

Supplementary Materials

Contents

A Study 1 Supplementary Results	2
A.1 Intent to Treat Model	2
B Study 2 Supplementary Results	3
B.1 Intent to Treat Model	3
B.2 Politically Mismatched Participants Excluded	4
B.3 Repeat Participants and Groups Excluded	5
B.4 Manipulation Check	6
B.5 Partisan Differences	7

A Study 1 Supplementary Results

A.1 Intent to Treat Model

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	111.57	37.19	16.55	0.0000
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	91.25	91.25	40.61	0.0000
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	16.77	16.77	7.46	0.0065
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	3.56	3.56	1.58	0.2086
Residuals	581	1305.57	2.25		

Table 1: **INCOMPLETE: Intent-to-treat model** $n = \text{XXX}$.

A.2 Manipulation Check

Because our study involved deception, it was critical that participants believe that they were (a) talking to real people during the chat phase and (b) that they were seeing a real person's choice behavior. We pretested our paradigm in several pilot studies, and in our final sample for Study 1, we found that XXXX% of participants believed they were talking to a real person during the chat phase of the experiment, and XXX % of participants in Conditions 2, 3, and 4 believed that another participant really was assigning tasks. As a robustness check, we found that our results were robust even when excluding those who failed both manipulation checks.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	15.83	5.28	2.54	0.0568
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	0.23	0.23	0.11	0.7419
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	12.54	12.54	6.03	0.0146
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	3.06	3.06	1.47	0.2263
Residuals	305	634.06	2.08		

Table 2: **INCOMPLETE** Only those who passed the manipulation check, $n = \text{XXX}$

B Study 2 Supplementary Results

B.1 Intent to Treat Model

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	111.57	37.19	16.55	0.0000
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	91.25	91.25	40.61	0.0000
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	16.77	16.77	7.46	0.0065
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	3.56	3.56	1.58	0.2086
Residuals	581	1305.57	2.25		

Table 3: Study 2: Intent-to-treat model, $n = 585$.

B.2 Politically Mismatched Participants Excluded

Participants were assigned roles (either Democrats or Republicans) based on the ideology they reported on Prolific. We also asked participants to report their political orientation on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Very Liberal, 7 = Very Conservative). We found that there were 5 participants who had reported that they were a Democrat on Prolific but responded that they were conservative in the survey, and 9 participants who reported that they were a Republican on Prolific, but responded that they were liberal in the survey.

We also asked participants how much they identified with their political ingroups or outgroups in the survey, and found that there were 11 Democrats who reported identifying more with Republicans than Democrats, and 25 Republicans who reported identifying more with Democrats than Republicans. Results do not significantly change when these participants ($n = 46$) are excluded. Results from the contrast models are listed in Table 3, and results from the linear model examining the interaction effect between condition (Ingroup vs. Outgroup) and Collective Identification was not significant $\beta = 0.086$, $t(244) = 0.74$, $p = 0.46$.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	29.16	9.72	4.75	0.0028
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	2.38	2.38	1.16	0.2816
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	21.39	21.39	10.46	0.0013
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	5.39	5.39	2.64	0.1052
Residuals	482	985.87	2.05		

Table 4: Politically mismatched participants excluded, $n = 486$.

B.3 Repeat Participants and Groups Excluded

Due to an error on Prolific, there were $n = 13$ participants who participated in our study more than once. We exclude their repeated participations from analyses, but because this study involves both deception and participant interaction, it was possible that the repeat subjects could have revealed the purpose of the study to other participants during the chat phase. After examining the chat logs, we found repeat participants did not reveal the purpose of the study during the chats. Nonetheless, we ran a robustness check excluding all participants who chatted with a repeat participant $n = 45$. Overall, we found that our results were robust even when excluding these participants.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	23.66	7.89	3.82	0.0101
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	3.09	3.09	1.50	0.2219
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	18.32	18.32	8.87	0.0030
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	2.25	2.25	1.09	0.2973
Residuals	499	1031.32	2.07		

Table 5: Results excluding those who had chatted with a repeat participant, $n = 503$

B.4 Manipulation Check

Because our study involved deception, it was critical that participants believe that they were (a) talking to real people during the chat phase and (b) that they were seeing a real person's choice behavior. We pretested our paradigm in several pilot studies, and in our final sample for Study 2, we found that 73.97% of participants believed they were talking to a real person during the chat phase of the experiment, and 74.48 % of participants in Conditions 2, 3, and 4 believed that another participant really was assigning tasks. As a robustness check, we found that our results were robust even when excluding those who failed both manipulation checks.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	15.83	5.28	2.54	0.0568
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	0.23	0.23	0.11	0.7419
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	12.54	12.54	6.03	0.0146
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	3.06	3.06	1.47	0.2263
Residuals	305	634.06	2.08		

Table 6: Only those who passed the manipulation check, $n = 309$.

B.5 Partisan Differences

We did not preregister any partisan differences, but we also wanted to include an exploratory analysis comparing Democrats and Republicans. We find evidence of outgroup derogation, but not moral hypocrisy in Democrats, whereas we find evidence of both outgroup derogation and moral hypocrisy in Republicans.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	11.08	3.69	1.96	0.1198
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	3.14	3.14	1.67	0.1976
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	7.88	7.88	4.19	0.0417
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.8505
Residuals	264	496.63	1.88		

Table 7: Democrats only, $n = 268$.

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Model	3	39.75	13.25	6.12	0.0005
Contrast 1 - Self vs. Other	1	20.35	20.35	9.41	0.0024
Contrast 2 - Ingroup vs. Outgroup	1	10.76	10.76	4.97	0.0266
Contrast 3 - Self/Ingroup vs. Other/Outgroup	1	8.64	8.64	3.99	0.0467
Residuals	260	562.40	2.16		

Table 8: Republicans only, $n = 264$.