79]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 354) = 133.04, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .27, 90% CI [.21, .33].

 **Study 7.** Participants thought that the low-SES child would be more positively affected by the events than they would be (*M* = 7.87, *SD* = 1.19), *t*(185) = 3.71, *p* < .001, *d* = .27, 95% CI [.07, .48], whereas they thought that the high-SES child would be less positively affected by the events than they would be (*M* = 7.97, *SD* = 1.02), *t*(188) = -2.98, *p* = .003, *d* = -.22, 95% CI [-.42, -.01]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 373) = 21.72, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .06, 90% CI [.02, .10].

 **Study 8.** Despite the fact that they were adults rating the effect of the negative events on a child, participants thought that the low-SES child would be less affected than they would be (*M* = 6.15, *SD* = 1.44), *t*(211) = -2.97, *p* = .003, *d* = -.20, 95% CI [-.39, -.01], whereas they thought that the high-SES child would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 6.28, *SD* = 1.49), *t*(196) = 14.13, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.01, 95% CI [.80, 1.22]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 407) = 108.59, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .21, 90% CI [.16, .27].

 **Study 9.** Participants thought they would be less positively affected by the events (*M* = 7.64, *SD* = 1.30) than the child target, *t*(420) = 7.01, *p* < .001, *d* = .35, 95% CI [.21, .48], and this difference was equally large for the low-SES and high-SES child, *F*(1, 419) = .65, *p* = .422, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01].

 **Study 11.** Participants thought that the negative events would be as harmful for themselves (*M* = 6.57, *SD* = 1.20) as for the low-SES target, *t*(44) = -1.35, *p* = .183, *d* = -.20, 95% CI [-.62, .21], whereas they thought the events would be less harmful for themselves (*M* = 6.41, *SD* = 1.07) than for the high-SES target, *t*(43) = 6.90, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.04, 95% CI [.60, 1.49]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 87) = 28.66, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .25, 90% CI [.12, .36].

 **Study 12.** Participants thought that they would be more negatively affected by the events (*M* = 6.16, *SD* = 1.15) than the low-SES target, *t*(18) = -2.90, *p* = .010, *d* = -.67, 95% CI [-1.32, -.01], whereas they thought they would be less negatively affected (*M* = 6.03, *SD* = 1.44) than the high-SES target, *t*(17) = 4.14, *p* = .001, *d* = .98, 95% CI [.29, 1.67]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 35) = 20.28, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .37, 90% CI [.16, .52].

 **Study 13.**

 ***First Sample.*** Participants thought that the events would negatively affect themselves (*M* = 6.22, *SD* = 1.35) to the same extent as the low-SES 10-year-old, *t*(25) = -1.21, *p* = .240, *d* = -.24, 95% CI [-.78, -.31], whereas they thought that they would be less negatively affected (*M* = 5.49, *SD* = 1.73) than the high-SES 10-year-old, *t*(26) = 3.71, *p* = .001, *d* = .71, 95% CI [.16, 1.26]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 51) = 11.93, *p* = .001, *ηp2* = .19, 90% CI [.05, .34].

 ***Second Sample.*** Participants thought that they would less negatively affected by the events than both the low-SES child (*M* = 5.54, *SD* = *SD* = 1.75), *t*(70) = 3.53, *p* = .001, *d* = .42, 95% CI [.09, .75], and the high-SES child (*M* = 5.65, *SD* = 1.64), *t*(84) = 10.08, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.09, 95% CI [.77, 1.42]. The self-other difference was larger for the high-SES child than for the low-SES child, *F*(1, 154) = 5.23, *p* = .024, *ηp2* = .03, 90% CI [.00, .09].

**Study 14.** Participants thought that the low-SES target would be as affected by the events as they would be (*M* = 6.59, *SD* = 1.34), *t*(391) = -1.05, *p* = .297, *d* = -.05, 95% CI [-.19, .09], whereas they thought that the high-SES target would be more negatively affected by the events than they would be (*M* = 6.60, *SD* = 1.16), *t*(379) = 10.33, *p* < .001, *d* = .53, 95% CI [.38, .67]. This interaction between self- versus other-ratings was significant, *F*(1, 707) = 35.23, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .05, 90% CI [.02, .08], and was not qualified by target gender, *F*(1, 707) = .36, *p* = .551, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01], target race, *F*(1, 707) =1.35, *p* = .245, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01], or their interaction, *F*(1, 707) = 2.66, *p* = .104, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01].

**Supplemental Studies**

**Supplemental Study 1**

 **Sample.** We recruited 251 participants through MTurk. To be included in analyses, participants were required to pass an attention check question and confirm that they did not respond randomly. In total, 238 participants met these criteria and were included in analyses.

 **Materials and Procedure.** Participants were randomly assigned to read about either a low-SES or high-SES White man (using the SES descriptions from previous studies). After reading about the individual, participants rated how unexpected a series of 10 events would be on a scale from 0 (not at all unexpected) to 10 (extremely unexpected). The events are presented in Table S15.

 **Results.** We compared the perceived unexpectedness of each event for the low-SES and high-SES target. Five of the events were rated as equally unexpected (see Table S15) for both individuals. We chose these five events to use for Studies 4 and 15.

**Supplemental Study 2**

 **Sample.** We recruited 294 participants through MTurk, of whom 266 met the inclusion criteria from Supplemental Study 1.

 **Materials and Procedure.** The materials and procedure were identical to Study 1a, with one exception. In addition to rating how negatively affected the low-SES or high-SES target would be by the 11 events, participants also rated how tough the target seemed on four questions (“How tough do you think Jordan is?”; “How weak do you think Jordan is?” [reversed]; “How resilient do you think Jordan is?”; and “How easily upset do you think Jordan is?” [reversed]). We expected that the low-SES target would be perceived as tougher, and that this perception would mediate the effect of SES condition on the perceived impact of the negative events.

