



1-2017


Backlash: The Politics and Real-World Consequences of Minority Group Dehumanization

Nour Kteily

Emile Bruneau

University of Pennsylvania, emile.bruneau@asc.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers

 Part of the American Politics Commons, Cognition and Perception Commons, Cognitive Psychology Commons, Community Psychology Commons, Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons, International and Intercultural Communication Commons, Mass Communication Commons, Personality and Social Contexts Commons, Social Influence and Political Communication Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Kteily, N., & Bruneau, E. (2017). Backlash: The Politics and Real-World Consequences of Minority Group Dehumanization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43 (1), 87-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216675334>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/571
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Backlash: The Politics and Real-World Consequences of Minority Group Dehumanization

Abstract

Research suggests that members of advantaged groups who feel dehumanized by other groups respond aggressively. But little is known about how meta-dehumanization affects disadvantaged minority group members, historically the primary targets of dehumanization. We examine this important question in the context of the 2016 U.S. Republican Primaries, which have witnessed the widespread derogation and dehumanization of Mexican immigrants and Muslims. Two initial studies document that Americans blatantly dehumanize Mexican immigrants and Muslims; this dehumanization uniquely predicts support for aggressive policies proposed by Republican nominees, and dehumanization is highly associated with supporting Republican candidates (especially Donald Trump). Two further studies show that, in this climate, Latinos and Muslims in the United States feel heavily dehumanized, which predicts hostile responses including support for violent versus non-violent collective action and unwillingness to assist counterterrorism efforts. Our results extend theorizing on dehumanization, and suggest that it may have cyclical and self-fulfilling consequences.

Keywords

dehumanization, meta-dehumanization, prejudice, intergroup relations, meta-perceptions, 2016 U.S. Election, Donald Trump

Disciplines

American Politics | Cognition and Perception | Cognitive Psychology | Communication | Community Psychology | Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication | International and Intercultural Communication | Mass Communication | Personality and Social Contexts | Social and Behavioral Sciences | Social Influence and Political Communication | Social Psychology

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Backlash: The Politics and Real-World Consequences of Minority Group
Dehumanization**

Word Count: 12, 157

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 Abstract

5 Research suggests that members of advantaged groups who feel dehumanized by other
6 groups respond aggressively. But little is known about how meta-dehumanization affects
7 disadvantaged minority group members, historically the primary targets of
8 dehumanization. We examine this important question in the context of the 2016 U.S.
9 Republican Primaries, which have witnessed the widespread derogation and
10 dehumanization of Mexican immigrants and Muslims. Two initial studies document that:
11 Americans blatantly dehumanize Mexican immigrants and Muslims, this dehumanization
12 uniquely predicts support for aggressive policies proposed by Republican nominees, and
13 dehumanization is highly associated with supporting Republican candidates (especially
14 Donald Trump). Two further studies show that, in this climate, Latinos and Muslims in
15 the U.S. feel heavily dehumanized, which predicts hostile responses including support for
16 violent versus non-violent collective action and unwillingness to assist counter-terrorism
17 efforts. Our results extend theorizing on dehumanization, and suggest that it may have
18 cyclical and self-fulfilling consequences.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Keywords: Dehumanization; Meta-Dehumanization; Prejudice; Intergroup Relations;

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Meta-perceptions

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As the Republican Presidential Primaries unfolded, many expressed concern about the language expressed towards certain minority groups, in particular Mexican immigrants and Muslims. Donald Trump was at the forefront, using statements about immigrant “anchor babies” and Muslim “Trojan horses” in promoting controversial policies like building a wall between the U.S. and Mexico and instituting databases to track Muslims. Although Trump’s comments provoked outrage in many quarters, his rhetoric has seemingly not hurt him among his base, leading many to suggest that racial resentment is in fact an important foundation of his support (e.g., Cohn, 2015; McElwee & McDaniel, 2016). Perhaps in an attempt to compete for these same voters, other candidates followed suit, with Ben Carson using the term “rabid dogs” to describe Syrian refugees, and Ted Cruz talking about the need to patrol and secure Muslim neighborhoods. These trends suggest that negative perceptions of Mexican immigrants and Muslims may be prevalent among some Americans. Much of the language used (e.g., “rabid dogs”; “Trojan horse”) specifically suggests the relevance of blatant dehumanization, which has the potential for particularly far-reaching consequences.

One possibility consistent with prior research is that that overt dehumanization of Mexicans and Muslims may stoke aggressive attitudes and behavior, and motivate endorsement of hostile policies such as the mass deportation of illegal immigrants or the banning of Muslim travel to the U.S.— policies actually proposed recently by Republican candidates. But the effects of the dehumanization of Mexicans and Muslims might extend even beyond promoting hostility towards these groups: A second concern is how feeling dehumanized might affect minority group members on the receiving end, a question that has not received prior empirical attention. In the current work, we examine attitudes

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 among both majority and minority group members, exploring (a) how majority
4
5 Americans' dehumanization of Mexican immigrants and Muslims is associated with their
6
7 support for the Republican nominees and hostile policies they have proposed, and (b)
8
9 how minority Americans respond to feeling dehumanized.
10
11

12 **The Consequences of Blatant Dehumanization and Meta-Dehumanization**

13
14
15 Recent work outside the context of the current election cycle illustrates why the
16
17 blatant dehumanization of Latinos and Muslims may be so consequential. Although
18
19 contemporary research on dehumanization has tended to focus on its more subtle,
20
21 everyday forms, Kteily, Bruneau, Waytz, and Cotterill (2015) have demonstrated that
22
23 blatant dehumanization continues to be relevant in modern society (see also Haslam,
24
25 Loughnan, & Sun, 2011; Jackson & Gaertner, 2010). Using a novel measure of blatant
26
27 dehumanization based on the popular 'Ascent of Man' diagram, these authors showed
28
29 that, on average, samples of British and American participants explicitly rated Muslims
30
31 as less 'evolved' than their own group. Moreover, the degree of reported blatant
32
33 dehumanization was associated with outgroup aggression (e.g., support for torture)
34
35 beyond subtle forms of dehumanization (such as denying others uniquely human
36
37 emotions or traits; e.g., Leyens et al., 2000; Haslam, 2005) and 'mere' dislike (see also
38
39 Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008; Leidner, Castano, & Ginges, 2013).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Here, we extend the prior work on blatant dehumanization by examining how
47
48 Americans perceive Mexican immigrants and Muslims, and more importantly, by
49
50 examining how dehumanization might help explain real trends that have emerged during
51
52 the current American election cycle. Although many have speculated that outgroup
53
54 animus may be contributing to the surprising groundswell of support for Republican
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 candidates like Donald Trump (e.g., McElwee & McDaniel, 2016), this has yet to be
4
5 empirically examined. Moreover, it remains unclear whether blatant dehumanization is in
6
7 fact associated with support for the actual policy proposals these candidates have
8
9 advocated for. We shed light on these questions here, highlighting the potential for
10
11 blatant dehumanization to influence consequential real-world outcomes.
12
13

14
15 Beyond promoting hostility among majority Americans, the dehumanization of
16
17 Mexican immigrants and Muslims could also have effects on the dehumanized. In
18
19 particular, members of these minority groups perceiving that they are viewed as less than
20
21 fully human may respond with aggression towards majority Americans. Consistent with
22
23 this possibility, recent research suggests that *feeling* blatantly dehumanized (i.e., meta-
24
25 dehumanization) can motivate reciprocal hostility. Examining samples of advantaged
26
27 groups (e.g., Americans, Israelis), Kteily, Hodson, and Bruneau (2016) showed that
28
29 feeling blatantly dehumanized is separate from feeling disliked (i.e., meta-prejudice), and
30
31 that meta-dehumanization is uniquely associated with aggressive attitudes and behavior
32
33 (see also Andrighetto, Riva, Gabbiadini, & Volpato, in press; Bastian & Haslam, 2010,
34
35 2011). Moreover, these authors found that Americans who were primed to think (or
36
37 reported thinking) that they were seen as animals by Muslims were significantly more
38
39 likely to reciprocate by dehumanizing Muslims and recommending more hostile anti-
40
41 Muslim actions.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Despite the contributions of this prior work, one significant shortcoming is that it
49
50 has focused on just one side of the equation, by examining dehumanization and meta-
51
52 dehumanization only among members of advantaged groups. Thus, little is known about
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 how members of *disadvantaged* minority groups—historically, the primary targets of
4 blatant dehumanization— may respond to feeling dehumanized.
5
6

7
8 On the one hand, there are reasons to think that minority group members will be
9 less likely than advantaged group members to react with hostility to being dehumanized.
10 It is possible, for example, that some minority group members— for example, those
11 higher on system-justification motives (Jost & Banaji, 2004)— will accept dehumanizing
12 views of the ingroup held by those at the top. Moreover, even if minority group members
13 reject the dehumanization they perceive, their relative lack of power may diminish their
14 likelihood of responding to being dehumanized with aggression, because of a lack of
15 perceived efficacy or a fear of retribution (see also Miranda, Gourveia-Pereira, & Vaes,
16 2014).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 On the other hand, being blatantly dehumanized involves a striking and aversive
30 threat to the ingroup's social identity (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999)
31 that may well be rejected as illegitimate and stoke strong desires for reciprocation despite
32 any potential consequences. In fact, research among disadvantaged group members
33 outside the context of dehumanization has suggested that they too can respond to
34 negative stereotypes of the group with hostility (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999;
35 Kamans, Gordijn, Oldenhuis, & Otten, 2009). Thus, it is plausible that members of
36 minority groups will respond as advantaged group members do – with reciprocal
37 dehumanization and increased hostility. Because minority group members are likely the
38 primary targets of dehumanization, better understanding their responses to feeling
39 dehumanized has important theoretical and practical implications (see also Lyons-Padilla,
40 Gelfand, Mirahmadi, Farooq, & van Egmond, 2015). For example, Muslims are involved
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 in thwarting a significant percentage of the terror plots in the U.S. (Triangle Center on
4
5 Terrorism and Homeland Security, 2013). If potential Muslim allies come to feel
6
7 dehumanized, they may respond with hostility rather than cooperation. Ironically, if
8
9 meta-dehumanization predicts aggression among minority group members, this could
10
11 reinforce the original dehumanizing perceptions that majority group members hold,
12
13 promulgating a vicious cycle of intergroup hostility.
14
15

16
17 We directly tackled these questions in the present work, simultaneously
18
19 examining both the dehumanization of minority group members by majority group
20
21 members, and, for the first time, minority group members' feelings of meta-
22
23 dehumanization. Rooting our examination in the actual statements and policy proposals
24
25 put forward by the Republican presidential candidates, we first examined the prevalence
26
27 and consequences of majority Americans' blatant dehumanization of Mexican
28
29 immigrants (Study 1a) and Muslims (Study 1b). Subsequently, we tested whether Latino
30
31 (Study 2a) and Muslim (2b) residents of the U.S. felt dehumanized (by Trump,
32
33 Republicans, and majority Americans), and explored how these feelings were uniquely
34
35 associated (beyond feeling disliked) with feeling integrated into U.S. society and
36
37 consequential responses such as hostility, aggression, and the unwillingness to report
38
39 terrorism to law enforcement.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Study 1a

46 Method

47
48 **Participants.** We aimed to collect a large sample of participants, hoping to have
49
50 at least 300 non-Latino Americans. We thus collected data from 363 participants on
51
52 Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a reliable and diverse platform for subject
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 recruitment (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011), in August 2015. Participants were
4
5 recruited to participate in a survey about their “social and political attitudes”, and were
6
7 compensated \$.75 on mTurk for participating. Twenty Latino American participants and
8
9 one participant who did not report their ethnicity were excluded, leaving 342 non-Latino
10
11 American participants (M age = 33.10, SD = 10.43; 54.7% female; 237 White/Caucasian
12
13 American; 57 Asian American; 13 Black/African American; 2 Native American; 33
14
15 Other).

19 20 **Measures.**

21
22 Primary measures were assessed in the order described below, unless otherwise
23
24 specified.

25
26
27 **Political Conservatism** was measured using three items: economic and social
28
29 conservatism (1= *Liberal*; 7= *Conservative*) and party preference (1= *Strong Democrat*;
30
31 7= *Strong Republican*; α = .79).

32
33
34 Next, participants responded to measures assessing blatant dehumanization and
35
36 prejudice, which were presented in randomized order.

37
38
39 **Prejudice** was assessed using a feeling thermometer rating of Mexican
40
41 immigrants on a 0 (*very cold*) to 100 (*very warm*) scale (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses,
42
43 1993). Scores were reversed such that higher scores indicate greater prejudice. Other
44
45 groups assessed were Americans, Europeans, Arabs, Iranians, Muslims, Doctors, and
46
47 Welfare recipients.

