

A. Preregistered Analyses Study 1

The experiment was preregistered:

https://osf.io/jdxrt?view_only=92b706eca24e42b88a6f92b452c8b511

In the paper, we deviated from the preregistered analyses of Study 1. Initially, we planned on testing effects on a total of four dependent variables, namely invitation likelihood, expected performance of the applicant, expected enjoyment of having the applicant as a colleague, as well as a salary offer made to the applicant (see preregistration for details on the measurement of these variables). In the paper, for the sake of clarity, we only report findings on our primary dependent variable (i.e., invitation likelihood). Furthermore, initially, we planned on analyzing the interaction between applicants' ethnicity and time pressure/diversity climate. However, when working on the theoretical framework for our paper, we noticed that prejudice towards the applicant's ethnic group was crucial as a starting point, and that time pressure and diversity climate rather act as moderators of the prejudice effect on evaluations. Therefore, in the paper, we analyzed the interaction between prejudice towards the applicants' group and time pressure/diversity climate. We did that separate for the two ethnicities (Dutch/ingroup and Dutch-Moroccan/outgroup) to avoid the unreliable interpretation of three-way interactions.

In the following tables, we report results of the preregistered analyses on all four dependent variables. The preregistered hypotheses read:

H1: High (compared to low) time pressure has a stronger negative effect on the likelihood to invite an applicant to a job interview (H1a), expected performance of the applicant (H1b), expected enjoyment of having the applicant as a colleague (H1c), and the salary offer (H1d) for outgroup than for ingroup applicants.

and

H2: A more negative organizational diversity climate has a stronger negative effect on the likelihood to invite an applicant to a job interview (H1a), expected performance of the applicant (H1b), expected enjoyment of having the applicant as a colleague (H1c), and the salary offer (H1d) for outgroup than for ingroup applicants.

We did not find a significant interaction between time pressure or diversity climate and ethnicity for any of our four dependent variables. Given the lack of significant interaction terms, we did not conduct separate follow-up analyses for the two ethnicities (i.e., testing main effects of time pressure or diversity climate on our dependent variables separately for Dutch/ingroup and Dutch-Moroccan/outgroup applicants). We reject both preregistered hypotheses H1 and H2.

A1. Analysis for Preregistered H1 (Study 1)

Table S1

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Time Pressure, Applicants' Ethnicity, and their Interaction on the Dependent Variables.

Dependent Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Invitation Likelihood								
(Intercept)	7.05	0.17	41.88	<.001	7.11	0.20	36.01	<.001
Time Pressure	-0.26	0.19	-1.36	.173	-0.39	0.28	-1.37	.170
Ethnicity	0.70	0.19	3.12	<.001	0.59	0.26	2.24	.026
Time Pressure x Ethnicity					0.24	0.38	0.63	.527
	Adjusted R ² = .028, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 7.84, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 5.35, <i>p</i> = .001			
Expected Performance								
(Intercept)	4.65	0.10	48.30	<.001	4.67	0.11	41.32	<.001
Time Pressure	-1.10	0.11	-0.98	.327	-0.15	0.16	-0.90	.368
Ethnicity	0.40	0.10	3.75	<.001	0.37	0.15	2.46	.014
Time Pressure x Ethnicity					0.07	0.22	0.34	.734
	Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 7.49, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .024, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 5.02, <i>p</i> = .002			
Expected Enjoyment								
(Intercept)	4.72	0.09	54.56	<.001	4.71	0.10	46.41	<.001
Time Pressure	-0.03	0.10	-0.35	.724	-0.02	0.15	-0.16	.875
Ethnicity	0.42	0.10	4.32	<.001	0.43	0.13	3.18	.002
Time Pressure x Ethnicity					-0.02	0.19	-0.10	.921
	Adjusted R ² = .034, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 9.38, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .032, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 6.24, <i>p</i> < .001			
Salary Offer								
(Intercept)	2047.52	34.97	58.56	<.001	2020.00	40.97	49.31	<.001
Time Pressure	-23.70	38.91	-0.61	.543	33.55	59.08	0.57	.570
Ethnicity	-38.60	39.24	-0.98	.326	10.16	54.52	0.19	.852
Time Pressure x Ethnicity					-101.00	78.48	-1.29	.199
	Adjusted R ² < .001, <i>F</i> (2, 477) = 0.67, <i>p</i> = .511				Adjusted R ² < .001, <i>F</i> (3, 476) = 1.00, <i>p</i> = .392			