 **Results.** As in previous studies, participants thought the low-SES target would be less affected by the negative events (*M* = 7.37, *SD* = 1.71) than the high-SES target (*M* = 8.93, *SD* = 1.41), *t*(264) = 8.09, *p* < .001, *d* = .99, 95% CI [.72, 1.26]. Participants also thought that the low-SES target was tougher (*M* = 7.25, *SD* = 1.64) than the high-SES target (*M* = 4.97, *SD* = 1.87), *t*(264) = -10.57, *p* < .001, *d* = -1.30, 95% CI [-1.58, -1.01], and this perception mediated the effect of SES on perceived harm using Hayes’ (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS with 5,000 resamples, indirect effect = .57, 95% CI [.27, .89].

**Supplemental Study 3**

 **Sample.** We recruited 301 participants through MTurk, of whom 214 met the inclusion criteria (passing two attention check questions and confirming nonrandom responding).

 **Materials and Procedure.** Participants were randomly assigned to read about a White man, a White woman, a Black man, or a Black woman. All targets were described as high-SES using the descriptions from previous studies. After reading about a target, participants provided their perception of the target’s general social class and of the target’s income. Participants rated the target’s social class on a 5-point scale with common class labels (poor, working class, middle class, upper-middle class, upper class). Participants rated the target’s perceived income on the same 12-point scale used to indicate their own income, which ranged from “Less than $10,000” to “More than $150,000.”

 **Results.** Participants perceived the high-SES White target to be of a higher social class (*M* = 3.85, *SD* = .77) than the high-SES Black target (*M* = 3.48, *SD* = .86), *t*(202.49) = 3.35, *p* = .001, *d* = .46, 95% CI [.19, .74]. Participants also perceived the high-SES White target as earning a higher income (*M* = 7.40, *SD* = 2.90) than the high-SES Black target (*M* = 6.87, *SD* = 2.42), though this difference was not significant, *t*(212) = 1.43, *p* = .153, *d* = .20, 95% CI [-.07, .47]. Target gender did not moderate the effect of target race on perceptions of class, *F*(1, 210) = 1.12, *p* = .292, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .03], or income, *F*(1, 210) = .52, *p* = .474, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .03].

**Supplemental Study 4**

**Sample.** We recruited 352 participants through MTurk, of whom 203 met the inclusion criteria from Supplemental Study 3.

**Materials and Procedure.** The materials and procedure were identical to Study 1a, with one exception. Instead of describing targets as relatively low- or high-SES, we described targets as having experienced a relatively large or small amount of hardship (while holding SES constant). Specifically, in the condition with more hardship, participants read the following:

Jordan lives in a large city in the U.S. He [she] grew up in a middle-class household and has never had to struggle financially. Nonetheless, Jordan has experienced many hardships in his [her] life. He [she] had few friends growing up, and his [her] parents often neglected him [her]. He [she] has also faced some health problems and suffered personal losses.

In contrast, in the condition with little hardship, participants instead read:

Jordan lives in a large city in the U.S. He [she] grew up in a middle-class household and has never had to struggle financially. Jordan has experienced few hardships in his [her] life. He [she] had many friends growing up, and his [her] parents doted on him [her]. He [she] has always been in good health and has never suffered any great personal losses.

We expected that targets who had experienced more hardship would be perceived as less negatively affected by the events than targets who had experienced less hardship.

**Results.** Participants thought the target who had experienced more hardship would be less affected by the negative events (*M* = 6.90, *SD* = 1.58) than the target who had experienced less hardship (*M* = 7.56, *SD* = 1.49), *t*(201) = 3.07 *p* = .002, *d* = .43, 95% CI [.15, .71]. The effect of hardship was not moderated by target gender, *F*(1, 199) = .00, *p* = .967, *ηp2* = .00.

Participants thought that the target who experienced more hardship would be slightly less negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 7.11, *SD* = 1.37), *t*(105) = -1.72, *p* = .088, *d* = -.17, 95% CI [-.44, .10], whereas they thought that the target who experienced less hardship would be more negatively affected than they would be (*M* = 7.20, *SD* = 1.38), *t*(96) = 3.03, *p* = .003, *d* = .31, 95% CI [.02, .59]. This interaction between self- versus target-ratings and condition was significant, *F*(1, 201) = 11.10, *p* = .001, *ηp2* = .05, 90% CI [.01, .11].

**Supplemental Study 5**

 **Sample.** We recruited 352 participants through MTurk, of whom 265 met the inclusion criteria from Supplemental Studies 3 and 4.

 **Materials and Procedure.** The procedure was similar to Study 1a, except that participants rated the impact of the 11 negative events for both a low-SES and a high-SES target (i.e., the design was within-subjects). Participants read about a male target named Jordan who was described as relatively low-SES using the relevant description from Study 1a, as well as a target named Thomas, who was described as relatively high-SES using the relevant description from Study 1a. Participants read about the two targets in a counterbalanced order; order did not moderate results, *F*(1, 263) = 2.01, *p* = .157, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .03].

 **Results.** As in the between-subjects version, participants thought that the low-SES target would be less affected by the negative events (*M* = 6.24, *SD* = 1.74) than the high-SES target (*M* = 7.66, *SD* = 1.35), *t*(264) = 12.01, *p* < .001, *d* = .74, 95% CI [.56, .91]. Thus, even when the comparison between low- and high-SES targets was made more explicit, participants displayed the thick skin bias.

**Supplemental Study 6**

 **Sample.** We recruited 118 participants through MTurk, of whom 111 met the inclusion criteria from Supplemental Study 1.

 **Materials and Procedure.** Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. In the “poor” condition, participants were asked, “What do you think the typical poor person’s sensitivity to pain is?” In the “rich” condition, participants were asked the same question but about a “typical rich person.” Participants responded by rating pain sensitivity on a scale from 0 (not at all sensitive) to 100 (most sensitive imaginable).