48
49
50 **Blatant Dehumanization** was assessed as in Kteily et al. (2015, 2016).
51
52 Specifically, we created a composite formed from the (reverse-scored) rating of Mexican
53
54 immigrants on the 0-100 Ascent scale of blatant dehumanization (Kteily et al., 2015; see
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 Figure 1), and ratings of Mexican immigrants on nine items adapted from Bastian,
4 Denson, and Haslam (2013) that assess animalistic dehumanization. Specifically,
5 participants were asked to “Please rate how well the following terms describe Mexican
6 immigrants”, on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*) scale: “savage, aggressive”,
7 “backward, primitive”, “lacking morals”, “barbaric, cold-hearted”, “refined and cultured”
8 (reverse-coded), “rational and logical” (reverse-coded), “scientifically/technologically
9 advanced” (reverse-coded), “capable of self-control” (reverse-coded), and “mature,
10 responsible” (reverse-coded). Scores on these nine items were averaged ($\alpha = .82$; $M =$
11 3.47 , $SD = .95$) and standardized, and then combined with the standardized ratings of
12 Mexican immigrants on the Ascent scale ($M = 24.22$, $SD = 26.17$) to create a composite
13 of blatant dehumanization ($r = .48$, $p < .001$). We also obtained animalistic trait ratings
14 for the ingroup (i.e., Americans), as well as Ascent ratings for Americans, Europeans,
15 Arabs, Iranians, Muslims, Doctors, and Welfare recipients (see Supplemental Table 1).
16 Results reported below were similar if we computed prejudice and dehumanization as
17 (ingroup-outgroup) difference scores.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 ***Anti-Immigration Attitudes*** was assessed by asking participants to indicate their
40 agreement with a series of ten statements on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*)
41 scale. These statements reflected several related aspects of anti-immigration sentiment,
42 with an emphasis on illegal immigration from Mexico in particular (see Supplemental
43 Materials for full scale). These included a lack of sympathy for undocumented
44 immigrants (e.g., “Undocumented immigrants are just unfortunate people doing their best
45 under difficult circumstances” (reverse-coded)), the belief that immigrants pose a realistic
46 threat to Americans (e.g., “People are coming from all over that are killers and rapists and
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 they're coming into this country [illegally]"; "Cheap foreign labor holds down salaries,
4 keeps unemployment high, and makes it difficult for poor and working-class Americans
5 to earn a middle-class wage"), the belief that borders should be tightened and immigrants
6 expelled (e.g., "All these illegals need to be deported") and thinking that Mexico should
7 be held responsible (e.g., "The Mexican government has taken the U.S. to the cleaners.
8 They are responsible for this problem [illegal immigration] and they must help pay to
9 clean it up"). Several of these statements were direct quotes from Donald Trump
10 (including the second and last items listed above). One of the items, capturing hostility
11 towards and support for expulsion of immigrants, was assessed on a 0-100 scale: "Which
12 language do you think illegal immigrants understand better: the language of reason or the
13 language of detention and expulsion?" assessed on a 0 (*definitely the language of reason*)
14 to 100 (*definitely the language of detention and expulsion*) scale. All items were
15 converted to a 0 to 100 scale and averaged ($\alpha = .89$).¹

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 ***Anti-Immigrant Policy Support*** was assessed by asking participants to indicate
35 their support with each of six policies on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*)
36 scale. These focused on specific policy proposals intended to reduce immigration,
37 including via surveillance, exclusion, aggressive forms of detention, and deportation.
38 These policies were: "We should triple the number of Immigration and Customs
39 enforcement agents", "We need to build a wall to keep out illegal immigrants from
40 Mexico and elsewhere", "The U.S. should restrict visas to Mexicans", "Unless Mexico
41 pays for a wall to keep out immigrants, we should increase fees on all worker visas from
42 Mexico", "Illegal aliens apprehended crossing the border must be detained until they are
43 sent home, no more catch-and-release", and "Mexican immigrants caught crossing the
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58
59
60

¹ Excluding this item did not affect any of the conclusions.

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 border illegally should be kept in solitary confinement until they are deported”. Several
4
5 of these policies were taken directly from Donald Trump’s official immigration platform
6
7 (on his campaign website; see Supplemental Materials for further details). One further
8
9 item assessed support for deportation by asking participants whether those staying
10
11 illegally in the U.S. should receive (a) pathway to citizenship, (b) legal status, or (c)
12
13 deportation; participants were given a score of 0 if they chose either option (a) or (b), and
14
15 a score of 100 if they chose option c. All items were converted to a 0-100 scale and then
16
17 averaged ($\alpha = .92$).
18
19
20
21

22 ***Signing Anti-Immigration Petitions*** was assessed as in Kteily et al. (2015, 2016)
23
24 by giving participants the opportunity to actually sign in support of or opposition to each
25
26 of six petitions urging congress to implement the types of anti-immigration policies
27
28 assessed earlier. These were: “Urge congressional members to support building a wall
29
30 between the U.S. and Mexico”, “Urge congressional members to increase the number of
31
32 Immigration and Customs enforcement agents”, “Urge congressional members to
33
34 immediately deport any illegal immigrants captured” “Urge congressional members to
35
36 grant permanent residency to any illegal Mexican immigrants who have not committed
37
38 any crimes in the U.S.” (reverse-coded), “Urge congressional members to heavily restrict
39
40 the number of immigrant visas to the U.S.”, and “Urge congressional members to stop
41
42 automatically granting citizenship to the children of illegal immigrants who are born in
43
44 the U.S.”. Participants could choose to add their online signature in opposition to the
45
46 petition (coded as -1), choose not sign the petition (coded as 0), or choose to sign in
47
48 support of the petition (coded as +1) ($\alpha = .82$).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 **Candidate Support.** For exploratory purposes, we were interested in assessing the
5 extent to which dehumanization was associated with supporting several of the political
6 candidates for the U.S. presidency who were prominent at the time of data collection.
7
8 These items were assessed immediately after political conservatism. Specifically, we
9 asked participants to indicate the extent to which they supported each of the following
10 candidates on a 1 (*do not support at all*) to 7 (*strongly support*) scale (participants were
11 told not to respond for any candidate they were not aware of): Hillary Clinton, Bernie
12 Sanders, Donald Trump, Ted Cruz, Jeb Bush, Scott Walker, and Rand Paul.
13
14

15
16 Finally, we also assessed levels of intergroup contact with people of Mexican
17 background, and infrahumanization; these items are beyond the scope of the current work
18 and are not discussed further.²
19
20

21 **Results**

22 We observed high levels of prejudice and dehumanization towards Mexican
23 immigrants, as well as support for anti-immigration attitudes and policy support: For
24 example, on the feeling thermometer Mexican immigrants were rated almost 40 points
25 below the scale maximum, and on the Ascent scale of blatant dehumanization they were
26 rated almost 25 points below the scale maximum (see Supplemental Table 2 for full
27 variable descriptives and inter-correlations). By way of comparison, participants rated
28 Americans, on average, about 18 points higher than Mexican immigrants on the feeling
29 thermometer, and about 12 points higher on the Ascent scale (both of these ratings were
30 significantly higher than for Mexican immigrants; $ps < .001$).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55
56
57
58 ² Note that including infrahumanization in the analyses below does not alter the results.
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 Our central research interest was in assessing the unique association between
5 blatant dehumanization and anti-immigration attitudes and behavior. Thus, we conducted
6 a series of multiple regression analyses, in which we regressed each of our attitudinal
7 outcome measures (Anti-Immigration Attitudes; Anti-Immigrant Policy Support) and our
8 behavioral measure (Signing Anti-Immigrant Petitions) on blatant dehumanization,
9 controlling for political conservatism and prejudice.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Consistent with expectations (see Table 1), blatant dehumanization of Mexican
18 immigrants was uniquely associated with more support for the anti-immigration
19 statements and policies, controlling for levels of political conservatism and prejudice.
20 Thus, individuals who dehumanized Mexican immigrants to a greater extent were more
21 likely to cast them in threatening terms, withhold sympathy from them, and support
22 measures designed to send and keep them out, like surveillance, detention, expulsion, and
23 building a wall between the U.S. and Mexico. Importantly, these associations held not
24 only for individuals' expressed attitudes but also their behavior: individuals who
25 dehumanized Mexican immigrants to a greater extent were more likely to actually sign
26 petitions in favor of these policies, many of which were taken directly from Donald
27 Trump's campaign platform.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Finally, we assessed the association between blatant dehumanization of Mexican
44 immigrants and candidate support (see Table 2). In our analyses, we examined both zero-
45 order relationships between blatant dehumanization of Mexican immigrants and
46 candidate support, as well as results from a series of regressions in which we regressed
47 support for each candidate on dehumanization, controlling for prejudice and conservatism
48 (in order to isolate the dehumanization-specific associations).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 Interestingly, we observed that blatant dehumanization was correlated with
5 supporting each of the candidates, with the exception of Hillary Clinton. Specifically,
6 support for Bernie Sanders was associated with *less* dehumanization of Mexican
7 immigrants, whereas support for each of the Republican candidates (Donald Trump, Ted
8 Cruz, Jeb Bush, Scott Walker, and Rand Paul) was associated with greater
9 dehumanization. This was especially true when it came to Donald Trump: using Steiger's
10 (1980) test for differences in dependent correlations among the 282 participants who
11 provided data for all candidates, we found that the relationship between dehumanization
12 of Mexican immigrants and candidate support was stronger for Donald Trump than for
13 any of the other Republican candidates (all z s > 3.57, p s < .001).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 These patterns were similar when controlling for conservatism and prejudice,
28 especially with respect to the Republican candidates. We observed no unique association
29 between dehumanization and supporting Bernie Sanders, and a positive association with
30 supporting Hillary Clinton (a suppressor variable effect, given that there was no zero-
31 order correlation). On the other hand, dehumanization positively predicted support for
32 each of the Republican candidates, with the exception of Rand Paul. Again, this
33 relationship was numerically higher for Donald Trump.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Discussion**

44 Study 1a highlighted the relevance of blatant dehumanization to anti-Mexican
45 immigration attitudes and policies, beyond political conservatism and prejudice. Those
46 who dehumanized Mexican immigrants to a greater extent were significantly more likely
47 to endorse firm measures (many taken directly from Donald Trump's actual campaign
48 platform) to restrict immigration, such as tightening border control and the detention and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3
4 expulsion of existing illegal immigrants. Moreover, our findings suggest that support for
5
6 the Republican candidates, and particularly for Donald Trump, is associated with blatant
7
8 dehumanization of Mexican immigrants. In Study 1b, we extended our examination to
9
10 blatant dehumanization of a second outgroup that has been the target of Republican
11
12 candidate rhetoric and policy proposals: Muslims.
13
14

15 Study 1b

17 Method

18
19
20 **Participants.** As in Study 1a, we aimed to collect a large sample of participants.
21
22 We thus collected data from 463 participants on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (mTurk), a
23
24 reliable and diverse platform for subject recruitment (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling,
25
26 2011), in December 2015. Participants were recruited to participate in a survey about
27
28 their "social and political attitudes", and were compensated \$1 on mTurk for
29
30 participating. Six participants reported being Muslim and two participants did not report
31
32 their religion. These participants were thus excluded, leaving 455 non-Muslim residents
33
34 of the U.S. (M age = 34.15, SD = 10.54; 50.9% female; 332 White/Caucasian American;
35
36 36 Asian American; 49 Black/African American; 26 Hispanic American; 6 Native
37
38 American; 6 Other).
39
40
41
42

43 Measures.

44
45
46 Primary measures were assessed in the order described below, unless otherwise
47
48 specified.
49

50
51 **Political Conservatism** was measured using two items from Study 1a: economic
52
53 and social conservatism ($r = .63, p < .001$).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 Next, we assessed prejudice and blatant dehumanization, presented in randomized
4
5 order.
6

7
8 *Prejudice* was assessed as in Study 1a, here with respect to Muslims. Other target
9
10 groups were Americans, Europeans, Arabs, Swedes, Nigerians, and Muslim refugees.

