**Online Supplement 1: Sample Demographics (*N* = 1,913)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean/Prop. | SD |
| Woman respondent (1 = yes) | .50 | .50 |
| *Race/Ethnicity* | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | .68 |  |
| Black, non-Hispanic | .11 |  |
| Other, non-Hispanic | .01 |  |
| Hispanic | .15 |  |
| 2+, non-Hispanic | .03 |  |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | .02 |  |
| Respondent age | 50.59 | 16.87 |
| *High level of education* | |  |
| No HS diploma | .03 |  |
| HS graduate or equivalent | .18 |  |
| Some college | .45 |  |
| BA or above | .34 |  |
| *Marital Status* | |  |
| Married | .51 |  |
| Widowed | .05 |  |
| Divorced | .13 |  |
| Separated | .02 |  |
| Never married | .21 |  |
| Living with partner | .07 |  |
| *Region* | |  |
| Northeast | .15 |  |
| Midwest | .27 |  |
| South | .35 |  |
| West | .23 |  |
| Employed respondent (1 = yes) | .60 | .49 |

**Online Supplement 2: Predicted Moral Evaluation by Scenario**

****

**Online Supplement 3: Results with Controls (*N* = 1,913)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Statusa | Moral Evaluationb |
| Forgiveness Condition | 1.409\*\*\* (0.077) | 2.575\*\*\* (0.114) |
| Woman | –0.098 (0.078) | –0.112 (0.114) |
| Black | 0.092 (0.131) | 0.261 (0.191) |
| Asian | –0.052 (0.277) | 0.211 (0.400) |
| Hispanic | –0.072 (0.116) | –0.081 (0.167) |
| Multi-Racial | –0.483\* (0.227) | –0.307 (0.324) |
| Other Race | 0.377 (0.363) | –0.171 (0.548) |
| Age | –0.005 (0.003) | –0.012\*\* (0.004) |
| High School | 0.200 (0.239) | 0.524 (0.348) |
| Some College | 0.316 (0.230) | 0.283 (0.334) |
| BA or more | 0.191 (0.236) | –0.085 (0.343) |
| Widowed | 0.201 (0.183) | 0.121 (0.262) |
| Divorced | –0.095 (0.120) | –0.072 (0.173) |
| Separated | –0.144 (0.285) | –0.314 (0.429) |
| Never Married | 0.172 (0.109) | –0.081 (0.157) |
| Cohabitating | 0.016 (0.160) | –0.267 (0.233) |
| Midwest | –0.105 (0.126) | –0.066 (0.183) |
| South | 0.000 (0.121) | 0.066 (0.176) |
| West | –0.208 (0.130) | –0.054 (0.189) |
| Employed | 0.041 (0.088) | –0.080 (0.127) |
| Constant | 5.263\*\*\* (0.327) | –0.707 (0.471) |

Standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* *p* < 0.001, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \* *p* < 0.05 (two-tailed tests)

a OLS b Binarylogistic regression

**Online Supplement 4: Weighted Results (*N* = 1,913)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Statusa | Moral Evaluationb |
| Forgiveness Condition | 1.304\*\*\* (0.109) | 2.363\*\*\* (0.150) |
| Constant | 5.128\*\*\* (0.079) | –1.165\*\*\* (0.111) |

Standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* *p* < 0.001, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \* *p* < 0.05 (two-tailed tests)

a OLS b Binarylogistic regression

**Online Supplement 5: Full Mediation Analysis (*N* = 1,913)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Moral Evaluationb | Statusa | Statusa | Statusa |
| Forgiveness Condition | 2.521\*\*\* (0.111) |  | 1.414\*\*\* (0.069) | 0.494\*\*\* (0.083) |
| Group Motivation Condition | 0.136 (0.111) | 0.172\* (0.075) | 0.222\*\* (0.068) | –0.108 (0.070) |
| Morally Right |  | 1.610\*\*\* (0.075) |  | 0.721\*\*\* (0.086) |
| Perceived Group Motivation |  |  |  | 0.319\*\*\* (0.017) |
| Constant | –1.438\*\*\* (0.100) | 4.887\*\*\* (0.065) | 4.934\*\*\* (0.060) | 3.555\*\*\* (0.088) |

Standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* *p* < 0.001, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \* *p* < 0.05 (two-tailed tests)

a OLS b Binarylogistic regression

**Online Supplement 6:** *(How) does individual-level variation shape moral assessments of revenge and forgiveness?*

We leverage our survey data to evaluate whether and how the perceived morality of revenge and forgiveness varies with individual-level traits. Our data includes three identities (national, political, and sports-related), and individual levels of group identification and perceptions of intergroup conflict. We also have standard demographic data that allows us to check for variation across key respondent subgroups. While any number of these individual-level factors might shape moral evaluations of revenge and forgiveness, we focus on a subset that have theoretical relevance or speak to past work.

