

## Supplemental Material

**Different correlations.** The correlations between distinctiveness and dangerousness were different in Study 3 (where it was positive) and Study 4 (where it was negative).

When participants rate social groups, we believe distinctiveness is loading primarily on something like real and perceived “foreignness.” Groups like Aboriginal Australians, for example, are seen as very distinctive. South Asians and East Asians also have relatively high distinctiveness ratings. For dangerousness ratings, however, foreignness appears to operate in the opposite direction: Relatively foreign groups were seen as less dangerous than relatively domestic groups, like Blacks and Latinos. Thus, our findings regarding dangerousness may reflect a real-world correlation in how social threat tends to work: People are threatened more by the common domestic groups (Blacks, Latinos; with some exceptions, like Arabs) that they encounter more often in threatening contexts (e.g., who they see on crime blotters). It is also possible that this correlation is not externally-driven and, perhaps by chance, the racial groups that we used clustered into domestic/dangerous and foreign/benign. In either of these cases, the negative correlation is driven by the mismatch between the threatening, domestic groups (Blacks/Latinos in particular) vs. the foreign, benign groups (Aboriginal Australians, East Asians, and South Asians)—the dimensions of dangerousness and distinctiveness negatively correlate with each other due to the nature of the items (the racial groups) themselves. Thus, the negative correlation is not relevant to the mechanism or theoretical framework; both of these properties, regardless of how they inter-correlate, are conceptually prominent and distinct from one another.

Furthermore, we likely would have found a similar negative correlation for liquids if we had selected more exotic liquids, for which people are not sure whether they are dangerous (e.g., horseshoe crab blood), and more well-known liquids, which people know are dangerous (e.g., bleach, gasoline). In this case, distinctiveness and dangerousness would negatively correlate with each other. The sample of liquids that we used in the present work, either by chance or because this is how liquids tend to actually pattern in the world, had more overlap on these dimensions than the social categories described above (e.g., cyanide is both more dangerous and distinctive than morphine, which is both more dangerous and distinctive than vodka). Here, too, this pattern has to do with the items themselves, and is not counter to our theoretical framework.