11
12 *Blatant Dehumanization* was assessed as in Study 1a, here with respect to
13
14 Muslims. Scores on the nine animalistic traits were averaged ($\alpha = .94$; $M = 3.84$, $SD =$
15
16 1.41) and standardized, and then averaged with the standardized reverse-scored ratings of
17
18 Muslims on the Ascent scale ($M = 26.59$, $SD = 29.34$) to create a composite of blatant
19
20 dehumanization ($r = .67$, $p < .001$). We also obtained Ascent ratings for the groups
21
22 included in the prejudice rating scale (see Supplemental Table 3), and ratings on the set
23
24 of animalistic trait ratings for the ingroup (i.e., Americans). Results were consistent if we
25
26 computed prejudice and dehumanization as (ingroup-outgroup) difference scores. As in
27
28 Study 1a, infrahumanization was measured but did not affect interpretation of the results
29
30 and is not discussed further.
31
32
33
34

35
36 Next, participants responded to statements assessing their anti-Muslim attitudes
37
38 and policy support, assessed in randomized order.
39

40
41 *Anti-Muslim Attitudes* was assessed by asking participants to indicate their
42
43 agreement with six statements reflecting a perception of Muslims as a threat to American
44
45 security on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale: “Muslims are a potential
46
47 cancer to this country”, “Muslims are looking to hurt Americans the first chance they
48
49 get”, “A significant number of Muslims in the U.S. secretly support ISIS”, “The attacks
50
51 in San Bernardino prove it: Muslims are a threat to people from this country”, “Those
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 who stand behind Muslims are putting everyone at risk”, and “Those who stand behind
4
5 Muslims in this country are betraying their fellow Americans” ($\alpha = .98$).
6
7

8 *Anti-Muslim Policy Support* was assessed by asking participants to indicate
9
10 their support with each of nine policies targeting Muslims on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7
11
12 (*strongly agree*) scale. These policies ranged from restricting Muslim entry to the U.S.
13
14 (“We should stop giving out visas to Muslims to enter the U.S.”; “We need to stop
15
16 accepting Muslim refugees into this country, period”; “No more political correctness:
17
18 Muslim refugees need to go”), to imposing surveillance on Muslims in the U.S. (“We
19
20 should tap the phones of any Muslims in the U.S. who make calls to Middle Eastern
21
22 countries on a frequent basis”; “We should institute a database that keeps track of
23
24 Muslims in this country”), and restricting the religious freedom of Muslims in the U.S.
25
26 (“We should ban the opening of any new Mosques in this country”; “We should ban the
27
28 wearing of the Islamic veil (or ‘headdress’)”; “We should allow Muslims to practice their
29
30 religion with no restrictions in the U.S.” (reverse-coded)) ($\alpha = .96$). As in Study 1a,
31
32 several of these policies were adapted from Donald Trump’s campaign statements (see
33
34 Supplemental Materials for further details).
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Signing Anti-Muslim Petitions* was assessed as in Study 1a, by giving
41
42 participants the opportunity to actually sign six petitions urging congressional members
43
44 to implement the types of policies described above. These were: “Urge congressional
45
46 members to deny entry to any Muslim refugees who seek to come to the U.S.”, “Urge
47
48 congressional members to deny welfare benefits to any Muslim refugees who enter the
49
50 U.S.”, “Urge congressional members to increase federal spending on investigating the
51
52 background of refugees from Muslim countries”, “Urge congressional members to
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 support a ban on visas to Muslims”, “Urge congressional members to introduce
4
5 surveillance programs targeting Mosques in the U.S.”, and “Urge congressional members
6
7 to create a database to track Muslims in the U.S.” ($\alpha = .93$).
8
9

10 Next, we assessed anti-Islamic extremism fund disbursement and support for
11
12 Arab immigration, which were presented in randomized order.
13
14

15 *Anti-Islamic Extremism Fund Disbursement* was assessed using a measure
16
17 adapted from Kteily et al. (2015), in which participants were asked to distribute funds
18
19 proportionally between two different programs aimed at decreasing extremism in Muslim
20
21 communities in the U.S.: one based on punishment and control and the other based on
22
23 education and outreach. Specifically, participants read: “In an effort to give back to some
24
25 of the communities that are targets of our studies, we have received a small grant that
26
27 allows us to distribute some money to anti-terrorism efforts. We're giving each of our
28
29 participants the opportunity to decide where this money should be distributed. Please
30
31 indicate below what percent of the money you would like distributed to each of the
32
33 projects in the U.S. — we will then base our contributions on participants'
34
35 recommendations. Please make sure that the choices add up to 100%” Participants could
36
37 then allocated funds in any proportion to either of the following two options: “Build
38
39 libraries and schools in Muslim majority communities throughout the U.S.”, and
40
41 “Increase surveillance and policing capabilities in Muslim majority communities
42
43 throughout the U.S.”. We took the proportion of funds distributed to surveillance and
44
45 policing as our dependent variable.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Support for Arab Immigration* was assessed using an item adapted from Kteily et
54
55 al. (2015), in which we examined the percentage of immigration visas that participants
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 would be willing to grant to Arabs (participants could distribute a limited number of visas
4
5 in any proportion to Arabs, Mexicans, Chinese, Western Europeans, Russians, and
6
7 Vietnamese).

8
9
10 *Candidate Support* was assessed as in Study 1a, but towards the candidates most
11 prominent at the time of the study: Hillary Clinton, Bernie Sanders, Donald Trump, Ted
12 Cruz, Jeb Bush, Ben Carson, Rand Paul, Carly Fiorina, Chris Christie, and Marco Rubio.
13
14 Participants were told not to respond to a particular candidate if they were not aware of
15
16 them. These items were assessed immediately after political conservatism.

17
18
19
20
21
22 Beyond the main variables described above, we also assessed participants' media
23 consumption. These items are beyond the scope of the current work and are not discussed
24 further. We also assessed non-Muslim Americans' own sense of being dehumanized (i.e.,
25 meta-dehumanization) and disliked (i.e., meta-prejudice) by Muslims. Although our
26
27 focus here is on non-Muslim Americans' dehumanization of Muslims (rather than their
28
29 own sense of being dehumanized), the results from these items replicate the findings of
30
31 Kteily et al. (2016): Specifically, non-Muslim Americans who felt dehumanized by
32
33 Muslims were more likely to themselves dehumanize Muslims (see Supplemental
34
35 Materials for full analyses). Moreover, including meta-dehumanization and meta-
36
37 prejudice as covariates does not change the interpretation of the analyses reported below.

38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 **Results**

46
47
48 As in Study 1a, we observed high levels of prejudice and dehumanization towards
49
50 Muslims. Muslims were rated approximately 50 points below the scale maximum on the
51
52 feeling thermometer, and almost 30 points below the scale maximum on the Ascent scale
53
54 of blatant dehumanization (see Supplemental Table 4 for full variable descriptives and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 inter-correlations). By way of comparison, participants rated Americans, on average,
4
5 about 27 points higher than Muslims on the feeling thermometer, and about 16 points
6
7 higher on the Ascent scale (both of these ratings were significantly higher than for
8
9 Muslims; $ps < .001$).

10
11
12 As in Study 1a, we conducted a series of multiple regression analyses, regressing
13
14 each of the attitudinal (anti-Muslim attitudes, anti-Muslim policy support, and support for
15
16 Arab immigration) and behavioral (anti-Islamic extremism fund disbursement, and
17
18 signing anti-Muslim petitions) outcome measures on the blatant dehumanization of
19
20 Muslims, controlling for political conservatism and anti-Muslim prejudice. As with the
21
22 results in Study 1a, we observed that blatant dehumanization was uniquely associated
23
24 with each of the aggressive attitudes and behaviors, with the exception here of support for
25
26 Arab immigration (see Table 3). Thus, controlling for prejudice and conservatism, non-
27
28 Muslim residents of the U.S. who dehumanized Muslims to a greater extent were more
29
30 likely to cast them in threatening terms, and endorse policies such as increasing
31
32 surveillance of Muslims, restricting their entry into the U.S., and restricting their religious
33
34 freedoms. Importantly, and as with Study 1a, this pattern extended not only to
35
36 participants' reported attitudes, but also to their actions, with those dehumanizing
37
38 Muslims to a greater extent more likely to actually sign anti-Muslim petitions and divert
39
40 funds to policing Muslim communities rather than investing in their education. Again,
41
42 many of the policies examined were taken directly from policy proposals endorsed by
43
44 Donald Trump as part of his campaign for the Republican nomination.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Next, we examined the association between blatant dehumanization and candidate
54
55 support, looking both at zero-order relationships as well as regression coefficients from
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 analyses in which candidate support was regressed on blatant dehumanization controlling
4
5 for prejudice and conservatism. As can be seen in Table 4, the pattern of results was
6
7 similar to that from Study 1a. Specifically, in zero-order terms, blatant dehumanization of
8
9 Muslims was negatively correlated with support for the Democratic candidates (here,
10
11 both Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders), and positively correlated with support for all of
12
13 the Republican candidates. As in Study 1a, blatant dehumanization of Muslims was more
14
15 strongly correlated with support for Donald Trump than any of the other Republican
16
17 candidates (all Steiger's z s > 3.32 , $ps < .001$). When controlling for conservatism and
18
19 prejudice (i.e., examining regression coefficients rather than zero-order correlations), we
20
21 observed a negative association between dehumanization and supporting Bernie Sanders,
22
23 but no association with support for Hillary Clinton. On the other hand, dehumanization
24
25 significantly predicted greater support for Donald Trump, Ted Cruz, Jeb Bush, Ben
26
27 Carson, and Marco Rubio (the associations with support for Carly Fiorina, Chris Christie,
28
29 and Rand Paul were nonsignificant). Controlling for conservatism and prejudice,
30
31 dehumanization of Muslims was numerically most strongly associated with support for
32
33 Donald Trump, but comparable in magnitude to support for Ted Cruz and Jeb Bush.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Discussion**

42
43 The results of Study 1b converge with the results of Study 1a to suggest that
44
45 blatant dehumanization is a potent predictor of aggressive intergroup attitudes and
46
47 behavior towards marginalized groups in the U.S. Notably, the policies we examine are
48
49 far from hypothetical: most were directly pulled from Republican candidate platforms
50
51 and speeches. Indeed, our data suggest a striking association between anti-Muslim
52
53 dehumanization and support for several of the Republican political candidates (including
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 the eventual nominee, Donald Trump), even controlling for dislike of Muslims and
4
5 political conservatism.
6

7
8 In Studies 2a and 2b, we examined the other side of the dehumanization equation,
9
10 by investigating the extent to which Latino and Muslim Americans *felt* dehumanized, and
11
12 how this ‘meta-dehumanization’ (Kteily et al., 2016) was associated with their own
13
14 attitudes and behavioral intentions. In Study 2a, we examined perceptions of being
15
16 dehumanized by Donald Trump and Republicans among Latino residents of the U.S. In
17
18 Study 2b, we examined meta-dehumanization with respect to Donald Trump and non-
19
20 Muslim Americans among Muslim residents of the U.S.
21
22
23

24 Study 2a

25 Method

26
27 **Method**

28
29 **Participants.** As in earlier studies, we aimed to collect a large sample of
30
31 participants. We recruited participants through the Instantly (previously uSamp) data
32
33 collection service in September 2015 (see also Aribarg, Arora, Henderson, & Kim, 2014;
34
35 Cacioppo, Cacioppo, Gonzaga, Ogburn, & VanderWeele, 2013). Participants first
36
37 completed a prescreening questionnaire, which asked participants to report their ethnicity
38
39 and whether they were born in the U.S. The prescreening also included an attention
40
41 check. Consistent with the sample we requested from Instantly, only individuals who
42
43 selected that they were native-born Latinos and who passed the initial attention check (n
44
45 = 354) proceeded to the survey. Of these, 307 completed the survey, 283 of whom
46
47 correctly responded to a second attention check embedded near the end of the survey, and
48
49 thus comprised our final sample (M age = 34.25, SD = 12.46; 68.6% female).
50
51
52

53 **Measures.**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 Primary measures were assessed in the order described below, unless otherwise
4 specified.
5

6
7
8 ***Political Conservatism*** was measured as in Study 1a ($\alpha = .83$).
9

10 Next, participants responded to measures assessing meta-dehumanization and
11 meta-prejudice (presented in randomized order), as well as measures assessing
12 dehumanization and prejudice (also presented in randomized order). The order of the
13 block containing meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice and the block containing
14 dehumanization and prejudice was counterbalanced.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ***Meta-Dehumanization (Trump)*** was measured by using five items adapted from
23 Kteily et al. (2016) assessing the extent to which participants felt dehumanized by Donald
24 Trump (e.g., “Donald Trump sees people from Latino background as sub-human”;
25 “Donald Trump thinks of people from Latino background as animal-like”; see
26 Supplemental Materials for full scale). Responses were assessed on a 1 (*strongly*
27 *disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ($\alpha = .96$).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 ***Meta-Dehumanization (Republicans)*** was measured using the same five items
37 used to assess Trump meta-dehumanization, but here referring to Republicans (e.g.
38 “Republicans see people from Latino background as sub-human”) ($\alpha = .96$).
39
40
41
42

43 ***Meta-Prejudice (Trump)***. In order to distinguish feelings of being dehumanized
44 from feelings of being *disliked* by Trump, we also assessed meta-prejudice using five
45 items adapted from Kteily et al. (2016) (e.g., “Donald Trump doesn’t like people from
46 Latino background much”; see Supplemental Materials for full scale) ($\alpha = .96$).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2

3 *Meta-Prejudice (Republicans)* was assessed using the same five items used to
4 assess Trump meta-prejudice, but with reference to Republicans (e.g., “Supporters of the
5 Republican Party feel cold towards people from Latino background”) ($\alpha = .94$).
6
7

8 *Blatant Dehumanization (Trump)* was assessed as in Studies 1a and 1b, using a
9 composite of the (reverse-coded) standardized rating of Trump on the Ascent scale ($M =$
10 50.64, $SD = 38.61$), as well as the standardized average of ratings of Trump on a series of
11 (here, seven) animalistic traits ($\alpha = .79$; $M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.30$).
12
13

14 *Blatant Dehumanization (Republicans)* was assessed as for Trump, but here with
15 reference to supporters of the Republican Party: (reverse-scored) Ascent scale ratings ($M =$
16 34.57, $SD = 31.33$); animalistic trait ratings ($\alpha = .71$; $M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.09$). Participants
17 were also asked to provide Ascent ratings for the ingroup and several other groups (see
18 Supplemental Table 5), and animalistic trait ratings for the ingroup.
19

20 *Prejudice (Trump and Republicans)* was assessed as in Studies 1a and 1b, here
21 using (reverse-scored) feeling thermometer ratings. We computed prejudice separately
22 for Donald Trump and supporters of the Republican Party. We also had feeling
23 thermometer ratings for the same groups assessed on the Ascent scale.
24
25

26 Next, participants responded to questions assessing emotional hostility towards
27 Trump and Republicans, punitiveness towards Trump and support for policies against
28 him, and anti-Republican Party attitudes. These questions were presented in randomized
29 order. Finally, participants reported their support for various political candidates.
30

