

Study 2 Supplementary Materials

Table of Contents

1. Table S1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Abortion Stance	1
2. Study Materials for Pro-choice Participants	2
Outgroup Perception Condition	2
Metaperception Condition	5
Ingroup Perception Condition	8
3. Study Materials for Pro-life Participants	12
Outgroup Perception Condition	12
Metaperception Condition	15
Ingroup Perception Condition	18
4. Questions Answered by All Participants	22
Screening Question	22
Demographic Questions	22
5. Social Acceptability Analysis	24
Table S2. Planned Contrast Analyses for Social Acceptability	25
6. Perceived Motives Analysis	26
References	29

Table S1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Abortion Stance

Variable	Pro-choice ($n = 289$)	Pro-life ($n = 263$)
Age (years)	$M = 36.84$, Range = 18–74	$M = 41.60$, Range = 19–80
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	180	135
Male	98	124
Non-binary	10	2
Prefer not to say	1	2
<i>Education</i>		
Less than high school	2	2
High school graduate	27	47
Some college	74	45
2-year degree	28	32
4-year degree	112	89
Professional degree	40	47
Doctorate	6	1
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Asian/Asian American	23	8
Black/African American	39	49
Hispanic	26	15
Native American or Alaska Native	5	1
White or European American	195	187
North African or Middle Eastern	1	1
Other	-	2
Household Income	Median = \$65,000 (IQR: \$35,000–\$125,000)	Median = \$65,000 (IQR: \$45,000–\$125,000)

Note. Pro-choice participants were distributed across conditions as follows: outgroup perception ($n = 96$), metaperception ($n = 97$), and ingroup perception ($n = 96$). Pro-life participants were distributed across conditions as follows: outgroup perception ($n = 89$), metaperception ($n = 85$), and ingroup perception ($n = 89$).

Study Material for Pro-choice Participants

Outgroup Perception Condition

Emily, a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community, holds strong pro-life beliefs, rooted in her faith and experience as a young mother. Despite the challenges of early motherhood, she found purpose and joy in raising her child, reinforcing her belief that life starts at conception. Concerned about what she sees as a disregard for unborn lives, Emily actively advocates for restrictive abortion laws, speaking at community events and state sessions. Despite criticism for her views, she remains determined, hoping to inspire others and promote the value of family and alternatives to abortion.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, which of the following statements about Emily is NOT true?

- Emily is a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community.
- Emily supports access to abortion and advocates for pro-choice policies.
- Emily's pro-life beliefs are influenced by her faith and experience as a young mother.
- Emily actively participates in community events and state sessions to promote restrictive abortion laws.

Morality

Please read the following sentences and indicate the extent to which you think each statement describes Emily: (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.

2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.
10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

Please rate Emily on the following dimensions using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely):

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy

- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

If you were to sit on a bench alongside Emily, what comfortable distance would you prefer to maintain? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far way as possible)

Perceived Motives

Which of the following reasons do you think is the best explanation for Emily's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to restrict women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to protect the unborn.
3. She is concerned about violations of the religious laws.
4. She does not care about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you dislike Emily's stance?
2. How much do you oppose her stance?

3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you find her stance?

All items were rated on a 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Metaperception Condition

Sara, a 28-year-old liberal woman from a progressive urban area, is passionate about advocating for reproductive rights. A few years ago, she faced an unexpected pregnancy at a time when financial constraints, personal goals, and the absence of a supportive partner made her unprepared to have a child. After much consideration, she decided to have an abortion, a difficult and emotional experience that strengthened her belief in a woman's right to choose. Disturbed by the rise of restrictive abortion laws, Sara actively speaks at rallies, sharing her story to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy. Despite facing hostility, she remains committed to inspiring change and protecting reproductive rights.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, what does Sara do to advocate for reproductive rights?

- She shares her story at rallies to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy.
- She writes laws to support abortion access.
- She donates to organizations supporting reproductive rights.
- She volunteers to help women access reproductive healthcare.

Morality

In this section, we want you to think about Sara from the perspective of a prolife person. Specifically, we are asking you to answer each question based on how you believe a typical prolife person would view her beliefs, values, and actions. For example, do you think

a prolife person would believe that Sara is an empathetic person toward those people who have suffered in their lives? Use the following scale to rate each statement based on what you think a prolife person would believe about Sara's views. (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.
2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.
10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

In this section, we want you to think about Sara from the perspective of a prolife person. Specifically, we are asking you to rate Sara on the following dimensions based on how you believe a typical prolife person would rate her. Please use a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) for each dimension. Consider how a typical prolife person might perceive Sara, and base your ratings on that perspective rather than your own views.