Note. *n* = 482. Reference group for Time Pressure is low (coded as 0), and reference group for Ethnicity is Dutch/Ingroup (coded as 0). The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors; the second models additionally include their interaction.

A2. Analysis for Preregistered H2 (Study 1)

Table S2

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Diversity Climate, Applicants' Ethnicity, and their Interaction on the Dependent Variables.

Dependent Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Invitation Likelihood								
(Intercept)	6.33	0.43	14.81	<.001	6.19	0.65	9.49	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.12	0.08	1.46	.144	0.15	0.13	1.15	.250
Ethnicity	0.69	0.19	3.63	<.001	0.93	0.85	1.09	.277
Diversity Climate x Ethnicity					-0.05	0.17	-0.29	.771
	Adjusted R ² = .028, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 7.98, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 5.34, <i>p</i> = .001			
Expected Performance								
(Intercept)	4.40	0.24	18.00	<.001	4.09	0.37	10.97	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.04	0.05	0.84	.401	0.10	0.07	1.40	.163
Ethnicity	0.40	0.11	3.69	<.001	0.93	0.49	1.91	.057
Diversity Climate x Ethnicity					-0.11	0.10	-1.12	.265
	Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 7.36, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 5.33, <i>p</i> = .001			
Expected Enjoyment								
(Intercept)	4.52	0.22	20.56	<.001	4.42	0.34	12.18	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.04	0.04	0.90	.370	0.06	0.07	0.87	.382
Ethnicity	0.41	0.10	4.26	<.001	0.58	0.44	1.33	.184
Diversity Climate x Ethnicity					-0.03	0.09	-0.40	.693
	Adjusted R ² = .035, <i>F</i> (2, 479) = 9.73, <i>p</i> < .001				Adjusted R ² = .033, <i>F</i> (3, 478) = 6.53, <i>p</i> < .001			
Salary Offer								
(Intercept)	2042.42	88.87	22.98	<.001	1864.85	135.11	13.80	<.001
Diversity Climate	-1.27	16.98	-0.08	.948	34.69	26.70	1.30	.195
Ethnicity	-38.55	39.31	-0.98	.327	261.55	176.68	1.48	.139
Diversity Climate x Ethnicity					-60.18	34.54	-1.74	.082
	Adjusted R ² < .001, <i>F</i> (2, 477) = 0.49, <i>p</i> = .614				Adjusted R ² = .002, <i>F</i> (3, 476) = 1.34, <i>p</i> = .002			

Note. *n* = 482. Reference group for Ethnicity is Dutch (coded as 0). The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors, while the second models additionally include their interaction.

B. Robustness Checks Study 1

B1. First Robustness Check H1 (Study 1)

Table S3

Regression Models Estimating the Effect of Prejudice towards the Applicant's Group on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	8.16	0.90	9.10	<.001
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-3.56	<.001
Gender: Male	-0.16	0.25	-0.65	.518
Age	0.00	0.01	0.03	.980
Education	0.17	0.24	0.73	.468
HR Involvement	-0.03	0.12	-0.23	.818
Adjusted R ² = .037, <i>F</i> (5, 267) = 3.11, <i>p</i> = .009				
Ethnicity: Dutch				
(Intercept)	8.74	1.09	8.00	<.001
Prejudice	-0.01	0.01	-0.75	.454
Gender: Male	0.02	0.30	0.07	.942
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.04	.299
Education	-0.41	0.27	-1.52	.131
HR Involvement	0.06	0.14	0.45	.656
Adjusted R ² = -.008, <i>F</i> (5, 202) = 0.68, <i>p</i> = .637				

Note. *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan) = 274; *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch) = 208.