31 *Emotional Hostility (Trump and Republicans)* was assessed by asking
32 participants to report the extent to which they felt a number of emotions – “Anger”,
33 “Disgust”, “Contempt”, “Revulsion”, “Respect”, and “Compassion” – separately for
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 Donald Trump and supporters of the Republican Party. The last two emotions were
4
5 reverse-coded. Responses were provided on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*) scale
6
7
8 (Trump: $\alpha = .71$; Republicans: $\alpha = .71$).
9

10 ***Anti-Trump Policy Support*** was assessed by asking participants to indicate the
11
12 extent to which they endorsed four separate actions targeted at Trump (e.g., “Donald
13
14 Trump should be banned from appearing on any Latino media platforms, such as
15
16 Univision”; “I support a boycott of Donald Trump’s businesses by those in the Latino
17
18 community”; see Supplemental Materials for full scale). Responses were provided on a 1
19
20 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ($\alpha = .91$).
21
22
23

24 ***Punitiveness towards Trump*** was assessed by asking participants to indicate the
25
26 extent to which they agreed with seven statements reflecting a desire for Trump to suffer
27
28 greatly (e.g., “It would give me great pleasure if Donald Trump got seriously sick”; “If I
29
30 could, I would spit in the face of Donald Trump”; “Donald Trump deserves to rot in
31
32 hell”; see Supplemental Materials for full scale). Responses were provided on a 1
33
34 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ($\alpha = .92$).
35
36
37

38 ***Anti-Republican Party Attitudes*** was assessed with four items (e.g., “I would
39
40 never vote for the Republican Party”; “It would give me great pleasure if the Republican
41
42 Party fell apart entirely”; see Supplemental Materials for full scale). Responses were
43
44 provided on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ($\alpha = .88$).
45
46
47

48 ***Candidate Support.*** As in prior studies, we examined support for the political
49
50 candidates that were most prominent at the time of the study on a 1 (*do not support at all*)
51
52 to 7 (*strongly support*) scale. Targets included: Hillary Clinton, Bernie Sanders, Donald
53
54 Trump, Ted Cruz, Jeb Bush, Scott Walker, Rand Paul, and Mike Huckabee.
55
56
57
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

We also had a measure of social dominance orientation (Ho et al., 2015), which we did not include in the analyses because it was not available in the other studies (including it did not change any of the conclusions reported below). We also included a number of exploratory measures: perceptions of the degree of overlap between Trump and the Republican Party, endorsement of the idea that Latino Americans should stick together to achieve gains, and questions assessing whether Latinos cared more about being liked or respected. These items are beyond the scope of the current manuscript and are not discussed further.

Results

Variable descriptives and inter-correlations can be found in Supplemental Tables 6a and 6b.

As in Kteily et al. (2016), we first conducted a factor analysis on the items assessing meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice to examine whether these two constructs were indeed distinct. We did this separately for the items focusing on (meta-perceptions about) each of Trump and the Republican Party. Consistent with earlier work (Kteily et al., 2016), we observed that meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice produced two (correlated) factors. With respect to Trump, the first factor (eigenvalue = 7.53; 75% of variance explained) reflected meta-prejudice and the second factor (eigenvalue = 1.13, 11.31% of variance explained) reflected meta-dehumanization. With respect to the Republican Party, the first factor reflected meta-prejudice (eigenvalue = 7.40, 74% of variance explained) and the second factor (eigenvalue = 1.01, 10.05% of variance

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

explained) reflected meta-dehumanization. For both targets, we observed no cross-loadings across factors (using a factor pattern loading cut-off of .30).³

We next examined mean levels of meta-prejudice and meta-dehumanization with respect to each of Donald Trump and the Republican Party. With respect to Donald Trump, we observed high levels of meta-prejudice ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.66$) and meta-dehumanization ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.85$). With respect to the Republican Party, meta-prejudice ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.58$) and meta-dehumanization ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.78$) were slightly lower than was true for Donald Trump ($ps < .001$). Moreover, for both targets, levels of meta-dehumanization were (unsurprisingly) lower than levels of meta-prejudice ($ps < .001$). Nevertheless, levels of meta-dehumanization were still above the scale midpoint with respect to both targets (Trump: $t(256) = 8.46$, $p < .001$; Supporters of Republican Party: $t(279) = 2.19$, $p = .03$), suggesting that Latino residents of the U.S., on average, felt that they were heavily dehumanized by both targets.

We were centrally interested in examining the extent to which meta-dehumanization was associated with hostile attitudes and intentions towards the 'offending' targets (Trump and Republicans), controlling for meta-prejudice and political conservatism. To that end, we conducted a separate series of multiple regression analyses, separately for each of the targets. Specifically, when examining attitudes about Donald Trump, we regressed each of our (Trump-specific) outcome measures (e.g., prejudice towards Trump; punitiveness towards Trump) on our scales assessing meta-

³ We used .3 as a cutoff based on a desire to conduct a relatively conservative test of the separation of the two factors in our factor analyses (i.e., we set a low threshold for reporting any cross-loading across factors). Although there is a debate about what constitutes a very low factor loading, many (e.g., Field, 2005; Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988; MacCallum et al., 2001) advocate factor pattern loadings as high as .60 or .70 and others (e.g., Stevens, 1992) suggest factor loadings of at least .40 to be interpretable.

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3
4 dehumanization and meta-prejudice with respect to Trump. When examining attitudes
5
6 about the Republican Party, we similarly regressed each our (Republican Party-specific)
7
8 outcome measures (e.g., prejudice; anti-Republican Party attitudes) on our scales
9
10 assessing meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice with respect to the Republican Party.
11
12 As in previous studies, we controlled for political conservatism in all of our analyses.
13
14

15 Beginning with Donald Trump (see Table 5a), we observed that Latino residents
16
17 of the U.S. who felt dehumanized by Donald Trump were more likely to themselves
18
19 dehumanize and report feeling emotionally hostile towards Trump, and more likely
20
21 support anti-Trump policies like endorsing boycotts of his businesses. The same was
22
23 (independently) true for meta-prejudice, which was associated with each of these
24
25 outcomes, as well as with anti-Trump prejudice. When it came to especially punitive
26
27 attitudes towards Trump (such as hoping that he got seriously ill), meta-dehumanization
28
29 was a significant predictor whereas meta-prejudice was not significantly associated.
30
31
32
33
34 Meta-dehumanization played a similarly important role with respect to the Republican
35
36 Party (see Table 5b). Latino residents of the U.S. who felt dehumanized by the
37
38 Republican Party were more likely to themselves dehumanize supporters of the
39
40 Republican Party, feel emotionally hostile towards them, and express attitudes such as
41
42 hoping that the Republican Party fell apart. In sum, then, we observed strong support
43
44 among Latino residents of the U.S. for the idea that feeling dehumanized by a target is
45
46 associated with hostile attitudes and intentions towards that target.
47
48
49

50 Examining members of majority groups, Kteily et al. (2016) observed that part of
51
52 the association between feeling dehumanized and aggressive outcomes such as
53
54 punitiveness and emotional hostility was indirect, mediated via outgroup dehumanization
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 and outgroup prejudice. That is, their analyses suggested that part of the reason that those
4
5 who feel dehumanized by a target endorse hostile actions towards that target is because
6
7 they are more likely to dislike and dehumanize them. We examined this same process
8
9 here, among our minority Latino participants. Specifically, we examined whether meta-
10
11 dehumanization and our hostile outcome measures were indirectly linked via each of
12
13 dehumanization and prejudice, controlling for meta-prejudice and conservatism (see
14
15 Figure 2 for an example). Again, we did this separately for each of our targets (i.e.,
16
17 Donald Trump and the Republican Party). Analyses were conducted using Hayes' (2013)
18
19 PROCESS macro (Model 4) with 10,000 bootstrap resamples. Results of these analyses
20
21 can be found in Tables 6a and 6b.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Consistent with Kteily et al. (2016), but here with members of minority groups,
28
29 we observed support for significant indirect effects from meta-dehumanization to
30
31 hostility via dehumanization across all outcome measures, for both targets (i.e., Trump
32
33 and the Republican Party). For example, part of the link between feeling dehumanized by
34
35 Trump and endorsing punitive attitudes towards him (e.g., saying one would spit on him
36
37 if they could) was accounted for by participants' own dehumanization of Trump.
38
39 Similarly, dehumanization of the Republican Party accounted for part of the link between
40
41 feeling dehumanized by the Republican Party and outcomes like saying that one would
42
43 never vote for them (i.e., anti-Republican Party attitudes). In contrast, we found no
44
45 evidence of indirect effects from meta-dehumanization to our outcome measures via
46
47 prejudice, for either target.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Finally, as an exploratory analysis, we assessed the extent to which feeling
54
55 dehumanized by Donald Trump and the Republican Party was associated with candidate
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 support (see Supplemental Tables 7a and 7b). We observed that feeling dehumanized by
4
5 Trump and supporters of the Republican Party was positively correlated with support for
6
7 Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders (i.e., the Democratic nominees). Feeling
8
9 dehumanized by Trump was also associated with less support for him. The only other
10
11 significant associations were (unexpected) modest positive correlations between feeling
12
13 dehumanized by supporters of the Republican Party and support for Rand Paul and Scott
14
15 Walker.⁴
16
17
18
19

20 Discussion

21
22 In sum, the results of Study 2a show that Latino residents of the U.S.— one of the
23
24 groups regularly on the receiving end of dehumanizing rhetoric in the U.S. during the
25
26 2016 election cycle—perceived that their group is strongly dehumanized in the eyes of
27
28 Republicans, and especially Donald Trump. Moreover, this perception had important
29
30 consequences: meta-dehumanization was associated with a range of aggressive reactions,
31
32 including emotional hostility and endorsement of punitive measures, such as hoping that
33
34 the Republican Party falls apart and wishing Trump harm. Furthermore, we found support
35
36 for the idea that part of the link between feeling dehumanized by a target and support for
37
38 hostile responses towards them was mediated by participants' own dehumanization of the
39
40 'offending' target, consistent with prior work among majority group members (Kteily et
41
42 al., 2016). In Study 2b, we examined similar questions among a subset of people who
43
44 have also been vilified during the presidential primary season: Muslims.
45
46
47
48
49

50 Study 2b

51 Method

52
53
54
55
56
57 ⁴ We did not control in these analyses for meta-prejudice and conservatism because doing so tended to
58 cause suppressor variable effects.
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

Participants. As in earlier studies, we aimed to collect a large sample of participants, this time through snowball sampling. A link to our survey was initially distributed via the mailing list of a non-governmental organization serving Muslim residents of the U.S. Participants were offered a \$5 online gift card for their participation, and were encouraged to pass along the survey link to other Muslim residents of the U.S. they knew. Data collection was stopped after the response rate slowed. Of the 233 Muslim respondents, 203 completed the survey. We restricted our sample to participants who correctly answered an attention check question embedded within the survey ($N = 124$ participants; M age = 29.92, $SD = 9.22$; 58.1% female). Primary conclusions were not affected if participants who failed the attention check question were included in the analyses.

Measures.

Primary measures were assessed in the order described below, unless otherwise specified.

Political Conservatism was measured as in Study 2a ($\alpha = .80$).

Next, participants responded to measures assessing meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice (presented in randomized order), as well as measures assessing dehumanization. The order of the block containing meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice and the block containing dehumanization was counterbalanced.

Meta-Dehumanization (Trump) was measured as in Study 2a ($\alpha = .94$).

Meta-Dehumanization (Americans) was measured as for Donald Trump, but here with respect to non-Muslim Americans (e.g. “Non-Muslims Americans think of people from Muslim background as subhuman”; $\alpha = .92$).

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2

3 *Meta-Prejudice (Trump)* was assessed as in Study 2a ($\alpha = .94$).
4

5 *Meta-Prejudice (Americans)* was assessed using the same five items as for
6 Donald Trump, but with reference to non-Muslim Americans ($\alpha = .93$).
7

8 *Blatant Dehumanization (Trump)* was assessed using ratings of Trump on a
9 series of the same seven animalistic traits as in Study 2a ($\alpha = .83$). We also included
10 animalistic trait ratings of the ingroup. We did not have animalistic trait ratings of non-
11 Muslim Americans, nor did we have Ascent scale ratings for any groups.
12

13 Next, participants responded to items assessing anti-Trump policy support and
14 feelings of integration into the U.S., presented in randomized order.
15

16 *Anti-Trump Policy Support* was assessed as in Study 2a, with items adapted for
17 relevance to Muslims (see Supplemental Materials for full scale) ($\alpha = .74$).
18

19 *Integration into U.S.* was assessed by asking participants to indicate their
20 agreement with a range of five items designed to capture the extent to which they felt
21 integrated into, and happy in, the U.S.: “As a Muslim, I feel integrated into the
22 mainstream of American society”, “As a Muslim, I feel like an important part of the
23 American social fabric”, “As a Muslim, I feel that if I work hard, I can succeed in
24 American society”, “As a Muslim, I feel proud to be a part of America”, and “As a
25 Muslim, I feel disenchanted with life in America”. Responses were provided on a 1
26 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ($\alpha = .71$).
27

28 Next, participants responded to items assessing their perceived and desired
29 overlap with Americans, as well as their belief in the idea of a clash of civilizations.
30 These items were presented in randomized order.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Perceived Overlap was assessed by providing participants with a series of 7 images, each with a small circle, labeled ‘you’, and a larger circle, labeled ‘group’, in progressively closer arrangement with each other (adapted from the inclusion of ingroup in self scale; Wright, Aron, & Tropp, 2002); participants chose the image that best represented their relationship to Americans, on a scale of 1 (*distant*) to 7 (*full overlap*). Separately, participants filled out the same item for the ingroup (computing perceived overlap as a difference score yielded similar conclusions).