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy
- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

What distance do you think a prolife person would prefer to maintain while sitting on a bench alongside Sara? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far way as possible).

Perceived Motives

From the perspective of a pro-life person, which of the following reasons do you think best explains Sara's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to protect women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to harm the unborn.
3. She wants to violate of the religious laws.
4. She is concerned about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you believe a pro-life person will dislike Sara's stance?
2. How much do you believe a pro-life person will oppose Sara's stance?
3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you believe a pro-life person will find her stance?

All items were rated on 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Ingroup Perception

Sara, a 28-year-old liberal woman from a progressive urban area, is passionate about advocating for reproductive rights. A few years ago, she faced an unexpected pregnancy at a time when financial constraints, personal goals, and the absence of a supportive partner made her unprepared to have a child. After much consideration, she decided to have an abortion, a difficult and emotional experience that strengthened her belief in a woman's right to choose. Disturbed by the rise of restrictive abortion laws, Sara actively speaks at rallies, sharing her story to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy. Despite facing hostility, she remains committed to inspiring change and protecting reproductive rights.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, what does Sara do to advocate for reproductive rights?

- She shares her story at rallies to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy.
- She writes laws to support abortion access.
- She donates to organizations supporting reproductive rights.
- She volunteers to help women access reproductive healthcare.

Morality

Please read the following sentences and indicate the extent to which you think each statement describes Sara: (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.
2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.

10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

Please rate Sara on the following dimensions using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely):

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy
- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

If you were to sit on a bench alongside Sara, what comfortable distance would you prefer to maintain? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far away as possible)

Perceived Motives

From your perspective, which of the following reasons do you think best explains Sara's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to protect women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to harm the unborn.
3. She wants to violate the religious laws.
4. She is concerned about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you dislike Sara's stance?
2. How much do you oppose Sara's stance?
3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you find her stance?

All items were rated on a 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Study Material for Pro-life Participants

Outgroup Perception Condition

Sara, a 28-year-old liberal woman from a progressive urban area, is passionate about advocating for reproductive rights. A few years ago, she faced an unexpected pregnancy at a time when financial constraints, personal goals, and the absence of a supportive partner made her unprepared to have a child. After much consideration, she decided to have an abortion—a difficult and emotional experience that strengthened her belief in a woman's right to choose. Disturbed by the rise of restrictive abortion laws, Sara actively speaks at rallies, sharing her story to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy. Despite facing hostility, she remains committed to inspiring change and protecting reproductive rights.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, what does Sara do to advocate for reproductive rights?

- She shares her story at rallies to emphasize the importance of women's autonomy.
- She writes laws to support abortion access.
- She donates to organizations supporting reproductive rights.
- She volunteers to help women access reproductive healthcare.

Morality

Please read the following sentences and indicate the extent to which you think each statement describes Sara: (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.

2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.
10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

Please rate Sara on the following dimensions using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely):

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy

- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

If you were to sit on a bench alongside Sara, what comfortable distance would you prefer to maintain? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far way as possible)

Perceived Motives

Which of the following reasons do you think is the best explanation for Sara's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to protect women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to harm the unborn.
3. She wants to violate of the religious laws.
4. She is concerned about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you dislike Sara's stance?
2. How much do you oppose her stance?
3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you find her stance?

All items were rated on 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Metaperception Condition

Emily, a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community, holds strong pro-life beliefs, rooted in her faith and experience as a young mother. Despite the challenges of early motherhood, she found purpose and joy in raising her child, reinforcing her belief that life starts at conception. Concerned about what she sees as a disregard for unborn lives, Emily actively advocates for restrictive abortion laws, speaking at community events and state sessions. Despite criticism for her views, she remains determined, hoping to inspire others and promote the value of family and alternatives to abortion.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, which of the following statements about Emily is NOT true?

- Emily is a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community.
- Emily supports access to abortion and advocates for pro-choice policies.
- Emily's pro-life beliefs are influenced by her faith and experience as a young mother.
- Emily actively participates in community events and state sessions to promote restrictive abortion laws.

Morality

In this section, we want you to think about Emily from the perspective of a prochoice person. Specifically, we are asking you to answer each question based on how you believe a typical prochoice person would view her beliefs, values, and actions. For example, do you think a prochoice person would believe that Emily is an empathetic person toward those people who have suffered in their lives? Use the following scale to rate each statement based on what you think a prochoice person would believe about Emily's views. (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.
2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.
10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

In this section, we want you to think about Emily from the perspective of a pro-choice person. Specifically, we are asking you to rate Emily on the following dimensions based on how you believe a typical pro-choice person would rate her. Please use a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) for each dimension. Consider how a typical pro-choice person might perceive Emily, and base your ratings on that perspective rather than your own views.