B2. First Robustness Check H2 (Study 1)

Table S4

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Time Pressure, Prejudice towards the Applicant's Group, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan								
(Intercept)	8.28	0.91	9.06	<.001	7.67	0.95	8.04	<.001
Time Pressure: High	-0.17	0.25	-0.68	.498	0.84	0.53	1.57	.118
Prejudice	-0.03	0.01	-3.56	<.001	-0.01	0.01	-1.10	.271
Gender: Male	-0.15	0.26	-0.58	.564	-0.16	0.25	-0.61	.540
Age	0.00	0.01	-0.06	.956	0.00	0.01	0.07	.942
Education	0.17	0.24	0.73	.469	0.20	0.24	0.85	.396
HR Involvement	-0.03	0.11	-0.24	.808	-0.03	0.12	-0.29	.772
Time Pressure x Prejudice					-0.03	0.01	-2.12	.035
	Adjusted R ² = .035, <i>F</i> (6, 266) = 2.67, <i>p</i> = .016				Adjusted R ² = .048, <i>F</i> (7, 265) = 2.96, <i>p</i> = .005			
Ethnicity: Dutch								
(Intercept)	8.82	1.09	8.07	<.001	8.89	1.10	8.10	<.001
Time Pressure: High	-0.36	0.29	-1.24	.215	-0.90	0.70	-1.28	.202
Prejudice	-0.01	0.01	-0.78	.435	-0.02	0.01	-1.12	.264
Gender: Male	0.03	0.30	0.09	.925	0.03	0.30	0.10	.920
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.99	.321	-0.01	0.01	-0.93	.356
Education	-0.38	0.27	-1.41	.161	-0.35	0.27	-1.28	.201
HR Involvement	0.06	0.14	0.420	.675	0.05	0.14	0.38	.703
Time Pressure x Prejudice					0.02	0.02	0.85	.398
	Adjusted R ² = -.005, <i>F</i> (6, 201) = 0.83, <i>p</i> = .550				Adjusted R ² = -.006, <i>F</i> (7, 200) = 0.81, <i>p</i> = .579			

Note. *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan) = 274; *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch) = 208. The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors. The second models additionally include the interaction between the predictors.

For Dutch-Moroccan candidates, post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was negatively associated with Dutch-Moroccan invitation likelihood under high ($b = -0.04$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(126) = -4.04$, $p < .001$), but not under low time pressure ($b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(135) = -0.94$, $p = .349$).

B3. First Robustness Check H3 (Study 1)

Table S5

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Diversity Climate, Prejudice Towards the Applicant's Group, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan								
(Intercept)	7.90	1.03	7.64	<.001	9.89	1.40	7.05	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.06	0.11	0.52	.606	-0.37	0.23	-1.60	.110
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-3.43	<.001	-0.08	0.03	-2.87	.004
Gender: Male	-0.17	0.26	-0.66	.513	-0.15	0.25	-0.58	.565
Age	0.00	0.01	-0.06	.952	0.00	0.01	-0.01	.990
Education	0.18	0.24	0.74	.458	0.20	0.24	0.83	.407
HR Involvement	-0.03	0.12	-0.25	.804	-0.01	0.12	-0.07	.945
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					0.01	0.01	2.08	.038
	Adjusted R ² = .035, <i>F</i> (6, 266) = 2.63, <i>p</i> = .017				Adjusted R ² = .047, <i>F</i> (7, 265) = 2.90, <i>p</i> = .006			
Ethnicity: Dutch								
(Intercept)	8.10	1.20	6.73	<.001	6.95	1.99	3.50	.001
Diversity Climate	0.17	0.13	1.28	.202	0.39	0.33	1.18	.238
Prejudice	-0.01	0.01	-0.60	.550	0.03	0.05	0.58	.561
Gender: Male	0.02	0.30	0.07	.947	0.00	0.30	0.00	.999
Age	-0.02	0.01	-1.25	.215	-0.02	0.01	-1.29	.199
Education	-0.44	0.27	-1.62	.107	-0.41	0.28	-1.48	.141
HR Involvement	0.05	0.14	0.33	.745	0.04	0.14	0.27	.789
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					-0.01	0.01	-0.73	.468
	Adjusted R ² = -.005, <i>F</i> (6, 201) = 0.84, <i>p</i> = .537				Adjusted R ² = -.007, <i>F</i> (7, 200) = 0.81, <i>p</i> = .591			