Desired Overlap was assessed using the same images presented for perceived overlap, but here with instructions to indicate how close/integrated they would *like to be* with Americans. Separately, participants filled out the same item for the ingroup (computing desired overlap as a difference score yielded similar conclusions).

Belief in Clash of Civilizations was assessed by asking participants to indicate their agreement with the following statement: “How strongly do you agree or disagree with the idea that there is an inherent ‘clash of civilizations’ between the values of the West and the values of Islam?” Responses were provided on a 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*) scale.

Next, participants responded to items assessing their emotional hostility.

Emotional Hostility was assessed by asking participants to indicate how much “anger” and “disgust” they felt when they thought about how they were perceived by non-Muslim Americans ($r = .69, p < .001$). We also assessed how much they felt “Frustrated”, “Hopeful”, “Loving”, and “Grateful”. Because these items did not as clearly reflect emotional hostility, they were not included, but a composite using all six items (with the last three items reverse-coded) yielded consistent conclusions.

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

Next, participants responded to items assessing their support for violent collective action and their willingness to report terrorism to law enforcement, presented in randomized order.

Support for Violent Collective Action was assessed by giving participants the following prompt:

In the 1960s, African Americans were faced with two main approaches to gaining civil rights, each supported by two of the most famous leaders in American history: Martin Luther King, and Malcolm X. On the one hand, King advocated active non-violent resistance, and on the other hand, Malcolm X advocated resistance to White aggression “by any means necessary”. How strongly do you support each of these approaches to support Muslim civil rights in the U.S. today?

Participants indicated their approval for “King’s nonviolent approach” and “Malcolm X’s ‘by any means necessary’ approach” on separate 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Completely*) scales.

In order to assess support for violent (vs. non-violent) forms of collective actions, we computed a difference score, subtracting endorsement of the MLK approach from endorsement of the Malcolm X approach.

Willingness to Report Terrorism was assessed by asking participants to indicate their endorsement of four items reflecting a willingness to cooperate with American authorities to report suspicious activities in their neighborhoods. The first two items were “How willing are you to cooperate with the police to prevent terrorism?” and “How willing are you to report terrorism-related risks?” The second two items were preceded by the following prompt, intended to capture some of the real-world tradeoffs involved in reporting terrorism:

Tipping off American law enforcement about suspicious activity related to terrorism poses risks to Muslims in the U.S.: the suspicion could represent a legitimate threat, so reporting could save lives. But the suspicion also

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3 may be nothing, which would leave the community open to an over-
4 reaction by law enforcement.
5
6

7 Subsequently, participants were asked “In general, how willing are you to cooperate with
8 American authorities to prevent terrorism” and “If you had a mild suspicion about a
9 fellow Muslim in your community who might be a threat, how likely would you be to
10 report a potential risk to law enforcement?” Responses were provided on a 1 (*not at all*)
11 to 7 (*very much so*) scale ($\alpha = .87$).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Finally, we included exploratory items assessing perceived overlap between the
19 views of Donald Trump and each of Americans as a group and the Republican Party,
20 support for the Republican Party, and endorsement of the idea that Muslim Americans
21 should stick together to achieve gains. These items were not part of our main analyses for
22 this manuscript and are not discussed further.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Results**

31
32 Variable descriptives and inter-correlations can be found in Supplemental Tables
33 8a and 8b.
34
35
36

37 As in Study 2a, we conducted factor analyses on the items assessing meta-
38 dehumanization and meta-prejudice, separately for each of our two targets (Trump and
39 non-Muslim Americans). Consistent with the results of Study 2a, we observed that meta-
40 dehumanization and meta-prejudice produced two separate (correlated) factors for each
41 target: With respect to Trump, the first factor (eigenvalue = 6.69; 67% of variance
42 explained) reflected meta-dehumanization and the second factor (eigenvalue = 1.45,
43 14.5% of variance explained) reflected meta-prejudice. With respect to non-Muslim
44 Americans, the first factor (eigenvalue = 5.87, 59% of variance explained) reflected
45 meta-prejudice and the second factor (eigenvalue = 1.86, 18.6% of variance explained)
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 reflected meta-dehumanization. For non-Muslim Americans, we observed no cross-
4 loadings across factors (using a factor pattern loading cut-off of .30). For Donald Trump,
5 one item from the meta-prejudice factor (“Donald Trump doesn’t like people from
6 Muslim backgrounds much”) also loaded weakly (factor pattern loading= .37) on the
7 meta-dehumanization factor, but was not included in computing the meta-dehumanization
8 composite.
9

10 We next examined mean levels of meta-prejudice and meta-dehumanization with
11 respect to each of Donald Trump and non-Muslim Americans. Beginning with Donald
12 Trump, we observed high levels of meta-prejudice ($M = 6.15$, $SD = 1.27$) and meta-
13 dehumanization ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.45$). With respect to non-Muslim Americans, meta-
14 prejudice ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.31$) and meta-dehumanization ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.45$) were
15 lower than was true for Donald Trump ($ps < .001$). Moreover, for both targets, levels of
16 meta-dehumanization were (unsurprisingly) lower than levels of meta-prejudice ($ps <$
17 $.001$). Nevertheless, levels of meta-dehumanization were still at or above the scale
18 midpoint in both cases (non-Muslim Americans: $t(123) = .30$, $p = .77$; Trump: $t(123) =$
19 12.73 , $p < .001$), suggesting that, on average, our sample of Muslims residents in the U.S.
20 felt strongly disliked and dehumanized by both Trump and non-Muslim Americans more
21 broadly.
22

23 As in Study 2a, we were centrally interested in examining the extent to which
24 meta-dehumanization was associated with hostile views towards the ‘offending’ targets.
25 To that end, we conducted a series of multiple regression analyses separately for each
26 target, regressing our outcome variables on meta-dehumanization, controlling for meta-
27 prejudice and political conservatism.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3 Beginning with Donald Trump (see Table 7a), we observed that Muslims who felt
4 dehumanized by Trump were significantly more likely to themselves dehumanize Trump
5 and significantly more likely to endorse anti-Trump policies. This was true beyond both
6 political conservatism and feeling *disliked* by Trump, which was itself associated with
7 more dehumanization but was not significantly associated with anti-Trump policy
8 support. Moreover, consistent with the analyses in Study 2a, we observed a significant
9 indirect link between meta-dehumanization and anti-Trump policy support via
10 dehumanization of Trump (unstandardized indirect effect = .09, 95% CI [.01, .21]).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Meta-dehumanization with respect to non-Muslim Americans was similarly
23 predictive of outcomes (see Table 7b). Controlling for conservatism and meta-prejudice,
24 feeling dehumanized by non-Muslim Americans was associated with feeling less
25 integrated into the U.S., more emotional hostility, greater support for violent over non-
26 violent forms of collective action, and perhaps most consequentially, lower willingness to
27 report potential terrorist activity to law enforcement. Meta-dehumanization was also
28 associated with perceiving and wanting less overlap with other Americans and a greater
29 belief in the idea that there is a fundamental clash between Islam and Western culture, but
30 these associations were not statistically significant in zero-order terms (see Supplemental
31 Table 8b), and thus likely reflect suppressor variable effects. In contrast to meta-
32 dehumanization, feelings *disliked* by non-Muslim Americans tended to be weakly
33 correlated or uncorrelated with outcomes in zero-order terms (see Supplemental Table
34 8b), and had little unique association with the outcome measures controlling for
35 conservatism and meta-dehumanization.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 Because we did not measure participants' dehumanization of Americans in this
5 study, we could not examine whether it mediated part of the link between meta-
6 dehumanization and support for outcomes. At the same time, our inclusion of the
7
8 measure of participants' sense of their integration into the U.S. allowed us to examine
9
10 another theoretical proposition. Specifically, previous work has suggested that feeling
11
12 marginalized or alienated from society is associated with emotional hostility and support
13
14 for more extreme political ideology and behavior. For example, feeling disconnected
15
16 from Dutch society was associated with radical beliefs in a sample of Muslim youth in
17
18 the Netherlands (Doosje, Loseman, & van den Bos, 2013; see also Lyons-Padilla et al.,
19
20 2015). We reasoned that individuals who felt that they were seen as less than fully human
21
22 by Americans might come to feel less integrated into the American mainstream, which
23
24 might then predict their endorsement of more extreme attitudes.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Based on this reasoning, we examined the indirect effect from meta-
32 dehumanization to each of emotional hostility, support for violent collective action, and
33
34 willingness to report terrorism via participants' sense of integration. We again used
35
36 Hayes' (2013) PROCESS macro (Model 4) with 10,000 bootstrap resamples, and
37
38 controlled for meta-prejudice and political conservatism. Results of this analysis can be
39
40 found in Table 8. Consistent with our reasoning, we observed significant indirect effects
41
42 from meta-dehumanization to each of the outcome measures we considered via (lower)
43
44 feelings of integration (see Table 8).⁵
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 ⁵ Because neither meta-dehumanization or meta-prejudice were significantly correlated with perceived
54 overlap, desired overlap, or belief in the clash of civilizations (see Supplemental Table 8b), we did not
55 consider these variables as potential mediators in our analyses. When we nevertheless controlled for their
56 associations with each of integration and the outcome variables, we observed that the indirect effects via
57 integration on support for violent collective action and willingness to report terrorism became marginally
58 significant (i.e., 90% confidence intervals did not include 0). On the other hand, the indirect effect on
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Finally, whereas Study 2a included only native (i.e., U.S.-born) Latino residents of the U.S., Study 2b included both native ($n = 71$) and non-native Muslims residents of the U.S. ($n = 53$). Despite the relatively small sub-samples, we conducted supplementary analyses, for exploratory purposes, in which we investigated differences in mean levels of meta-dehumanization and in the relationship between meta-dehumanization and our outcome variables as a function of native/non-native status. We observed that native and non-native American Muslims expressed equivalent mean levels of meta-dehumanization with respect to Donald Trump, and the relationship between feeling dehumanized by Trump and the relevant outcome measures was not moderated by native versus non-native status. In contrast, native-born Muslim residents of the U.S. felt significantly more dehumanized by majority Americans than did non-native Muslims. Moreover, on average, this meta-dehumanization was significantly more strongly associated with outcomes for native-born versus non-native Muslims, for whom several of the relationships were nonsignificant (see Supplementary Materials for full results). We return to this point in the General Discussion.

Discussion

In sum, the evidence in Study 2b converged strongly with the results from Study 2a: As with Latino residents of the U.S., we observed that Muslim residents felt heavily dehumanized, both by Donald Trump, and by non-Muslim Americans. Those who felt dehumanized by Trump were more likely to reciprocally dehumanize him, a relationship that also accounted in part for the link between meta-dehumanization and the endorsement of anti-Trump policies. Feeling dehumanized by non-Muslim Americans

emotional hostility became nonsignificant. Given that this model includes a large number of variables with a relatively small sample size, it would be worth re-examining among a larger sample.