 **Results.** Participants thought that the typical poor person was less sensitive to pain (*M* = 52.31, *SD* = 16.46) than the typical rich person (*M* = 64.68, *SD* = 19.03), *t*(109) = 3.66, *p* < .001, *d* = .69, 95% CI [.30, 1.09].

**Supplemental Tables**

 Below are the supplemental tables. The tables are listed here for convenience.

Table S1: Participant Demographics

Table S2: Interactions Between Target SES and Gender Across Studies

Table S3: Relations between Participant SES and Self-Rated Harm of Negative Events

Table S4: Interactions between Participant SES and SES Conditions Across Studies

Table S5: Negative Events from Study 1a

Table S6: Positive Events from Study 3

Table S7: Equally and Unequally Unexpected Events from Study 4

Table S8: Negative Events from Study 6

Table S9: Positive Events from Study 7

Table S10: Negative Events from Study 8

Table S11: Positive Events from Study 9

Table S12: Negative Events from Study 10

Table S13: Negative Events from Study 13

Table S14: Negative Events from Study 14

Table S15: Negative Events and Descriptive Statistics for Supplemental Study 1

Table S1: Participant Demographics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Gender(%) | Age | Ethnicity (%) | Personal Income (%) | Household Income (%) | Social Status | Personal Education (%) |
| Study 1a | Female: 53.7Male: 46.3 | M = 35.69SD = 12.74 | Black: 7.5Asian: 7.0White: 74.8Latinx: 3.7Native American: .9Multiracial: 5.1Other: .9 | <10K: 26.210K-19,999: 13.120K-29,999: 15.030K-30,999: 13.140K-49,999: 7.550K-50,999: 5.160K-69,999: 7.970K-79,999: 4.780K-89,999: 2.390K-99,999: 2.3100K-149,999: 1.9>150K: .9 | <10K: 6.110K-19,999: 5.620K-29,999: 10.730K-30,999: 9.840K-49,999: 12.650K-50,999: 10.760K-69,999: 9.870K-79,999: 9.380K-89,999: 5.190K-99,999: 5.6100K-149,999:8.9>150K: 5.6 | M = 4.90SD = 1.71 | Working Class: 51.9Middle Class: 48.1 |
| Study 1b | Female: 53.1Male: 46.4Other: .5 | M = 35.99SD = 11.88 | Black: 9.6Asian: 4.3White: 78.0Latinx: 4.8Native American: 1.0Multiracial: 2.4 | <10K: 19.110K-19,999: 12.920K-29,999: 10.030K-30,999: 14.440K-49,999: 11.550K-50,999: 15.860K-69,999: 5.770K-79,999: 4.380K-89,999: 2.990K-99,999:1.0100K-149,999: 2.4>150K: 0 | <10K: 3.310K-19,999: 6.720K-29,999: 12.030K-30,999: 12.440K-49,999: 10.050K-50,999: 12.960K-69,999: 8.670K-79,999: 6.280K-89,999: 7.290K-99,999: 7.2100K-149,999: 10.5>150K: 2.9 | M =5.35SD = 1.76 | Working Class: 45.9Middle Class: 54.1 |
| Study 1c | Female: 52.4Male: 47.1Other: .5 | M = 34.39SD = 10.61 | Black: 10.5Asian: 7.6White: 72.4Latinx: 4.8Native American: 1.0Multiracial: 3.3Other: .5 | <10K: 19.510K-19,999: 16.220K-29,999: 13.830K-30,999: 13.340K-49,999: 11.950K-50,999: 3.860K-69,999: 9.070K-79,999: 6.280K-89,999: 1.490K-99,999: 1.0100K-149,999: 3.3>150K: .5 | <10K: 3.810K-19,999: 6.220K-29,999: 12.430K-30,999: 14.440K-49,999: 10.550K-50,999: 9.160K-69,999: 9.670K-79,999: 7.280K-89,999: 3.890K-99,999: 5.3100K-149,999: 12.9>150K: 4.8 | M = 5.01SD = 1.90 | Working-Class: 41.9Middle Class: 58.1 |
| Study 1d | Female: 54.5Male: 45.0Other: .5 | M = 34.24SD = 11.25 | Black: 9.0Asian: 8.1White: 68.8Latinx: 9.5Native American: .5Multiracial: 3.2Other: .9 | <10K: 19.910K-19,999: 10.420K-29,999: 14.030K-30,999: 12.740K-49,999: 11.350K-50,999: 12.760K-69,999: 6.370K-79,999: 4.580K-89,999: 1.890K-99,999: 1.4100K-149,999: 2.7>150K: 2.3 | <10K: 2.310K-19,999: 5.920K-29,999: 13.130K-30,999: 7.240K-49,999: 11.850K-50,999: 12.260K-69,999: 7.770K-79,999: 11.380K-89,999: 4.190K-99,999: 7.2100K-149,999: 12.7>150K: 4.5 | M = 5.16SD = 1.68 | Working Class: 43.9Middle Class: 56.1 |
| Study 2 | Female: 50.7Male: 49.3 | M = 34.99SD = 11.90 | Black: 15.5Asian: 3.6White: 73.4Latinx: 3.3Native American: 2.4Multiracial: 1.5Other: .3 | <10K: 14.010K-19,999: 10.420K-29,999: 11.930K-30,999: 17.340K-49,999: 11.950K-50,999: 11.360K-69,999: 7.870K-79,999: 5.480K-89,999: 2.790K-99,999: 1.5100K-149,999: 4.2>150K: 1.5 | <10K: 3.010K-19,999: 5.120K-29,999: 7.530K-30,999: 11.340K-49,999: 11.350K-50,999: 10.760K-69,999: 10.170K-79,999: 9.080K-89,999: 6.090K-99,999: 7.5100K-149,999: 13.4>150K: 5.1 | M = 5.54SD = 1.79 | Working Class: 38.2Middle Class: 61.8 |
| Study 3 | Female: 55.4Male: 44.1Other: .5 | M = 35.24SD = 10.69 | Black: 7.7Asian: 4.6White: 82.6Latinx: 3.1Native American: .5Multiracial: 1.5 | <10K: 19.510K-19,999: 12.820K-29,999: 12.330K-30,999: 16.440K-49,999: 13.850K-50,999: 7.760K-69,999: 5.170K-79,999: 4.680K-89,999: 2.690K-99,999: 1.5100K-149,999: 3.1>150K: .5 | <10K: 3.610K-19,999: 7.220K-29,999: 7.730K-30,999: 9.740K-49,999: 11.850K-50,999: 9.760K-69,999: 12.370K-79,999: 9.280K-89,999: 4.690K-99,999: 7.2100K-149,999: 11.3>150K: 5.6 | M = 5.09SD = 1.74 | Working Class: 50.3Middle Class: 49.7 |
| Study 4 | Female: 53.7Male: 44.9Other: 1.4 | M = 33.04SD = 13.24 | Black: 6.3Asian: 11.9White: 69.8Latinx: 6.3Multiracial: 5.3Other: .4 | <10K: 33.310K-19,999: 14.420K-29,999: 11.930K-30,999: 13.340K-49,999: 6.350K-50,999: 5.660K-69,999: 3.270K-79,999: 6.380K-89,999: 2.590K-99,999: .4100K-149,999: 1.4>150K: 1.4 | <10K: 8.410K-19,999: 8.420K-29,999: 10.930K-30,999: 11.940K-49,999: 8.150K-50,999: 10.260K-69,999: 7.770K-79,999: 8.180K-89,999: 4.990K-99,999: 6.3100K-149,999: 9.5>150K: 5.6 | M = 4.87SD = 1.70 | Working Class: 52.3Middle Class: 47.7 |