Note. $n_{(\text{Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan})} = 274$; $n_{(\text{Ethnicity: Dutch})} = 208$. The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors. The second models additionally include the interaction between the predictors.

For Dutch-Moroccan candidates, post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was negatively associated with Dutch-Moroccans' invitation likelihood when the climate was rather diversity-unfriendly (i.e., at $M - 1$ SD; $b = -0.04$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(266) = -3.98$, $p < .001$) or when it was neutral (i.e., at mean level; $b = -0.03$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(266) = -3.27$, $p = .001$), but not when it was rather diversity-friendly (i.e., at $M + 1$ SD; $b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(266) = -0.95$, $p = .341$).

B4. Second Robustness Check H1 (Study 1)

Table S6

Regression Models Estimating the Effect of Prejudice towards the Applicant's Group on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	8.09	0.21	38.35	<.001
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-3.52	<.001
Adjusted R ² = .026, <i>F</i> (1, 433) = 12.39, <i>p</i> < .001				
Ethnicity: Dutch				
(Intercept)	7.23	0.26	28.10	<.001
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-1.93	.055
Adjusted R ² = .008, <i>F</i> (1, 350) = 3.71, <i>p</i> = .055				

Note. *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan) = 435; *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch) = 352.

B5. Second Robustness Check H2 (Study 1)

Table S7

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Time Pressure, Prejudice Towards the Applicant's Group, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan								
(Intercept)	8.01	0.23	34.30	<.001	7.71	0.31	25.32	<.001
Time Pressure	0.14	0.21	0.70	.484	0.71	0.42	1.69	.092
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-3.51	<.001	-0.01	0.01	-1.31	.191
Time Pressure x Prejudice					-0.02	0.01	-1.54	.125
	Adjusted R ² = .024, <i>F</i> (2, 432) = 6.43, <i>p</i> = .002				Adjusted R ² = .028, <i>F</i> (3, 431) = 5.09, <i>p</i> = .002			
Ethnicity: Dutch								
(Intercept)	7.46	0.28	26.89	<.001	7.47	0.33	22.49	<.001
Time Pressure	-0.47	0.22	-2.13	.034	-0.51	0.52	-0.96	.336
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-1.96	.051	-0.02	0.01	-1.58	.115
Time Pressure x Prejudice					0.00	0.02	0.07	.947
	Adjusted R ² = .018, <i>F</i> (2, 349) = 4.13, <i>p</i> = .017				Adjusted R ² = .015, <i>F</i> (3, 348) = 2.75, <i>p</i> = .043			

Note. *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan) = 435; *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch) = 352. Reference group for Time Pressure is low (coded as 0). The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors. The second models additionally include the interaction between the predictors.

For Dutch-Moroccan candidates, post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was negatively associated with Dutch-Moroccan invitation likelihood under high ($b = -0.03$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(210) = -3.82$, $p < .001$), but not under low time pressure ($b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(221) = -1.25$, $p = .214$).