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 was similarly predictive of consequential responses (particularly among native-born
4 Muslims), including a sense of marginalization, greater emotional hostility, more support
5 for violent collective action, and less willingness to report terrorism to law enforcement
6 agencies. In line with prior work highlighting the role of feelings of marginalization in
7 contributing to radicalization, we observed that marginalization accounted for part of the
8 relationship between meta-dehumanization and the hostile outcome measures. Notably, in
9 contrast to meta-dehumanization, feeling *disliked* by non-Muslim Americans was
10 generally unassociated with hostility.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **General Discussion**

23
24 Four studies highlight the significant consequences of overt dehumanization.
25 Replicating and extending prior work, we found that majority Americans blatantly
26 dehumanized both Muslims and Mexican immigrants, and that the degree of blatant
27 dehumanization was uniquely associated with support for exclusionary policies proposed
28 by Donald Trump and his Republican peers. Although our correlational data cannot
29 establish causality, they are consistent with the idea that support for some of the
30 Republican candidates (and Trump in particular) comes not despite their dehumanizing
31 rhetoric, but potentially because of it. Given the substantial support that Trump has
32 received (securing the Republican nomination and receiving a record number of votes in
33 the nomination process), our results emphasize the significant notion that overt intergroup
34 attitudes persist—and may be on the rise—in contemporary society (see also Forscher,
35 Cox, Graetz, & Devine, 2015).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Our analyses with Latino and Muslim residents of the U.S. illuminate the
53 potential consequences of these trends. Among each group, we observed high levels of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 meta-dehumanization that were separable from (though correlated with) feeling disliked.
4
5 Critically, feeling dehumanized was associated with particularly hostile responses: for
6
7
8 for example, Latinos who reported feeling dehumanized by Trump were more likely to
9
10 dehumanize him, want to see him personally suffer and endorse hostile actions like
11
12 spitting in his face. Among Muslims, feeling dehumanized was associated with favoring
13
14 violent over non-violent collective action, and less willingness to report suspicious
15
16 activities to law enforcement.
17
18

19
20 Thus, dehumanization has dual and mutually-reinforcing consequences for the
21
22 prospects of intergroup conflict: Those who dehumanize are more likely to support
23
24 hostile policies, and those who are dehumanized feel less integrated into society and are
25
26 more likely to support exactly the type of aggressive responses (e.g., violent versus non-
27
28 violent collective action) that may accentuate existing dehumanizing perceptions.
29
30 Practically, these findings suggest that the ‘vicious cycle’ of dehumanization and meta-
31
32 dehumanization makes society less safe both for majority and minority group members,
33
34 and suggest that the calls by Trump and Cruz to make Americans safer by imposing
35
36 policies like databases to track Muslims are likely to backfire. Theoretically, these results
37
38 importantly extend prior work on meta-dehumanization among advantaged group
39
40 members (Kteily, Hodson, & Bruneau, 2016) by examining meta-dehumanization among
41
42 minority group targets for the first time. Documenting the full ‘vicious cycle’, we show
43
44 that minority group members are indeed dehumanized, that they readily perceive it, and
45
46 that—despite their disadvantaged status and relative disempowerment— they respond
47
48 with hostility of their own.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Moreover, our findings (Study 2a) suggest that, as with majority groups, part of the link between meta-dehumanization and hostility is mediated by reciprocal dehumanization of the ‘offending’ targets. Our results in Study 2b further suggest the role of a mediator that may be unique to minority groups: Specifically, we observed that Muslims who felt dehumanized reported feeling less integrated into the mainstream of the U.S., which predicted outcomes like their support for violent collective action and their unwillingness to report suspicious activities to law enforcement. This finding is consistent with prior work documenting the link between marginalization and radicalization among (minority) Muslims (e.g., Doosje et al., 2013; Lyons-Padilla et al., 2015), and suggests that meta-dehumanization may be an important antecedent. Because we did not have both of these measures in either of our minority samples, future work should simultaneously consider how reciprocal dehumanization and feelings of marginalization might link meta-dehumanization to hostility.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Despite the advances made by this work, it should be noted that our findings relied on convenience samples and were correlational in nature. Future work should replicate these patterns with more representative samples of Latino and Muslim Americans, and consider experimentally manipulating meta-dehumanization and meta-humanization to determine causality.⁶ Kteily et al. (2016) showed that priming Americans with the idea that Muslims humanized Americans increased Americans’ own humanization of Muslims. It may be similarly possible to reduce the association between meta-dehumanization and aggression among Muslims and Latinos in the U.S. by

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁶ Although causal claims are limited by the correlational nature of our data, it is worth noting that there is little reason to think that Muslims and Latinos would have felt dehumanized by Trump prior to the statements associated with his candidacy (and indeed the decision of Univision, the leading Spanish-language network, to drop Trump’s Miss Universe pageant was explicitly framed as responses to his rhetoric).

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 highlighting, for example, the fact that Trump supporters represent only a small
4
5 proportion of all Americans, or emphasizing the fact that many Americans (including
6
7 prominent Republicans) have disavowed Trump precisely because they consider him
8
9 bigoted towards minority groups.
10
11

12 From a theoretical perspective, more work is needed to understand the mediators
13
14 and moderators of the link between meta-dehumanization and aggression. We reasoned
15
16 that minority group members might respond aggressively to feeling dehumanized because
17
18 meta-dehumanization represents a stark social identity threat that they would seek to
19
20 rectify. Future work could examine this mechanism by directly assessing individuals'
21
22 sense of being offended and seeking to restore the standing of their group. It is also likely
23
24 that not all minority group members will respond to meta-dehumanization aggressively:
25
26 for example, minority group members who have lower collective self-esteem or perceive
27
28 the social system as more legitimate may respond to feeling dehumanized by distancing
29
30 themselves from the ingroup, rather than reciprocating on its behalf. Notably, although
31
32 not a central feature of our theorizing, supplemental analyses revealed an interesting
33
34 pattern suggestive of a potential moderator worth exploring further: Whereas native and
35
36 non-native born Muslims in Study 2b responded equivalently to feeling dehumanized by
37
38 Donald Trump, Muslims born in the U.S. were more likely (*vs.* non-natives) to respond to
39
40 feeling dehumanized by majority Americans with hostility (see Supplemental Materials
41
42 for details)⁷. Although speculative, it may be that those who are born in the U.S. have a
43
44 greater *expectation* than those born elsewhere (and who many not be U.S. citizens⁸) that
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ⁷ We thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this analysis.

56 ⁸ Because our measure simply asked participants whether or not they were born in the U.S., we cannot
57 determine precisely what proportion of the non-native participants were non-citizens (i.e., immigrants)
58
59
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3 they will be treated by the rest of their society as fully human. Learning that they are
4
5 nevertheless dehumanized might then be particularly likely to provoke aggression. Future
6
7 work should consider assessing the extent to which meta-dehumanization represents an
8
9 expectancy-violation.
10
11

12 Finally, although we focused here on the aggressive responses of minorities who
13
14 felt dehumanized, it is important to examine other ways in which minority group
15
16 members might be affected by meta-dehumanization. Some research in the interpersonal
17
18 context has suggested, for example, that those who are socially excluded experience this
19
20 exclusion as painful and may subtly dehumanize not only their ostracizer but also
21
22 themselves (Bastian & Haslam, 2010, 2011). Consistent with this, it is noteworthy that
23
24 several members of the Latino and Muslim communities have described feeling ‘hurt’ by
25
26 Trump’s remarks (e.g., Hernandez, 2016), a response that deserves further empirical
27
28 attention.
29
30
31
32

33 Conclusion

34
35 Much of the discussion emanating from the 2016 Republican Primary has
36
37 centered on the importance of protecting Americans’ safety. Frequently, this has been
38
39 paired with rhetoric framing Mexican immigrants and Muslims in animalistic terms to
40
41 highlight the threat they pose. Our research suggests that dehumanizing statements about
42
43 minority groups like Mexican immigrants and Muslims may help promote support for
44
45 hostile policies targeted at these groups, but by making them feel dehumanized, they also
46
47 further the very danger they purport to safeguard against.
48
49
50
51

52 References

53
54
55
56
57 versus naturalized citizens. Future work should assess citizenship/immigration status in addition to place of
58
59 birth.
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups
2
3

4 Andrighetto, L., Riva, P., Gabbiadini, A., & Volpato, C. (in press). Excluded from all
5 humanity: Animal metaphors exacerbate the consequences of social exclusion.
6 *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*.
7

8
9 Aribarg, A., Arora, N., Henderson, T., & Kim, Y. (2014). Private label imitation of a
10 national brand: Implications for consumer choice and law. *Journal of Marketing*
11 *Research*, 51(6), 657-675.
12

13 Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of
14 moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and*
15 *Social Psychology*, 71, 364–374. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364>
16
17

18 Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: The dehumanizing effects of
19 social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 107–113.
20 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022>
21
22

23 Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2011). Experiencing dehumanization: Cognitive and
24 emotional effects of everyday dehumanization. *Basic and Applied Social*
25 *Psychology*, 33, 295–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2011.614132>
26
27

28 Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive
29 discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and
30 well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135–149.
31 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.135>
32

33 Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and
34 content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.),
35 *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35–58). Oxford, England:
36 Blackwell Science.
37
38

39 Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., Gonzaga, G. C., Ogburn, E. L., & VanderWeele, T. J.
40 (2013). Marital satisfaction and break-ups differ across on-line and off-line meeting
41 venues. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(25), 10135-10140.
42

43 Cohn, N. (2015, December 31). Donald Trump's Strongest Supporters: A Certain Kind of
44 Democrat. *New York Times*. Retrieved from
45 [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/31/upshot/donald-trumps-strongest-supporters-a-](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/31/upshot/donald-trumps-strongest-supporters-a-certain-kind-of-democrat.html?_r=0)
46 [certain-kind-of-democrat.html?_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/31/upshot/donald-trumps-strongest-supporters-a-certain-kind-of-democrat.html?_r=0)
47
48

49 Doosje, B., Loseman, A., & van den Bos, K. (2013). Determinants of radicalization of
50 Islamic youth in the Netherlands: Personal uncertainty, perceived injustice, and
51 perceived group threat. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69, 586–604.
52
53

54 Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Second edition. Sage.
55

56 Forscher, P. S., Cox, W. T., Graetz, N., & Devine, P. G. (2015). The motivation to
57 express prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 791–812.
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000030>

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *94*(2), 292-306.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.292>

Guadagnoli E and Velicer W (1988) Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*, 265-275.

Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1105–1118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1105>

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., & Sun, P. (2011). Beastly: What makes animal metaphors offensive?. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 0261927X11407168.

Hernandez (2016, January 26). Donald Trump's remarks spur Latino 'naturalization blitz' before election. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/jan/26/donald-trump-latino-hispanic-immigrants-citizenship-voting>

Jackson, L. E., & Gaertner, L. (2010). Mechanisms of moral disengagement and their differential use by right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in support of war. *Aggressive behavior*, *36*(4), 238-250.

Kamans, E., Gordijn, E. H., Oldenhuis, H., & Otten, S. (2009). What I think you see is what you get: Influence of prejudice on assimilation to negative meta-stereotypes among Dutch Moroccan teenagers. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 842–851. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.593>

Kelman, H. G. (1973). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues*, *29*, 25–61.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1973.tb00102.x>

Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 901–931. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000048>

Kteily, N., Hodson, G., & Bruneau, E. (2016). They see us as less than human: Metadehumanization predicts intergroup conflict via reciprocal dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*, 343-370.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000044>

Leidner, B., Castano, E., & Ginges, J. (2013). Dehumanization, retributive and restorative justice, and aggressive versus diplomatic intergroup conflict resolution strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 181–192.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167212472208>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Backlash: The Consequences of Dehumanizing Minority Groups

2
3 Lyons-Padilla, S., Gelfand, M. J., Mirahmadi, H., Farooq, M., & van Egmond, M. (2015).
4 Belonging nowhere: Marginalization & radicalization risk among Muslim
5 immigrants. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, *1*(2), 1–12.

6
7
8 MacCallum, R.C., Widaman, K. F., Preacher, K.J., & Hong, S. (2001). Sample size in
9 factor analysis: The role of model error. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *36*, 611-
10 637.

11
12 McElwee, S., & McDaniel, J. (2016, March 22). Yes, Trump's biggest asset is racism:
13 Why bigotry (not the economy) is the biggest factor driving his rise. Retrieved from
14 http://www.salon.com/2016/03/22/yes_trumps_secret_weapon_is_racism_why_bigotry_not_the_economy_is_the_biggest_factor_driving_his_rise/

15
16
17
18 Miranda, M., Gouveia-Pereira, M., & Vaes, J. (2014). When in Rome: Identification and
19 acculturation strategies among minority members moderate the dehumanisation of
20 the majority outgroup. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*(4), 327-336.

21
22
23 Owuamalam, C., Issmer, C., Zagefka, H., Klaben, M., & Wagner, U. (2014). Why do
24 members of disadvantaged groups strike back at perceived negativity towards the
25 in-group? *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *24*, 249–264.
26 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.2165>


27
28
29 Stevens, J.P. (1992) *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (2nd edition).
30 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

31
32 Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and
33 distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*,
34 364 –373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.3.364>

35
36
37 Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security. (2013). *Muslim-American*
38 *Terrorism: Declining Further*. Chapel Hill, NC: Charles Kurzman.

39
40 Walker, A, (2015, August 21). 'Passionate' Trump fans behind homeless man's beating?
41 Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2015/08/20/after-two-brothers-allegedly-beat-homeless-man-one-them-admiringly-quote-donald-trump-deporting-illegals/I4NXR3Dr7litLi2NB4f9TN/story.html>

42
43
44
45 Wright, S. C., Aron, A., & Tropp, L. R. (2002). Including others (and groups) in the
46 self. *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal, and intergroup perspectives*, 343-
47 364.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. The “Ascent of Man” measure of blatant dehumanization. Scores are provided using a slider scale ranging from 0–100, with 0 corresponding to the left side of the image (i.e., quadrupedal human ancestor), and 100 corresponding to the right side of the image (‘full’ modern-day human). This figure was originally published in *Kteily, Bruneau, Waytz, & Cotterill, 2015, JPSP*, Figure 1.




Figure 2. Path model examining perceptions among Latino residents of the U.S., showing the link between feeling dehumanized by Donald Trump and supporting anti-Trump policies via dehumanization of and prejudice towards Trump in Study 2a, controlling for metaprejudice and political conservatism (not shown). Numbers reflect standardized β coefficients. * $p < .05$ *** $p < .001$. Dashed paths are nonsignificant.