| Study 5a | Female: 60.3Male: 39.7 | M = 34.19SD = 10.54 | Black: 5.9Asian: 9.3White: 76.0Latinx: 4.9Native American: 2.0Multiracial: 2.0 | <10K: 19.110K-19,999: 11.320K-29,999: 16.230K-30,999: 13.740K-49,999: 13.250K-50,999: 9.860K-69,999: 3.470K-79,999: 3.980K-89,999: 2.990K-99,999: 2.9100K-149,999: 3.4>150K: 0 | <10K: 3.410K-19,999: 5.420K-29,999: 11.330K-30,999: 11.840K-49,999: 12.750K-50,999: 10.860K-69,999: 3.970K-79,999: 10.380K-89,999: 8.890K-99,999: 4.4100K-149,999: 10.8>150K: 6.4 | M = 5.03SD = 1.67 | Working Class: 48.0Middle Class: 52.0 |
| Study 5b | Female: 55.6Male: 43.9Other: .4 | M = 36.36SD = 12.56 | Black: 4.0Asian: 8.5White: 74.4Latinx: 7.6Native American: 2.2Multiracial: 2.7Other: .4 | <10K: 24.210K-19,999: 9.420K-29,999: 14.830K-30,999: 13.540K-49,999: 14.850K-50,999: 10.360K-69,999: 2.270K-79,999: 2.780K-89,999: 1.890K-99,999: 1.8100K-149,999: 3.1>150K: 1.3 | <10K: 7.610K-19,999: 5.420K-29,999: 9.430K-30,999: 11.240K-49,999: 11.750K-50,999: 14.360K-69,999: 6.370K-79,999: 5.480K-89,999: 5.890K-99,999: 5.8100K-149,999: 13.0>150K: 4.0 | M = 4.91SD = 1.69 | Working Class: 49.8Middle Class: 50.2 |
| Study 6 | Female: 58.1Male: 41.3Other: .6 | M = 36.29SD = 11.35 | Black: 11.2Asian: 5.6White: 73.0Latinx: 6.7Native American: .6Multiracial: 2.2Other: .6 | <10K: 18.310K-19,999: 11.020K-29,999: 14.630K-30,999: 14.640K-49,999: 12.150K-50,999: 9.860K-69,999: 5.170K-79,999: 5.680K-89,999: 1.190K-99,999: 2.5100K-149,999: 3.7>150K: 1.7 | <10K: 3.110K-19,999: 7.320K-29,999: 8.130K-30,999: 14.640K-49,999: 8.750K-50,999: 13.560K-69,999: 7.970K-79,999: 8.780K-89,999: 5.990K-99,999: 6.7100K-149,999: 10.4>150K: 5.1 | M = 4.86SD = 1.72 | Working Class: 43.8Middle Class: 56.2 |
| Study 7 | Female: 64.5Male: 35.2Other: .3 | M = 37.58SD = 11.64 | Black: 7.2Asian: 5.9White: 78.9Latinx: 3.7Native American: 1.3Multiracial: 2.7Other: .3 | <10K: 20.010K-19,999: 9.620K-29,999: 15.230K-30,999: 14.740K-49,999: 11.550K-50,999: 10.460K-69,999: 6.770K-79,999: 5.680K-89,999: 1.190K-99,999: 2.1100K-149,999: 2.7>150K: .5 | <10K: 2.910K-19,999: 4.320K-29,999: 10.730K-30,999: 9.940K-49,999: 9.350K-50,999: 10.460K-69,999: 9.370K-79,999: 13.680K-89,999: 4.390K-99,999: 8.0100K-149,999: 13.3>150K: 4.0 | M = 5.18SD = 1.69 | Working Class: 45.9Middle Class: 54.1 |
| Study 8 | Female: 57.2Male: 42.8 | M = 36.08SD = 11.96 | Black: 7.3Asian: 7.3White: 72.9Latinx: 7.8Native American: .5Multiracial: 4.2 | <10K: 19.310K-19,999: 11.020K-29,999: 16.130K-30,999: 12.740K-49,999: 11.750K-50,999: 8.160K-69,999: 7.870K-79,999: 2.980K-89,999: 2.290K-99,999: 2.9100K-149,999: 3.7>150K: 1.5 | <10K: 2.710K-19,999: 5.120K-29,999: 11.230K-30,999: 10.040K-49,999: 12.750K-50,999: 9.860K-69,999: 10.870K-79,999: 9.080K-89,999: 4.690K-99,999: 5.1100K-149,999: 11.5>150K: 7.3 | M = 5.24SD = 1.65 | Working Class: 47.7Middle Class: 52.3 |
| Study 9 | Female: 58.4Male: 40.9Other: .7 | M = 35.14SD = 10.99 | Black: 8.1Asian: 9.0White: 72.4Latinx: 4.5Native American: .5Multiracial: 5.2Other: .2 | <10K: 20.010K-19,999: 14.020K-29,999: 10.030K-30,999: 12.640K-49,999: 14.750K-50,999: 10.060K-69,999: 5.770K-79,999: 5.580K-89,999: 2.690K-99,999: 1.2100K-149,999: 2.4>150K: 1.4 | <10K: 4.810K-19,999: 7.420K-29,999: 6.930K-30,999: 10.740K-49,999: 13.550K-50,999: 10.560K-69,999: 8.370K-79,999: 9.780K-89,999: 5.990K-99,999: 6.4100K-149,999: 11.2>150K: 4.8 | M = 5.21SD = 1.72 | Working Class: 46.8Middle Class: 53.2 |
| Study 10 | Female: 31.8 Male: 68.2 | M = 37.48SD = 12.94 | Black: 0Asian: 4.5White: 65.9Latinx: 20.5Multiracial: 2.3Other: 6.8 | <10K: 010K-19,999: 020K-29,999: 11.430K-30,999: 13.640K-49,999: 22.750K-50,999: 4.560K-69,999: 9.170K-79,999: 4.580K-89,999: 6.890K-99,999: 2.3100K-149,999: 18.2>150K: 6.8 | <10K: 2.310K-19,999: 020K-29,999: 4.530K-30,999: 2.340K-49,999: 9.150K-50,999: 2.360K-69,999: 4.570K-79,999: 6.880K-89,999: 6.890K-99,999: 2.3100K-149,999: 31.8>150K: 27.3 | M = 6.20SD = 1.32 | Working Class: 40.9Middle Class: 59.1 |
| Study 11 | Female: 91.0Male: 7.9Other: 1.1 | M = 28.26SD = 8.09 | Black: 4.5Asian: 7.9White: 71.9Latinx: 6.7Native American: 1.1Multiracial: 6.7Other: 1.1 | <10K: 34.810K-19,999: 12.420K-29,999: 6.730K-30,999: 6.740K-49,999: 7.950K-50,999: 13.560K-69,999: 13.570K-79,999: 1.180K-89,999: 1.190K-99,999: 1.1100K-149,999: 1.1>150K: 0 | <10K: 13.510K-19,999: 9.020K-29,999: 3.430K-30,999: 6.740K-49,999: 15.750K-50,999: 10.160K-69,999: 7.970K-79,999: 4.580K-89,999: 4.590K-99,999: 4.5100K-149,999: 10.1>150K: 10.1 | M = 6.72SD = 1.32 | Working Class: 0Middle Class: 100 |
| Study 12 | Female: 73.0Male: 24.3Other: 2.7 | M = 25.84SD = 3.10 | White: 91.9Multiracial: 2.7Other: 5.4 | <10K: 56.810K-19,999: 5.4 20K-29,999: 16.230K-30,999: 8.140K-49,999: 5.4 50K-50,999: 5.460K-69,999: 070K-79,999: 2.780K-89,999: 090K-99,999: 0100K-149,999: 0>150K: 0 | <10K: 13.510K-19,999: 5.420K-29,999: 8.130K-30,999: 10.840K-49,999: 5.450K-50,999: 5.460K-69,999: 8.170K-79,999: 13.580K-89,999: 2.790K-99,999: 8.1100K-149,999: 10.8>150K: 8.1 | M = 6.76SD = 1.06 | Working Class: 0Middle Class: 100 |
| Study 13 (First Sample) | Female: 75Male: 25 | M = 37.15SD = 10.52 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study 13 (Second Sample) | Female: 59.6Male: 38.5Prefer not to disclose: 1.9 | M = 43.99SD = 11.11 | Black: 6.4Asian: 7.6White: 85.3Latinx: 4.5Native American: 3.2Other: .6Prefer not to disclose: 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Study 14 | Female: 51.8Male: 48.2 | M = 48.32SD = 15.81 | Black: 9.9Asian: 3.8White: 80.9Native American: .8Multiracial: 4.0 |  | <10K: 5.610K-19,999: 4.120K-29,999: 7.530K-30,999: 11.440K-49,999: 10.850K-50,999: 7.960K-74,999: 11.875K-99,999: 14.3100K-149,999: 14.9>150K: 11.6 |  | Working Class: 61.3Middle Class: 38.7 |