B6. Second Robustness Check H3 (Study 1)

Table S8

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Diversity Climate, Prejudice Towards the Applicant's Group, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan								
(Intercept)	7.95	0.51	15.56	<.001	9.06	1.01	8.98	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.03	0.09	0.30	.766	-0.19	0.19	-0.97	.320
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-3.47	<.001	-0.05	0.02	-2.01	.045
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					0.01	0.00	1.28	.203
	Adjusted R ² = .024, <i>F</i> (2, 432) = 6.23, <i>p</i> = .002				Adjusted R ² = .025, <i>F</i> (3, 431) = 4.70, <i>p</i> = .003			
Ethnicity: Dutch								
(Intercept)	7.03	0.57	12.25	<.001	6.24	1.25	4.98	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.04	0.10	0.40	.692	0.19	0.24	0.81	.421
Prejudice	-0.02	0.01	-1.87	.062	0.01	0.03	0.29	.773
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					-0.01	0.01	-0.71	.481
	Adjusted R ² = .005, <i>F</i> (2, 349) = 1.93, <i>p</i> = .147				Adjusted R ² = .004, <i>F</i> (3, 348) = 1.45, <i>p</i> = .228			

Note. *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch-Moroccan) = 435; *n* (Ethnicity: Dutch) = 352. The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors. The second models additionally include their interaction.

For Dutch-Moroccan candidates, post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was negatively associated with Dutch-Moroccans' invitation likelihood when the climate was rather diversity-unfriendly (i.e., at *M* - 1 SD; *b* = -0.02, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(431) = -3.37, *p* < .001) or when it was neutral (i.e., at mean level; *b* = -0.02, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(431) = -3.45, *p* = .001), but not when it was rather diversity-friendly (i.e., at *M* + 1 SD; *b* = -0.01, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(431) = -1.53, *p* = .126).

C. Robustness Checks Study 2

C1. First Robustness Check H1 (Study 2)

Table S9

Regression Model Estimating the Effect of Prejudice towards Moroccans on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.67	0.62	12.37	<.001
Prejudice	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	.996
Gender: Male	-0.17	0.24	-0.72	.470
Age	0.02	0.01	1.57	.117
Education	-0.30	0.17	-1.78	.076
HR Involvement	-0.04	0.24	-0.15	.877

Note. $n = 255$. Adjusted $R^2 = .000$, $F(5, 247) = 1.01$, $p = .413$.

C2. First Robustness Check H2 (Study 2)

Table S10

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Time Pressure, Prejudice towards Moroccans, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.77	0.63	12.25	<.001	7.84	0.66	11.80	<.001
Time Pressure: High	-0.18	0.23	-0.80	.422	-0.32	0.47	-0.67	.503
Prejudice	-0.00	0.01	-0.07	.942	-0.00	0.01	-0.28	.779
Gender: Male	-0.18	0.24	-0.75	.457	-0.18	0.24	-0.76	.447
Age	0.02	0.01	1.53	.127	0.02	0.01	1.56	.121
Education	-0.30	0.17	-1.76	.079	-0.30	0.17	-1.76	.079
HR Involvement	-0.02	0.24	-0.07	.942	-0.03	0.24	-0.13	.894
Time Pressure x Prejudice					0.00	0.01	0.33	.743
	Adjusted R ² = -.001, F(6, 246) = 0.95, <i>p</i> = .462				Adjusted R ² = -.005, F(7, 245) = 0.82, <i>p</i> = .568			

Note. *n* = 255. The first model includes only the main effects of the two predictors. The second model additionally includes the interaction between the predictors.

Post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was neither under high ($b = 0.00$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(116) = 0.43$, $p = .667$) nor under low time pressure ($b = -0.00$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(123) = -0.01$, $p = .994$) associated with Dutch-Moroccan invitation likelihood.

C3. First Robustness Check H3 (Study 2)

Table S11

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Diversity Climate, Prejudice Towards Moroccans, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, Controlled for Participants' Gender, Age, Education, and HR Involvement.