Table 1. Simultaneous regression predicting anti-immigrant attitudes and behavior in Study 1a

	Anti-Immigration Attitudes R ² = .57		Anti-Immigrant Policy Support R ² = .49		Signing Anti-Immigrant Petitions R ² = .30	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	.36***	.28, .43	.33***	.25, .42	.32***	.22, .42
Prejudice	.27***	.18, .36	.22***	.12, .31	.16**	.04, .27
Blatant Dehumanization	.33***	.24, .43	.33***	.23, .43	.22***	.10, .34

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 2. Relationship between candidate support and blatant dehumanization of Mexican immigrants, controlling for prejudice and conservatism, in Study 1a

Candidate	Zero-order r	β	Mean (SD)	n
Hillary Clinton	-.04	.23***§	3.79 (2.15)	340
Bernie Sanders	-.37***	-.09	4.26 (2.17)	312
Donald Trump	.46***	.32***	2.83 (2.09)	331
Ted Cruz	.26***	.14*	2.58 (1.76)	305
Jeb Bush	.25***	.17*	2.72 (1.82)	322
Scott Walker	.29***	.18*	2.67 (1.88)	295
Rand Paul	.25***	.10	3.03 (1.89)	318

Note. Sample sizes (n) vary because participants were instructed to rate only candidates with whom they were familiar. Standardized beta coefficients reflect the effects of dehumanization on support for each candidate (separately), controlling for prejudice and conservatism. *** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$. § Reflects a suppressor variable effect.

Table 3. Simultaneous regressions predicting anti-Muslim attitudes and behavior in Study 1b.

	Anti-Muslim Attitudes R ² = .68		Anti-Muslim Policy Support R ² = .62		Support for Arab Immigration R ² = .17		Anti-Islamic Extremism Fund Disbursement R ² = .52		Signing Anti-Muslim Petitions R ² = .26	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	.27***	.21, .33	.26***	.20, .33	-.20***	-.30, -.10	.33***	.26, .40	.23***	.14, .33
Prejudice	.22***	.14, .30	.19***	.10, .28	-.21**	-.34, -.08	.16**	.06, .26	.14*	.02, .27
Blatant Dehum.	.49***	.41, .57	.49***	.40, .58	-.09	-.22, .05	.39***	.29, .49	.24***	.12, .37

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 4. Relationship between candidate support and blatant dehumanization of Muslims, controlling for prejudice and conservatism, in Study 1b

Candidate	Zero-order <i>r</i>	β	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>
Hillary Clinton	-.25***	-.06	3.39 (2.06)	453
Bernie Sanders	-.37***	-.13*	4.47 (2.20)	441
Donald Trump	.52***	.26***	2.46 (2.07)	452
Ted Cruz	.40***	.22***	2.34 (1.75)	432
Jeb Bush	.25***	.20**	2.26 (1.58)	444
Ben Carson	.33***	.13*	2.46 (1.83)	433
Rand Paul	.25***	.07	2.44 (1.65)	434
Carly Fiorina	.20***	.04	2.05 (1.45)	422
Chris Christie	.28***	.09	2.13 (1.48)	432
Marco Rubio	.33***	.14*	2.39 (1.63)	428

Note. Sample sizes (*n*) vary because participants were instructed to rate only candidates with whom they were familiar. Standardized beta coefficients reflect the effects of dehumanization on support for each candidate (separately), controlling for prejudice and conservatism. *** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$.

Table 5a. Simultaneous regressions predicting attitudes towards Donald Trump in Study 2a.

	Prejudice R ² = .26		Blatant Dehumanization R ² = .34		Emotional Hostility R ² = .36		Anti-Trump Policy Support R ² = .43		Punitiveness towards Trump R ² = .22	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	-.33***	-.44, -.22	-.17**	-.27, -.07	-.12*	-.22, -.02	-.02	-.12, .08	.12*	.01, .23
Meta- Prejudice	.39***	.24, .56	.39***	.23, .53	.42***	.27, .55	.41***	.27, .54	.14	-.02, .30
Meta-Dehum.	-.09	-.25, .07	.16*	.02, .31	.18*	.03, .32	.28***	.14, .42	.36***	.20, .52

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 5b. Simultaneous regressions predicting attitudes towards Republicans in Study 2a.

	Prejudice R ² = .23		Blatant Dehumanization R ² = .24		Emotional Hostility R ² = .28		Anti-Republican Party Attitudes R ² = .46	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	-.38***	-.49, -.28	-.22***	-.32, -.11	-.08	-.19, .02	-.01	-.10, .08
Meta-Prejudice	.25**	.08, .41	.10	-.07, .26	.20*	.05, .36	.23***	.10, .37
Meta-Dehum.	-.01	-.17, .15	.33***	.17, .49	.34***	.18, .49	.49***	.35, .62

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 6a. Unstandardized Indirect and Direct Effects of Meta-Dehumanization on Anti-Trump Attitudes and Policy Support via (a) Dehumanization and (b) Prejudice in Study 2a, Controlling for Meta-Prejudice and Political Conservatism.

	Emotional Hostility	Anti-Trump Policy Support	.Punitiveness
Indirect Effect (Dehumanization)	.04 [.005, .09]	.06 [.005, .14]	.05 [.007, .11]
Indirect Effect (Prejudice)	-.01 [-.05, .007]	.01 [-.005, .04]	.03 [-.01, .08]
Direct Effect	.11 [.01, .20]	.21 [.08, .35]	.28 [.12, .44]

Table 6b. Unstandardized Indirect and Direct Effects of Meta-Dehumanization on Anti-Republican Party Attitudes and Policy Support via (a) Dehumanization and (b) Prejudice in Study 2a, Controlling for Meta-Prejudice and Political Conservatism.

	Emotional Hostility	Anti-Republican Party Attitudes
Indirect Effect (Dehumanization)	.06 [.03, .12]	.05 [.01, .10]
Indirect Effect (Prejudice)	-.00 [-.03, .02]	-.00 [-.03, .03]
Direct Effect	.18 [.07, .29]	.41 [.29, .54]

Table 7a. Simultaneous regressions predicting attitudes towards Donald Trump in Study 2b.

	Blatant Dehumanization		Anti-Trump Policy Support	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	-.12*	-.24, -.00	.07	-.08, .22
Meta-Prejudice (Trump)	.40***	.24, .56	.12	-.08, .31
Meta-Dehumanization (Trump)	.40***	.24, .55	.53***	.33, .72

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 7b. Simultaneous regressions predicting attitudes among Muslim Americans in Study 2b.

	Integration R ² = .10		Perceived Overlap R ² = .09		Desired Overlap R ² = .07		Belief in Clash of Civilizations R ² = .14		Emotional Hostility R ² = .20		Support for Violent Collective Action R ² = .11		Willingness to Report Terrorism R ² = .07	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
Political Conservatism	-.03	-.20, .15	-.24**	-.41, -.06	-.16	-.34, .02	.25***	.08, .42	-.14	-.31, .02	.15	-.02, .33	-.12	-.30, .06
Meta-Prejudice (Americans)	-.11	-.31, .10	.08	-.13, .28	.16	-.05, .37	-.27**§	-.47, -.07	.06	-.13, .25	-.19	-.40, .01	.00	-.21, .21
Meta-Dehum. (Americans)	-.24*	-.44, -.04	-.22*§	-.42, -.01	-.23*§	-.43, -.02	.25*§	.05, .45	.39***	.20, .58	.34***	.13, .54	-.22*	-.43, -.01

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 § indicates a relationship that was not significant in zero-order terms, and thus, is best interpreted as a suppressor-variable effect

Table 8. Unstandardized Indirect and Direct Effects of Meta-Dehumanization on Hostile Attitudes via Feelings of Integration into American Society in Study 2b, Controlling for Meta-Prejudice and Political Conservatism.

	Emotional Hostility	Support for Violent Collective Action	Willingness to Report Terrorism
Indirect Effect	.04 [.001, .14]	.19 [.03, .45]	-.08 [-.20, -.01]
Direct Effect	.38 [.17, .59]	.51 [.10, .92]	-.12 [-.30, .06]

Section 1. Supplemental Analyses

Study 1b

Analyses including meta-dehumanization and meta-prejudice:

Effects of meta-dehumanization on outgroup (i.e., Muslim) dehumanization (controlling for meta-prejudice and conservatism): $b = .01, \beta = .37, p < .001$

Unstandardized indirect effect from Meta-Dehumanization → Dehumanization → Outcome measures (controlling for meta-prejudice, conservatism, and prejudice; see Kteily et al., 2016 for more details):

On anti-Muslim attitudes: .008 [.005, .01] (standardized indirect effect = .12)

On anti-Muslim policy support: .008 [.005, .01] (standardized indirect effect = .13)

On signing anti-Muslim petitions: .001 [.0003, .002] (standardized indirect effect = .07)

On anti-Islamic extremism fund disbursement: .13 [.07, .20] (standardized indirect effect = .10)

On support for Arab immigration: .0006 [-.03, .04] (standardized indirect effect = .00)

Study 2b

Examining differences between native and non-native Muslim residents of the U.S.:

With respect to Donald Trump:

Mean levels of meta-dehumanization:

Native Muslims: $M = 5.79, SD = 1.24$; Non-Native Muslims: $M = 5.49, SD = 1.69$
 $F(1, 122) = 1.34, p = .25$.

Moderation of effects of meta-dehumanization on outcomes by status as native vs. non-native (model controls for conservatism, meta-prejudice, and interaction between meta-prejudice and native vs. non-native; all effects reported are unstandardized):

- Dehumanization of Trump: Interaction effect = $-.08, p = .57$; effect for natives = $.39, p < .001$; effect for non-natives: $.31, p < .001$
- Anti-Trump Policy support: Interaction effect = $.00, p = .98$; effect for natives = $.46, p = .001$; effect for non-natives: $.47, p < .001$

With respect to majority Americans:

Mean levels of meta-dehumanization:

Native Muslims: $M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.23$; Non-Native Muslims: $M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.60$
 $F(1, 122) = 9.25$, $p = .003$.

Moderation of effects of meta-dehumanization on outcomes by status as native vs. non-native (model controls for conservatism, meta-prejudice, and interaction between meta-prejudice and native vs. non-native; all effects reported are unstandardized):

- Integration: Interaction effect = $.35$, $p = .03$; effect for natives = $-.38$, $p = .001$; effect for non-natives: $-.03$, $p = .80$
- Perceived Overlap: Interaction effect = $.33$, $p = .14$; effect for natives = $-.44$, $p = .007$; effect for non-natives: $-.11$, $p = .48$
- Desired Overlap: Interaction effect: $.36$, $p = .11$; effect for natives = $-.39$, $p = .02$; effect for non-natives: $-.04$, $p = .81$
- Belief in Clash of civilizations: Interaction effect: $.03$, $p = .91$; effect for natives = $.38$, $p = .07$; effect for non-natives: $.41$, $p = .04$
- Emotional Hostility: Interaction effect: $-.67$, $p = .001$; effect for natives = $.71$, $p < .001$; effect for non-natives: $.04$, $p = .77$
- Support for Violent Collective Action: Interaction effect = $-.77$, $p = .08$; effect for natives = 1.05 , $p = .001$; effect for non-natives: $.28$, $p = .37$
- Willingness to Report Terrorism: Interaction effect = $.46$, $p = .01$; Effect for natives = $-.36$, $p = .006$; effect for non-natives: $.09$, $p = .47$.

Section 2. Full Scale Items Used in Main Analyses

Study 1a

Anti-Immigration Attitudes

1. All these illegals need to be deported
2. Undocumented immigrants are just unfortunate people doing their best under difficult circumstances
3. People are coming from all over that are killers and rapists and they're coming into this country [illegally]*
4. Mexico has not treated us well. Mexico treats us as if we are stupid people, which of course our leaders are*
5. Cheap foreign labor holds down salaries, keeps unemployment high, and makes it difficult for poor and working-class Americans to earn a middle-class wage*
6. A nation without borders is not a nation
7. The Mexican government has taken the U.S. to the cleaners. They are responsible for this problem [illegal immigration] and they must help pay to clean it up*

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
8. As long as Mexican immigrants come here legally, we should welcome them with open arms
 9. We need to cut down on immigration, whether its legal or illegal
 10. Mexican immigrants enrich American culture

Anti-Immigrant Policy Support

1. We need to build a wall to keep out illegal immigrants from Mexico and elsewhere*
2. Illegal aliens apprehended crossing the border must be detained until they are sent home, no more catch-and-release*
3. We should triple the number of Immigration and Customs enforcement agents*
4. The U.S. should restrict visas to Mexicans.
5. Unless Mexico pays for a wall to keep out immigrants, we should increase fees on all worker visas from Mexico*
6. Mexican immigrants caught crossing the border illegally should be kept in solitary confinement until they are deported.

* Taken directly from Trump campaign platform

Signing anti-Immigration petitions

1. Urge congressional members to support building a wall between the U.S. and Mexico
2. Urge congressional members to increase the number of Immigration and Customs enforcement agents.
3. Urge congressional members to immediately deport any illegal immigrants captured.
4. Urge congressional members to grant permanent residency to any illegal Mexican immigrants who have not committed any crimes in the U.S.
5. Urge congressional members to heavily restrict the number of immigrant visas to the U.S.
6. Urge congressional members to stop automatically granting citizenship to the children of illegal immigrants who are born in the U.S.