Table S2: Interactions Between Target SES and Gender Across Studies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Study | Target SES X Gender Interaction |
| Study 1a | *F*(1, 210) = 1.62, *p* = .204, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .04] |
| Study 1b | *F*(1, 205) = 3.75, *p* = .054, *ηp2* = .02, 90% CI [.00, .06] |
| Study 1c | *F*(1, 206) = 2.39, *p* = .124, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .05] |
| Study 1d | *F*(1, 218) = 2.09, *p* = .150, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .04] |
| Study 2 | *F*(1, 330) = 1.78, *p* = .170, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .03] |
| Study 3 | *F*(1, 191) = 1.11, *p* = .293, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .04] |
| Study 4—Equally Expected | *F*(1, 282) = .23, *p* = .631, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01] |
| Study 4—Differentially Expected | *F*(1, 282) = 1.03, *p* = .301, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .02] |
| Study 6 | *F*(1, 352) = 1.42, *p* = .235, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .02] |
| Study 7 | *F*(1, 371) = .38, *p* = .536, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01] |
| Study 8 | *F*(1, 405) = .06, *p* = .802, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01] |
| Study 9 | *F*(1, 417) = .22, *p* = .638, *ηp2* = .00, 90% CI [.00, .01] |
| Study 11 | *F*(1, 85) = .94, *p* =.336, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .07] |
| Study 12 | *F*(1, 33) = .28, *p* = .598, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .12] |
| Study 13 – First Sample | *F*(1, 49) = .66, *p* = .420, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .11] |
| Study 13 – Second Sample | *F*(1, 152) = 2.20, *p* = .140, *ηp2* = .01, 90% CI [.00, .06] |