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.59	0.78	9.73	<.001	7.35	1.18	6.24	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.02	0.11	0.16	.870	0.07	0.21	0.32	.752
Prejudice	0.00	0.01	0.04	.967	0.01	0.02	0.27	.786
Gender: Male	-0.18	0.24	-0.74	.461	-0.18	0.24	-0.76	.447
Age	0.02	0.01	1.53	.127	0.02	0.01	1.53	.127
Education	-0.30	0.17	-1.78	.076	-0.30	0.17	-1.77	.079
HR Involvement	-0.04	0.24	-0.16	.873	-0.03	0.24	-0.15	.885
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					-0.00	0.00	-0.27	.787
Adjusted R ² = -.004, F(6, 246) = 0.84, <i>p</i> = .539				Adjusted R ² = -.008, F(7, 245) = 0.73, <i>p</i> = .648				

Note. *n* = 255. The first model includes only the main effects of the two predictors. The second model additionally includes the interaction between the predictors.

Post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was not associated with Dutch-Moroccans' invitation likelihood when the climate was rather diversity-unfriendly (i.e., at *M* - 1 SD; *b* = 0.00, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(245) = 0.19, *p* = .848), neutral (i.e., at mean level; *b* = 0.00, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(245) = 0.00, *p* = .998), and rather diversity-friendly (i.e., at *M* + 1 SD; *b* = -0.00, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(245) = -0.16, *p* = .871).

C4. Second Robustness Check H1 (Study 2)

Table S12

Regression Model Estimating the Effect of Prejudice towards Moroccans on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.68	0.20	38.07	<.001
Prejudice	-0.01	0.00	-1.75	.081

Note. $n = 348$. Adjusted $R^2 = .006$, $F(1, 346) = 3.06$, $p = .081$.

C5. Second Robustness Check H2 (Study 2)

Table S13

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Time Pressure, Prejudice Towards Moroccans, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.80	0.23	33.89	<.001	7.62	0.30	25.74	<.001
Time Pressure	-0.21	0.20	-1.05	.296	0.13	0.40	0.32	.751
Prejudice	-0.01	0.00	-1.82	.070	-0.00	0.01	-0.61	.545
Time Pressure x Prejudice					-0.01	0.01	-0.95	.345
	Adjusted R ² = .006, <i>F</i> (2, 345) = 2.08, <i>p</i> = .127				Adjusted R ² = .006, <i>F</i> (3, 344) = 1.68, <i>p</i> = .171			

Note. *n* = 348. Reference group for Time Pressure is low (coded as 0). The first model includes only the main effects of the two predictors. The second model additionally includes the interaction between the predictors.

Post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was neither under high ($b = -0.01$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(171) = -1.81$, $p = .072$) nor under low time pressure ($b = -0.00$, $SE = 0.01$; $t(173) = -0.66$, $p = .507$) associated with Dutch-Moroccan invitation likelihood.

C6. Second Robustness Check H3 (Study 2)

Table S14

Regression Models Estimating Effects of Diversity Climate, Prejudice Towards Moroccans, and their Interaction on Invitation Likelihood for Dutch-Moroccan Applicants, based on the full sample (i.e., without excluding any participants).

Variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	7.49	0.53	14.24	<.001	7.84	0.89	8.81	<.001
Diversity Climate	0.04	0.09	0.39	.698	-0.04	0.17	-0.21	.833
Prejudice	-0.01	0.00	-1.59	.113	-0.02	0.02	-0.88	.380
Diversity Climate x Prejudice					0.00	0.00	0.48	.630
	Adjusted R ² = .003, <i>F</i> (2, 345) = 1.60, <i>p</i> = .203				Adjusted R ² = .001, <i>F</i> (3, 344) = 1.14, <i>p</i> = .332			

Note. *n* = 348. The first models include only the main effects of the two predictors. The second models additionally include the interaction between the predictors.

Post-hoc simple slope analyses showed that prejudice towards Moroccans was not associated with Dutch-Moroccans' invitation likelihood when the climate was rather diversity-unfriendly (i.e., at *M* - 1 SD; *b* = -0.01, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(344) = -1.57, *p* = .118), neutral (i.e., at mean level; *b* = -0.01, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(344) = -1.49, *p* = .138), and rather diversity-friendly (i.e., at *M* + 1 SD; *b* = -0.01, *SE* = 0.01; *t*(344) = -0.74, *p* = .462).