Study 1b

Animalistic traits

1. Refined and cultured (reverse-coded)
2. Rational and logical (reverse-coded)
3. Backward, primitive
4. Savage, aggressive
5. Lacking morals

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
6. Barbaric, cold-hearted
7. Scientifically/technologically advanced (reverse-coded)
8. Capable of self-control (reverse-coded)
9. Mature, responsible (reverse-coded)

10 **Anti-Muslim attitudes**

- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
1. Muslims are a potential cancer to this country
2. Muslims are looking to hurt Americans the first chance they get
3. A significant number of Muslims in the U.S. secretly support ISIS
4. The attacks in San Bernardino prove it: Muslims are a threat to the people from this country
5. Those who stand behind Muslims in this country are betraying their fellow Americans
6. Those who stand behind Muslims in this country are putting everyone at risk

23 **Anti-Muslim policy support**

- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
1. We need to stop accepting Muslim refugees into this country, period
2. No more political correctness: Muslim refugees need to go
3. We should put any Muslims who enter into the country under strict surveillance*
4. We should stop giving out visas to Muslims to enter the U.S.*
5. We should tap the phones of any Muslims in the U.S. who make calls to Middle Eastern countries on a frequent basis.
6. We should institute a database that keeps track of Muslims in this country*
7. We should ban the opening of any new Mosques in this country
8. We should ban the wearing of the Islamic veil (or 'headdress')
9. We should allow Muslims to practice their religion with no restrictions in the U.S. (reverse-coded)

* Adapted from Trump statements

44 **Signing anti-Muslim petitions**

- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
1. Urge congressional members to deny entry to any Muslim refugees who seek to come to the U.S.
2. Urge congressional members to deny welfare benefits to any Muslim refugees who enter the U.S.
3. Urge congressional members to increase federal spending on investigating the background of refugees from Muslim countries
4. Urge congressional members to support a ban on visas to Muslims
5. Urge congressional members to introduce surveillance programs targeting Mosques in the U.S.
6. Urge congressional members to create a database to track Muslims in the U.S.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Study 2a
7

8 **Meta-Dehumanization (Trump)**
9

- 10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
1. Donald Trump sees people from Latino background as sub-human.
 2. Donald Trump thinks of people from Latino background as animal-like.
 3. Donald Trump thinks people from Latino background are beasts.
 4. Donald Trump sees people from Latino background as less evolved than other groups.
 5. Donald Trump see people from Latino background as belonging to a lower form of civilization

20 **Meta-Dehumanization (Republican Party)**
21

- 22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
1. Republicans see people from Latino background as sub-human.
 2. Republicans think of people from Latino background as animal-like.
 3. Republicans think people from Latino background are beasts.
 4. Republicans see people from Latino background as less evolved than other groups.
 5. Republicans see people from Latino background as belonging to a lower form of civilization

32 **Meta-Prejudice (Trump)**
33

- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
1. Donald Trump feels cold towards people from Latino background
 2. Donald Trump doesn't have positive attitudes towards people from Latino background
 3. Donald Trump doesn't like people from Latino background much
 4. Donald Trump doesn't think of people from Latino background in a friendly light
 5. People from Latino background are not the favorite people of Donald Trump

44 **Meta-Prejudice (Republican Party)**
45

- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
1. Supporters of the Republican party feel cold towards people from Latino background
 2. Supporters of the Republican party do not have positive attitudes towards people from Latino background
 3. Supporters of the Republican party don't like people from Latino background much
 4. Supporters of the Republican party don't think of people from Latino background in a friendly light
 5. People from Latino background are not the favorite people of supporters of the Republican party

Anti-Trump Policy Support

1. Donald Trump should be banned from appearing on any Latin media platforms, such as Univision
2. I support a boycott of Donald Trump's business by those in the Latino community
3. I will personally refuse to buy something if I know that Donald Trump will profit from it.
4. I think that Donald Trump should be sued for the incitement of violence

Punitiveness towards Trump

1. I hope that Donald Trump loses miserably in his race for the presidency
2. It would give me pleasure if Donald Trump got seriously sick.
3. Donald Trump deserves to rot in hell
4. It would give me great satisfaction if Donald Trump went bankrupt
5. Donald Trump deserves anything he gets, including physical attacks
6. I hope that Donald Trump suffers in his life.
7. If I could, I would spit in the face of Donald Trump

Anti-Republican Party Attitudes

1. I would never vote for the Republican party
2. I consider the Republican party an enemy of the Latino community
3. I would not be friends with people who I know are supporters of the Republican party.
4. It would give me great pleasure if the Republican party fell apart entirely.

Study 2b

Anti-Trump Policy Support

1. Donald Trump should be banned from appearing on any Arabic-language media platforms
2. I support a boycott of Donald Trump's business by those in the Muslim-American community
3. I will personally refuse to buy something if I know that Donald Trump will profit from it.
4. I think that Donald Trump should be sued for the incitement of violence

Integration into U.S.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. As a Muslim, I feel integrated into the mainstream of American society
2. As a Muslim, I feel that if I work hard, I can succeed in American society
3. As a Muslim, I feel like an important part of the American social fabric
4. As a Muslim, I feel proud to be a part of America
5. As a Muslim, I feel disenchanted with life in America

Supplementary Table 1. Mean blatant dehumanization among non-Latino Americans in Study 1a, assessed using the Ascent measure.

Target	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Quartiles (25, 50, 75)
Americans	87.34 (16.99)	81, 93, 100
Doctors	89.39 (16.15)**	83, 99, 100
Europeans	84.95 (19.35)**	80, 90, 100
Swedes	83.85 (21.32)***	76, 91, 100
Mexican immigrants	75.78 (21.16)***	56, 82, 100
Welfare recipients	75.38 (27.02)***	58, 82, 100
Arabs	72.97 (28.77)***	54, 81, 100
Muslims	71.25 (30.49)***	50, 81, 100

Note. Asterisks reflect significant difference in average Ascent rating from ingroup (Americans). * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplemental Table 2. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for Study 1a.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Political Conservatism	-					
2. Prejudice	.34***	-				
3. Blatant Dehumanization	.36***	.62***	-			
4. Anti- Immigration Attitudes	.57***	.60***	.63***	-		
5. Anti-Immigrant Policy Support	.52***	.54***	.59***	.87***	-	
6. Signing Anti-Immigrant Petitions	.45***	.40***	.43***	.65***	.67***	-
<i>M</i>	3.71	39.36	.00	41.54	41.75	-.01
<i>SD</i>	1.47	27.19	.86	21.48	28.70	.47

Note. Variable 3 is a composite of standardized variables (descriptives available in main text).
 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplementary Table 3. Mean blatant dehumanization among non-Muslim Americans in Study 1b, assessed using the Ascent measure.

Target	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Quartiles (25, 50, 75)
Americans	89.45 (14.89)	82, 96, 100
Europeans	89.68 (14.75)	83, 96, 100
Swedes	88.66 (16.50)	82, 97, 100
Nigerians	76.71 (26.85)***	64.5, 83, 100
Muslim Refugees	75.60 (27.57)***	64, 83, 100
Arabs	75.56 (27.43)***	62, 83, 100
Muslims	73.41 (29.34)***	55.5, 82, 100

Note. Asterisks reflect significant difference in average Ascent rating from ingroup (Americans). * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplementary Table 4. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for Study 1b.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Political Conservatism	-							
2. Prejudice	.40***	-						
3. Blatant Dehumanization	.41***	.74***	-					
4. Anti- Muslim Attitudes	.56***	.70***	.77***	-				
5. Anti-Muslim Policy Support	.53***	.66***	.73***	.92***	-			
6. Signing Anti-Muslim Petitions	.39***	.42***	.44***	.53***	.54***	-		
7. Anti-Islamic Extremism Fund Disbursement	.55***	.58***	.64***	.79***	.81***	.53***	-	
8. Support for Arab Immigration	-.32***	-.35***	-.32***	-.36***	-.34***	-.33***	-.35***	-
<i>M</i>	3.51	49.28	0.00	3.01	2.93	-.10	37.16	12.07
<i>SD</i>	1.58	31.59	.91	2.02	1.83	.49	38.59	9.94

Note. Variable 3 is a composite of standardized variables (descriptives available in main text).
 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplementary Table 5. Mean blatant dehumanization among Latino Americans in Study 2a, assessed using the Ascent measure.

Target	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Quartiles (25, 50, 75)
Latino Americans	85.81 (19.00)	79, 93, 100
Mexicans	82.24 (23.00)***	76, 90, 100
White Americans	81.36 (23.67)***	70, 90, 100
Legal immigrants from Latin America	80.82 (23.13)***	70, 89, 100
Asian Americans	79.69 (24.69)***	66, 88.5, 100
Black Americans	78.69 (23.97)***	65.75, 85, 100
Supporters of the Democratic Party	75.56 (26.81)***	57.5, 84, 100
Swedes	75.55 (27.59)***	58, 85, 100
Illegal immigrants from Latin America	74.11 (28.57)***	56, 84, 100
Arabs	69.43 (31.36)***	51, 79, 100
Supporters of the Republican Party	65.43 (31.34)***	46, 72, 95
Donald Trump	49.36 (38.61)***	7, 52, 88.75
White Supremacists	47.06 (35.36)***	10.5, 47, 82.5

Note. Asterisks reflect significant difference in average Ascent rating from ingroup (Latino Americans). * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplementary Table 6a. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for items assessed with respect to Donald Trump in Study 2a.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Conservatism	-							
2. Meta-Dehumanization	-.19**	-						
3. Meta-Prejudice	-.21**	.74***	-					
4. Prejudice	-.39***	.26***	.39***	-				
5. Blatant Dehumanization	-.31***	.48***	.54***	.66***	-			
6. Emotional Hostility	-.28***	.51***	.58***	.54***	.66***	-		
7. Anti-Trump Policy Support	-.18**	.59***	.62***	.36***	.59***	.66***	-	
8. Punitiveness towards Trump	.01	.44***	.38***	.04	.34***	.45***	.62***	-
<i>M</i>	3.99	4.98	5.66	67.97	.02	4.70	4.88	3.68
<i>SD</i>	1.57	1.85	1.66	32.17	.88	1.39	1.85	1.83

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Supplementary Table 6b. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for items assessed with respect to supporters of the Republican Party in Study 2a.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Conservatism	-						
2. Meta-Dehumanization	-.12*	-					
3. Meta-Prejudice	-.18**	.77***	-				
4. Prejudice	-.42***	.23***	.31***	-			
5. Blatant Dehumanization	-.27***	.43***	.39***	.60***	-		
6. Emotional Hostility	-.16***	.50***	.48***	.40***	.51***	-	
7. Anti-Republican Party Attitudes	-.11	.66***	.60***	.35***	.47***	.60***	-
<i>M</i>	3.99	4.23	4.64	52.46	.00	4.01	4.01
<i>SD</i>	1.57	1.78	1.58	27.98	.85	1.29	1.68

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Supplemental Table 7a. Correlations between feeling dehumanized by Donald Trump and political candidate support among Latino residents of the U.S. in Study 2a.

Candidate	Zero-order <i>r</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>
Hillary Clinton	.24***	4.69 (2.12)	276
Bernie Sanders	.21**	4.14 (1.93)	257
Donald Trump	-.22***	2.54 (1.99)	277
Ted Cruz	.01	3.43 (1.94)	260
Jeb Bush	.04	3.73 (1.95)	266
Scott Walker	.09	3.31 (1.90)	244
Rand Paul	.07	3.34 (1.90)	250
Mike Huckabee	.03	3.34 (1.95)	250

** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplemental Table 7b. Correlations between feeling dehumanized by the Republican party and political candidate support.

Candidate	Zero-order <i>r</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	<i>n</i>
Hillary Clinton	.36***	4.69 (2.12)	276
Bernie Sanders	.29***	4.14 (1.93)	257
Donald Trump	-.02	2.54 (1.99)	277
Ted Cruz	.09	3.43 (1.94)	260
Jeb Bush	.09	3.73 (1.95)	266
Scott Walker	.20**	3.31 (1.90)	244
Rand Paul	.19**	3.34 (1.90)	250
Mike Huckabee	.11	3.34 (1.95)	250

** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Supplementary Table 8a. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for items assessed with respect to Donald Trump in Study 2b.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Political Conservatism	-				
2. Meta-Dehumanization (Trump)	-.17	-			
3. Meta-Prejudice (Trump)	-.24***	.66***	-		
4. Blatant Dehumanization (Trump)	-.29***	.68***	.69***	-	
5. Anti-Trump Policy Support	-.05	.59***	.45***	.52***	-
<i>M</i>	2.85	5.66	6.15	5.61	5.15
<i>SD</i>	1.41	1.45	1.27	1.24	1.32

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Supplementary Table 8b. Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for items assessed with respect to non-Muslim Americans in Study 2b.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Political Conservatism	-									
2. Meta-Dehumanization (Americans)	-.00	-								
3. Meta-Prejudice (Americans)	-.08	.53***	-							
4. Integration into U.S.	-.02	-.30***	-.23**	-						
5. Perceived Overlap	-.24***	-.18	-.02	.48***	-					
6. Desired Overlap	-.17	-.15	.05	.45***	.50***	-				
7. Belief in Clash of Civilizations	.27***	.11	-.16	-.07	-.23*	-.21*	-			
8. Emotional Hostility	-.14	.42***	.27**	-.28***	-.15	-.12	-.05	-		
9. Support for Violent Collective Action	.17	.24**	-.03	-.38***	-.34***	-.43***	.23*	.15	-	
10. Willingness to Report Terrorism	-.13	-.22*	-.11	.39***	.29**	.54***	-.07	-.14	-.47***	-
<i>M</i>	2.85	4.04	4.94	5.14	4.91	5.72	3.32	4.20	-2.64	5.47
<i>SD</i>	1.41	1.45	1.31	1.12	1.56	1.53	2.03	1.57	3.01	1.31

*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$