*Note.* Studies 5a, 5b, and 10 had only male targets. The effects of target gender in Study 14 are reported in the main text.

Table S3: Relations between Participant SES and Self-Rated Harm of Events

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Study | SES Variable |
|  | Personal Income | Household Income | Subjective Status | Education |
| Study 1a | ***r* = -.16, *p* = .019** | *r* = -.07, *p* = .289 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .638 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .627 |
| Study 1b | *r* = .00, *p* = .971 | *r* = -.06, *p* =.358 | *r* = .00, *p* = .995 | *r* = .04, *p* = .531 |
| Study 1c | *r* = -.01, *p* = .890 | *r* = -.01, *p =* .908 | *r* = .11, *p* = .111 | *r* = -.08, *p* = .273 |
| Study 1d | *r* = -.05, *p* = .417 | *r* = -.05, *p* = .433 | *r* = .04, *p* = .551 | ***r* = -.14, *p* = .034** |
| Study 2 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .623 | *r* = -.02, *p* = .821 | *r* = .12, *p* = .077 | *r* = -.04, *p* = .555 |
| Study 3 | *r* = -.10, *p* = .172 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .674 | *r* = -.01, *p* = .870 | *r* = -.06, *p* = .413 |
| Study 4-EE | *r* = .03, *p* = .563 | *r* = .02, *p* = .709 | *r* = .01, *p* = .840 | *r* = -.08, *p* = .159 |
| Study 4-DE | *r* = .05, *p* = .356 | *r* = .01, *p* = .911 | *r* = .01, *p =* .931 | *r* = .05, *p* = .368 |
| Study 5a | *r* = -.02, *p* = .818 | *r* = -.07, *p* = .287 | *r* = .13, *p* = .056 | *r* = .10, *p* = .166 |
| Study 5b | *r* = -.07, *p* = .302 | *r* = -.05, *p* = .419 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .693 | *r* = -.08, *p* = .260 |
| Study 6 | ***r* = -.10, *p* = .049** | *r* = -.06, *p* = .251 | *r* = .03, *p* = .619 | *r* = .01, *p* = .873 |
| Study 7 | ***r* = -.10, *p* = .050** | *r* = -.02, *p* = .651 | *r* = .03, *p* = .566 | ***r* = -.15, *p* = .004** |
| Study 8 | *r* = -.04, *p* = .396 | *r* = -.04, *p* = .429 | *r* = .04, *p* = .418 | *r* = -.03, *p* = .523 |
| Study 9 | *r* = .04, *p* = .370 | *r* = .06, *p* = .207 | *r* = .05, *p* = .266 | *r* = .07, *p* = .151 |
| Study 11 | *r* = .10, *p* = .359 | *r* = .03, *p* = .787 | *r* = .07, *p* = .499 |  |
| Study 12 | *r* = .13, *p* = .440 | *r* = -.19, *p* = .264 | ***r* = -.38, *p* = .020** |  |
| Study 14-EE |  | ***r* = -.20, *p* < .001** |  | ***r* = -.19, *p* < .001** |
| Study 14-DE |  | ***r* = -.14, *p* < .001** |  | ***r* = -.12, *p* = .001** |

*Note*. Bold indicates significance at *p* < .05. EE = equally expected for low-SES and high-SES individuals. DE = differentially expected (more expected for low-SES individuals).