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy
- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

What distance do you think a pro-choice person would prefer to maintain while sitting on a bench alongside Emily? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far way as possible).

Perceived Motives

From the perspective of a pro-choice person, which of the following reasons do you think best explains Emily's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to restrict women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to protect the unborn.
3. She is concerned about violations of the religious laws.
4. She does not care about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you believe a pro-choice person will dislike Emily's stance?
2. How much do you believe a pro-choice person will oppose Emily's stance?
3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you believe a pro-choice person will find her stance?

All items were rated on 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Ingroup Perception

Emily, a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community, holds strong pro-life beliefs, rooted in her faith and experience as a young mother. Despite the challenges of early motherhood, she found purpose and joy in raising her child, reinforcing her belief that life starts at conception. Concerned about what she sees as a disregard for unborn lives, Emily actively advocates for restrictive abortion laws, speaking at community events and state sessions. Despite criticism for her views, she remains determined, hoping to inspire others and promote the value of family and alternatives to abortion.

Comprehension Check

Based on the scenario described, which of the following statements about Emily is NOT true?

- Emily is a 30-year-old woman from a conservative community.
- Emily supports access to abortion and advocates for pro-choice policies.
- Emily's pro-life beliefs are influenced by her faith and experience as a young mother.
- Emily actively participates in community events and state sessions to promote restrictive abortion laws.

Morality

Please read the following sentences and indicate the extent to which you think each statement describes Emily: (From 1 = Does not describe her at all to 5 = Describes her extremely well)

1. She is empathetic toward those people who have suffered in their lives.
2. It pains her when she sees someone ignoring the needs of another human being..
3. She believes that everyone should be given the same quantity of resources in life.
4. She gets upset when some people have a lot more money than others in her country.
5. She thinks people who are more hard-working should end up with more money.
6. She feels good when she sees cheaters get caught and punished.
7. She thinks children should be taught to be loyal to their country.
8. She believes the strength of a sports team comes from the loyalty of its members to each other.
9. She thinks it is important for societies to cherish their traditional values.
10. She believes that one of the most important values to teach children is to have respect for authority.
11. Choose the third option for this statement. (Attention Check)
12. She believes chastity is an important virtue.
13. It upsets her when people use foul language like it is nothing.

Warmth and Competence

Please rate Sara on the following dimensions using a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely):

- Warm
- Friendly
- Trustworthy
- Sincere
- Competent
- Capable
- Skillful
- Intelligent

Social Distance

If you were to sit on a bench alongside Emily, what comfortable distance would you prefer to maintain? 1 = As near as possible to 7 = As far way as possible)

Perceived Motives

From your perspective, which of the following reasons do you think best explains Emily's stance on abortion? Please rank the sentences from 1 (most likely) to 4 (least likely) by dragging and dropping them into your preferred order.

1. She wants to restrict women's right to choose what is best for them.
2. She wants to protect the unborn.

3. She is concerned about violations of the religious laws.
4. She does not care about how restricting abortion can be detrimental to women's health.

Social Acceptability

1. How much do you dislike Emily's stance?
2. How much do you oppose Emily's stance?
3. How politically/socially unacceptable do you find her stance?

All items were rated on a 7-point scale from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely.

Questions Answered by all the participants

Screening Question

Which of the following statements best represents your view on abortion?

- I believe abortion should be legal and accessible in all or most cases.
- I believe abortion should be illegal in all or most cases.
- I have no strong opinion on abortion.

Demographic Questions

1. What is your age?

[Open-ended numeric response]

2. What is your gender identity?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary / third gender
- Prefer not to say

3. Which of the categories best describes you?

- Native American or Alaska Native
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino/Latinx
- Middle Eastern or North African
- White or European American

- Other

4. Which one describes your political opinions better?

- Very liberal
- Liberal
- Slightly liberal
- Moderate
- Slightly conservative
- Conservative
- Very conservative

5. What is the highest level of education you completed?

- Less than high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- 2 year degree
- 4 year degree
- Professional degree
- Doctorate

6. What is your combined annual household income?

[Scale from "Less than \$10,000" to "More than \$150,000"]

Social Acceptability

To assess whether previously documented patterns of negative metaperceptions replicate in the context of abortion attitudes, we included a measure of social acceptability modeled after prior work on intergroup metaperceptions (Lees & Cikara, 2019). Participants rated the extent to which they disliked the target, opposed the target’s stance, and found the target’s stance politically or socially unacceptable. Specifically, participants responded to the following items: “How much do you dislike [the target name]?”, “How much do you oppose her stance?”, and “How politically or socially unacceptable do you find her stance?” Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*). All items were reverse-scored such that higher values indicated greater perceived social acceptability, and items were averaged to form a composite score.