Table S4: Interactions between Participant SES and SES Conditions Across Studies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Study | SES Variable |
|  | Personal Income | Household Income | Subjective Status | Education |
| Study 1a | *b* = .41, *p* = .505 | *b* = -.63, *p* = .322 | *b* = -.07, *p* = .554 | *b* = .38, *p* = .369 |
| Study 1b | *b* = -1.00, *p* = .154 | *b* = -.66, *p* = .370 | *b* = -.04, *p* = .730 | *b* = -.46, *p* = .300 |
| Study 1c | *b* = .26, *p* = .710 | *b* = -.47, *p* = .487 | *b* = -.13, *p* = .280 | *b* = -.38, *p* = .400 |
| Study 1d | *b* = .17, *p* = .779 | *b* = .10, *p* = .894 | *b* = -.14, *p* = .240 | *b* = -.21, *p* = .598 |
| Study 2 | *b* = .40, *p* = .583 | *b* = -.76, *p* = .298 | *b* = -.04, *p* = .742 | *b* = .38, *p* = .419 |
| Study 3 | *b* = -.05, *p* = .933 | *b* = -.51, *p* = .380 | *b* = -.02, *p* = .820 | ***b* = -.75, *p* = .041** |
| Study 4-EE | *b* = -.14, *p* = .793 | *b* = -.38, *p* = .443 | *b* = -.01, *p* = .921 | *b* = -.21, *p* = .570 |
| Study 4-DE | *b* = .16, *p* = .774 | *b* = .05, *p* = .926 | *b* = .02, *p* = .836 | *b* = -.10, *p* = .787 |
| Study 5a-Past | *b* = -.64, *p* = .432 | *b* = -.28, *p* = .746 | *b* = .04, *p* = .785 | *b* = -.74, *p* = .144 |
| Study 5a-Present | *b* = -.06, *p* = .943 | *b* = -.75, *p* = .368 | *b* = -.06, *p* = .699 | *b* = .27, *p* = .606 |
| Study 5b-Past | *b* = -.68, *p* = .425 | *b* = -.60, *p* = .455 | *b* = -.11, *p* = .517 | *b* = -.44, *p* = .435 |
| Study 5b-Present | *b* = -.39, *p* = .619 | *b* = -1.34, *p* = .062 | *b* = -.12, *p* = .418 | *b* = -.60, *p* = .238 |
| Study 6 | *b* = .02, *p* = .963 | *b* = -.73, *p* = .155 | ***b* = -.22, *p* = .018** | *b* = .07, *p* = .818 |
| Study 7 | *b* = -.24, *p* = .535 | *b* = -.32, *p* = .462 | *b* = .04, *p* = .620 | *b* = -.03, *p* = .900 |
| Study 8 | *b* = .73, *p* = .175 | *b* = 1.17, *p* = .051 | *b* = .11, *p* = .288 | *b* = .43, *p* = .219 |
| Study 9 | *b* = -.31, *p* = .468 | *b* = .35, *p* = .419 | *b* = -.02, *p* = .795 | *b* = .04, *p* = .886 |
| Study 10 | *b* = -58, *p* = .823 | *b* = -1.92, *p* = .426 | *b* = -.32, *p* = .397 | *b* = 1.49, *p* = .141 |
| Study 11 | *b* = -.32, *p* = .711 | *b* = -1.10, *p* = .145 | *b* = -.13, *p* = .592 |  |
| Study 12 | *b* = 2.33, *p* = .136 | *b* = .02, *p* = .990 | *b* = -.65, *p* = .163 |  |
| Study 14-EE |  | *b* = -.06, *p* = .878 |  | *b* = .06, *p* = .845 |
| Study 14-DE |  | *b* = .58, *p* = .089 |  | *b* = .49, *p* = .061 |

*Note*. Condition was coded as 0 = low-SES condition, 1 = high-SES condition. Personal income and household income were log-transformed. Income and status were mean-centered. Bold indicates significance at *p* < .05. EE = equally expected for low-SES and high-SES individuals. DE = differentially expected (more expected for low-SES individuals).

Table S5: Negative Events from Study 1a

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan orders takeout and is given an overcooked, badly seasoned entrée. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan’s faucet is leaky and constantly makes a dripping sound. | How annoyed? |
| Jordan goes to his local bank and the teller forgets his name, even though he has been going there for years. | How hurt? |
| Jordan’s neighborhood has a litter problem, with inconsistent efforts on behalf of the city to keep it clean. | How unfair? |
| Jordan is kept awake by noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan is mocked and insulted by his boss. | How embarrassed? |
| A police officer mistakenly believes he sees Jordan shoplifting and doesn’t believe him when he says he didn’t do it. | How upsetting? |
| Jordan is stranded without a ride and has to walk a mile in a rain storm. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan’s heating system breaks, leaving him without any heat in the middle of winter. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan’s apartment is flooded. | How bad? |
| Jordan’s tap water needs to be filtered before he can safely drink it. | How inconvenient? |

Table S6: Positive Events from Study 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan’s boss compliments his recent work. | How proud? |
| Jordan’s friend is throwing a party this weekend. | How excited? |
| Jordan hears a funny joke. | How amused? |
| Jordan gets some help from a friend on a household project. | How grateful? |
| Jordan is going on a vacation to the beach with his family. | How excited? |
| Jordan eats a tasty meal. | How satisfied? |
| Jordan wakes up very early and realizes he has time to sleep some more. | How relieved? |
| Jordan puts on warm clothes straight out of the dryer. | How pleased? |
| Jordan drives somewhere and hits only green lights at intersections. | How lucky? |
| Jordan gets to leave work an hour early on a Friday. | How happy? |
| Jordan receives a surprise gift from a friend. | How grateful? |
| Jordan receives several thoughtful cards on his birthday from family and friends. | How loved? |

Table S7: Equally and Unequally Unexpected Events from Study 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| **More Expected by Low-SES Individuals** |  |
| Jordan’s neighborhood has a litter problem, with inconsistent efforts on behalf of the city to keep it clean. | How unfair? |
| Jordan is unexpectedly stranded without a ride and has to walk a mile in a rain storm. | How intolerable? |
| Because of a city-wide contamination problem, Jordan’s tap water needs to be filtered before he can safely drink it. | How bad? |
| Despite living in a generally quiet neighborhood, Jordan is kept awake by noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan attends a city council meeting for the first time and is not given a chance to speak. | How offensive? |
|  |  |
| **Equally Expected Events** |  |
| Jordan orders takeout and is given an overcooked, badly seasoned entrée. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan enters a raffle at a city fair for a chance to meet a local celebrity but does not end up winning. | How disappointing? |
| Jordan meets his friend’s new partner and they treat him rather rudely. | How offensive? |
| Jordan is crossing the street in the main part of the city and is almost clipped by a speeding car. | How upsetting? |
| Jordan calls an Uber and it takes 10 minutes longer than the app initially says to arrive. | How annoying? |

Table S8: Negative Events from Study 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan is served an overcooked, badly seasoned meal. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan’s bathroom faucet is leaky and constantly makes a dripping sound. | How annoying? |
| Jordan goes to his local library and the librarian forgets his name, even though he has been going there for years. | How hurt? |
| Jordan’s neighborhood has a litter problem, with inconsistent efforts on behalf of the city to keep it clean. | How unfair? |
| Jordan is kept awake by noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan is mocked and insulted by his classmates. | How embarrassing? |
| A police officer mistakenly believes he sees Jordan shoplifting and doesn’t believe Jordan when he tells him that he didn’t do it. | How upsetting? |
| Jordan is stranded without a ride and has to walk a mile in a rain storm. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan’s home’s heating system breaks, leaving his family without any heat in the middle of winter. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan’s apartment is flooded. | How bad? |
| Jordan’s tap water needs to be filtered before he can safely drink it. | How inconvenient? |

Table S9: Positive Events from Study 7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan’s teacher compliments his recent classwork. | How proud? |
| Jordan’s friend is throwing a party this weekend. | How excited? |
| Jordan hears a funny joke. | How amused? |
| Jordan gets some help from a friend on a craft project. | How grateful? |
| Jordan is going on vacation to the beach with his family. | How excited? |
| Jordan eats a tasty meal. | How satisfied? |
| Jordan wakes up very early and realizes he has time to sleep some more. | How relieved? |
| Jordan puts on warm clothes straight out of the dryer. | How pleased? |
| Jordan gets to help with a classroom activity he’s been looking forward to. | How lucky? |
| Jordan gets to leave school an hour early on a Friday. | How happy? |
| Jordan receives a surprise gift from a friend. | How grateful? |
| Jordan receives several thoughtful cards on his birthday from family and friends. | How loved? |

Table S10: Negative Events from Study 8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| After growing up in a quiet neighborhood with little disruption, Jordan is kept awake at night by loud noises outside his window and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan is served an overcooked, poorly prepared lunch. | How gross? |
| Jordan’s teacher pays more attention to a classmate than to him. | How annoying? |
| Jordan’s family vacation is postponed. | How disappointing? |
| Jordan tries to say hi to a classmate but is ignored. | How offensive? |

Table S11: Positive Events from Study 9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan’s friend is having a party this weekend. | How exciting? |
| Jordan gets to leave school early one day. | How delighted? |
| Jordan’s family goes on vacation. | How fun? |
| Jordan is complimented by his teacher. | How proud? |
| Jordan eats a tasty meal. | How satisfied? |

Table S12: Negative Events from Study 10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan orders takeout and is given an overcooked, badly seasoned entrée. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan’s food takes an unexpectedly long time to be served after he orders it. | How frustrating? |
| Jordan’s waiter makes a mistake when taking his order and brings him a wrongly prepared dish. | How disappointing? |
| Jordan goes to a restaurant and is seated at a table very near the bathrooms. | How annoying? |

Table S13: Negative Events from Study 13

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| Jordan is stranded without a ride and has to walk a mile in a rain storm. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan is kept awake by a noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan is mocked by a classmate.\* | How embarrassing? |
| Jordan is served an overcooked, badly prepared lunch. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan is scolded by his teacher for something he did at school | How upsetting? |

\*In the second sample of Study 13, “mocked” was replaced with “teased.”

Table S14: Negative Events from Study 14

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Event | Response Rating |
| **More Expected by Low-SES Individuals** |  |
| Jordan’s neighborhood has a litter problem, with inconsistent efforts on behalf of the city to keep it clean. | How unfair? |
| Jordan’s apartment is flooded. | How bad? |
| Because of a city-wide contamination problem, Jordan’s tap water needs to be filtered before he can safely drink it. | How bad? |
| Despite living in a generally quiet neighborhood, Jordan is kept awake by noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | How intolerable? |
| Jordan attends a city council meeting for the first time and is not given a chance to speak. | How offensive? |
|  |  |
| **Equally Expected Events** |  |
| Jordan orders takeout and is given an overcooked, badly seasoned entrée. | How disgusting? |
| Jordan enters a raffle at a city fair for a chance to meet a local celebrity but does not end up winning. | How disappointing? |
| Jordan meets his friend’s new partner and they treat him rather rudely. | How offensive? |
| Jordan is crossing the street in the main part of the city and is almost clipped by a speeding car. | How upsetting? |
| Jordan calls an Uber and it takes 10 minutes longer than the app initially says to arrive. | How annoying? |

Table S15: Descriptive Statistics for Supplemental Study 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Event | Low-SES Target | High-SES Target | *t*-test |
| **Jordan orders takeout and is given an overcooked, badly seasoned entrée.** | 5.32 (2.51) | 5.47 (2.49) | *t* = .49 |
| Jordan’s neighborhood has a litter problem, with inconsistent efforts on behalf of the city to keep it clean. | 3.31 (2.33) | 6.29 (2.45) | *t* = 9.62\*\*\* |
| Jordan is unexpectedly stranded without a ride and has to walk a mile in a rain storm. | 5.06 (2.80) | 7.31 (2.51) | *t* = 6.54\*\*\* |
| Because of a city-wide contamination problem, Jordan’s tap water needs to be filtered before he can safely drink it. | 4.73 (2.97) | 6.93 (2.53) | *t* = 6.17\*\*\* |
| Despite living in a generally quiet neighborhood, Jordan is kept awake by noise outside his bedroom and only gets a few hours of sleep. | 5.09 (2.69) | 6.88 (2.44) | *t* = 5.38\*\*\* |
| **Jordan enters a raffle at a city fair for a chance to meet a local celebrity but does not end up winning.** | 2.39 (2.49) | 2.92 (2.67) | *t* = 1.57 |
| **Jordan meets his friend’s new partner and they treat him rather rudely.** | 5.94 (2.49) | 6.30 (2.34) | *t* = 1.13 |
| **Jordan is crossing the street in the main part of the city and is almost clipped by a speeding car.** | 5.88 (2.73) | 6.25 (2.75) | *t* = 1.04 |
| **Jordan calls an Uber and it takes 10 minutes longer than the app initially says to arrive.** | 4.98 (2.57) | 5.26 (2.53) | *t* = .87 |
| Jordan attends a city council meeting for the first time and is not given a chance to speak. | 4.10 (2.47) | 5.06 (2.71) | *t* = 2.85\*\* |

*Note*. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* <.001. Bolded items are equally expected for low-SES and high-SES individuals.
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