The omnibus analysis revealed a strong main effect of perception condition, $F(2, 545) = 133.48$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .33$, indicating that judgments of social acceptability varied substantially depending on whether participants evaluated an ingroup target, an outgroup target, or predicted how the outgroup would evaluate their ingroup. In contrast, there was no main effect of abortion stance, $F(1, 545) = 0.26$, $p = .61$, partial $\eta^2 < .001$, and no significant stance \times condition interaction, $F(2, 545) = 2.22$, $p = .11$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. Political ideology did not significantly predict social acceptability ratings, $F(1, 545) = 2.31$, $p = .13$.

To directly test ingroup favoritism, we compared ingroup evaluations from one stance with outgroup evaluations of that same target by the opposing stance. Consistent with strong ingroup bias, both contrasts were large and statistically significant. Pro-life participants rated a pro-life target as substantially more socially acceptable than pro-choice participants rated a pro-life target ($M_{\text{diff}} = 2.74$, $p < .0001$). Likewise, pro-choice participants rated a pro-choice target as more socially acceptable than pro-life participants rated a pro-choice target ($M_{\text{diff}} = 3.10$, $p < .0001$). These results indicate robust and symmetric ingroup favoritism in social acceptability judgments across abortion stances.

We next compared actual outgroup perceptions with opposing-group metaperceptions to assess the accuracy of beliefs about how one's group is viewed by ideological opponents. For both abortion stances, metaperceptions were significantly more negative than actual outgroup evaluations. Pro-life participants believed that pro-choice individuals would view pro-life targets as less socially acceptable than pro-choice participants actually did ($M_{\text{diff}} = 0.63$, $p = .015$). Similarly, pro-choice participants underestimated how socially acceptable they would be perceived by pro-life individuals ($M_{\text{diff}} = 0.88$, $p < .001$).

Although both groups evaluated outgroup members as moderately socially acceptable, they believed they were viewed far more negatively than was actually the case. This pattern parallels the results observed for warmth and competence judgments and contrasts with the more asymmetric metaperceptual patterns observed in the moral foundations domain.

Table S2: Planned Contrast Analyses for Social Acceptability Across Groups and Conditions

Contrast Type	Contrast	M Δ	SE	95% CI	$t(545)$	p
Ingroup vs. Outgroup (Opposing Stance)	Pro-life Ingroup vs. Pro-choice Outgroup	2.74	0.26	[2.22, 3.26]	10.43	< .001
	Pro-choice Ingroup vs. Pro-life Outgroup	3.10	0.26	[2.60, 3.61]	12.11	< .001
Outgroup vs. Metaperception (Opposing Stance)	Pro-life Outgroup vs. Pro-choice Metaperception	0.63	0.26	[0.12, 1.14]	2.44	.015
	Pro-choice Outgroup vs. Pro-life Metaperception	0.88	0.26	[0.36, 1.39]	3.35	.001

Note. M Δ = mean difference from estimated marginal means (adjusted for political ideology). Positive values indicate that the first group in the contrast was rated as more socially acceptable than the second group.

Perceived Motives Measure

The aim of the perceived motives measure was to go beyond abstract evaluations of social perception (e.g., morality, warmth, and competence) and assess whether participants possess a realistic understanding of the underlying moral reasons that motivate members of different groups to hold their abortion stance. Rather than asking whether targets are seen as good or bad, this measure captures how participants explain why individuals on each side of the abortion debate believe and act as they do.

Prior work suggests that pro-choice attitudes are commonly rooted in concerns about bodily autonomy, privacy, and gender equality, with abortion framed as a matter of women's rights and health rather than moral deviance (Beck et al., 2024; Fischer, 2003). In this view, support for abortion access is motivated by the belief that women should retain control over their own bodies and reproductive decisions.

In contrast, pro-life attitudes are typically grounded in moral concerns about the sanctity of life, harm to the unborn, and adherence to religious or moral rules governing human life (Hershenov, 2020; Swank, 2020). From this perspective, abortion is seen as morally wrong because it violates deeply held beliefs about the moral status of the fetus and the obligations imposed by religious or ethical frameworks.

Based on this literature, we constructed four motive items designed to reflect these canonical moral framings—two aligned with pro-choice moral reasoning (women's right to choose; concern for women's health) and two aligned with pro-life moral reasoning (protecting the unborn; adherence to religious or moral law). Importantly, these motives were intended to represent legitimizing moral explanations as articulated by each group themselves, rather than negative stereotypes or caricatured attributions imposed by opponents.

Specifically, participants ranked four possible motives underlying a target individual's abortion stance. These motives were derived from prior theoretical and empirical work identifying the central moral concerns that typically motivate pro-choice and pro-life positions, rather than evaluative judgments about the target's character. Participants were

asked to rank the motives to capture their perceived relative explanatory priority among competing moral frames, rather than their absolute endorsement of any single explanation. To capture framing alignment, we computed two composite scores for each participant. Ingroup-consistent framing reflected the average rank of motives aligned with the participant's own stance (pro-choice framing for pro-choice participants; pro-life framing for pro-life participants). Outgroup-consistent framing reflected the average rank of motives aligned with the opposing stance. Because rankings were ordinal (1 = most likely, 4 = least likely), lower values indicated greater perceived importance. We then computed a framing bias score by subtracting outgroup-consistent framing from ingroup-consistent framing, such that more negative values indicate stronger reliance on ingroup-consistent framing, whereas values closer to zero or positive values indicate greater reliance on outgroup-consistent framing.

Participants completed this task in one of three conditions: ingroup perception (explaining their own group's stance), outgroup perception (explaining the opposing group's stance), or metaperception (indicating how they believed the outgroup would explain their own group's stance).

Clear differences emerged across participant groups and conditions. Among pro-life participants, ingroup-consistent framing was especially pronounced in the ingroup condition. When explaining their own group's stance, pro-life participants overwhelmingly prioritized pro-life framing (i.e., protecting the unborn and religious or moral concerns), with the vast majority ranking these motives as the most likely explanations. In contrast, their use of pro-choice framing in this condition was minimal. When explaining the prochoice outgroup or considering how the outgroup might explain prolife motives, prolife participants showed a more balanced distribution of framing, with no strong expectation that the outgroup would impose a competing moral frame onto them.

Among prochoice participants, ingroup-consistent framing was also evident when explaining their own stance, with participants prioritizing women's rights and women's health.

When explaining the pro-life outgroup's stance, pro-choice participants showed a reduced reliance on ingroup-consistent (pro-choice) framing and were more willing to attribute pro-life positions to pro-life moral concerns. In contrast, in the metaperception condition, pro-choice participants expected a pronounced shift toward outgroup-consistent framing, believing that pro-life individuals would explain pro-choice motives using pro-life frames such as harm to the unborn or violations of religious values.

To formally test these patterns, we conducted an ANCOVA predicting framing bias from participant group (pro-choice vs. pro-life), condition (ingroup perception, outgroup perception, metaperception), and their interaction, controlling for political ideology. This analysis revealed a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 545) = 32.37, p < .001$, and a significant main effect of group, $F(1, 545) = 116.50, p < .001$. These effects were qualified by a strong Group \times Condition interaction, $F(2, 545) = 59.95, p < .001$. Political ideology did not emerge as a significant covariate.

Planned contrasts clarified the nature of this interaction. Among pro-choice participants, framing bias differed significantly between the ingroup and outgroup perception conditions, indicating a reduction in ingroup-consistent framing when explaining the pro-life outgroup relative to explaining their own group. More critically, pro-choice participants' metaperceptions differed sharply from their outgroup perceptions: they believed that the pro-life outgroup would rely substantially more on pro-life framing to explain pro-choice motives than pro-choice participants themselves used when explaining the pro-life outgroup, $t(545) = 7.81, p < .001$.

Among pro-life participants, framing bias was significantly more negative in the ingroup condition than in the outgroup condition, reflecting very strong reliance on pro-life framing when explaining their own stance. In contrast, there was no significant difference between the outgroup perception and metaperception conditions, indicating that pro-life participants did not expect the pro-choice outgroup to impose a markedly different moral framing on their motives, $t(545) = 0.33, p = .75$.

References

- Beck, E., Seelman, K., Charania, M., Snyder, S. M., & Saffan, S. (2024). Reproductive justice, bodily autonomy, and state violence. *Affilia*, 39(3), 554–568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08861099231225226>
- Fischer, J. M. (2003). Abortion, autonomy, and control over one's body. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 20(2), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052503202120>
- Hershenov, D. B. (2020). What must pro-lifers believe about the moral status of embryos? *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 101(2), 186–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/papq.12306>
- Swank, E. (2020). Gender, religion, and pro-life activism. *Politics and religion*, 13(2), 361–384. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755048319000531>