*Ingroup identification*: Identity can play an important role in group conflict, although scholars differ on the precise mechanism (Benard and Doan 2020; Brewer 2001; Halevy et al. 2008; Sherif 1966). We combine measures of cognitive, evaluative, and affective identity into a single scale, to capture the extent to which respondents see themselves as part of an ingroup, think positively about the group, and feel emotionally attached to the group (Dimmock, Grove, and Eklund 2005; Henry, Arrow, and Carini 1999; Jackson 2002; Minescu and Poppe 2011). We used a set of Likert-type six-point scales, averaged (α =.85).[[1]](#footnote-1)

*Perceived conflict*. Perceived conflict between the in- and outgroup features in a number of theories, and is often thought to exacerbate real-world conflict (Blumer 1958; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Minescu and Poppe 2011). We measured perceived conflict using a series of six-point items, anchored on “completely agree” and “completely disagree” (Riketta 2005), averaged to form a scale (α =.85).[[2]](#footnote-2)

*Gender*: Some work suggests that differences in physical aggression between men and women can be explained in part by men’s greater vengefulness (Wilkowski et al. 2012). We evaluate whether self-reported gender (1 = woman) moderates the perceived morality of revenge and forgiveness behavior.

*Region*: The southern culture of honor hypothesis (Lee and Ousey 2011; Nisbett and Cohen 1996), argues that the American South places a premium on personal honor, encouraging vengeful behavior. While we do not have the geographic granularity to examine this question in detail, for example by focusing on hilly counties historically used for herding as the theory suggests (Chu, Rivera, and Loftin 2000), we can at least evaluate whether revenge is more likely to be viewed as morally right in the South.

We conducted two sets of moderation analyses to answer these questions. First, we examine whether these variables moderate the effect of the forgiving/revenge condition on whether the focal character’s behavior is viewed as morally right. Second, we examine whether these variables moderate the effect of moral evaluation on status. In other words, we examine if different groups of people differentially view forgiveness compared to revenge and whether morality has different status value for them.[[3]](#footnote-3)

<Table S6.1 about here>

Table S6.1 includes results from logistic regressions of moral evaluation on potential moderators and the forgiveness/revenge conditions. Although we include the regression coefficients here, as noted in previous methodological work (Ai and Norton 2003), interaction terms in logistic regressions are meaningless because they concern the log-odds rather than the predicted probabilities in which we are substantively interested. Therefore, we examine, test for, and include in Table S6.1 the second differences in the predicted probabilities to gauge moderation for these models (Mize, Doan, and Long 2019).[[4]](#footnote-4) Gender, ingroup identification, and perceived group conflict each significantly moderate the effects of condition on the predicted probability of moral evaluation. The gender difference is significantly more negative in the revenge condition than in the forgiveness condition (Δ2 = –0.08, *p* < 0.05). Women and men tend to view forgiveness similarly, so this moderation effect is driven by women’s lower likelihood of viewing revenge as morally right compared to men (predicted probability of 0.18 for women compared to 0.23 for men). Contrary to research on the Southern culture of honor, we do not find significant regional variation.

**Table S6.1 Coefficients from Logistic Regression of Moral Evaluation on Condition and Potential Moderators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Gender | Region | Ingroup Identification | Outgroup Conflict |
| Forgiveness | 2.29\*\*\* | 2.82\*\*\* | 3.86\*\*\* | 2.58\*\*\* |
|  | (0.15) | (0.30) | (0.55) | (0.50) |
| Woman | -0.36\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.16) |  |  |  |
| Midwest |  | 0.08 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.27) |  |  |
| South |  | 0.34 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.25) |  |  |
| West |  | 0.21 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.27) |  |  |
| Ingroup Identification |  |  | 0.37\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | (0.09) |  |
| Outgroup Conflict |  |  |  | 0.20\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.09) |
| Forgiveness |  |  |  |  |
| × Woman | 0.47\* |  |  |  |
|  | (0.22) |  |  |  |
| × Midwest |  | -0.18 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.37) |  |  |
| × South |  | -0.42 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.35) |  |  |
| × West |  | -0.44 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.38) |  |  |
| × Ingroup Identification |  |  | -0.30\* |  |
|  |  |  | (0.12) |  |
| × Outgroup Conflict |  |  |  | -0.01 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.12) |
| Constant | -1.19\*\*\* | -1.56\*\*\* | -2.99\*\*\* | -2.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.11) | (0.22) | (0.42) | (0.37) |
| Moderator marginal effect |  |  |  |  |
| Forgiveness condition | 0.02  (0.03) | *All NS* | 0.01  (0.01) | 0.03\*  (0.01) |
| Revenge condition | -0.06\*  (0.03) | *All NS* | 0.06\*\*\*  (0.01) | 0.03\*  (0.01) |
| 2nd difference in effect | -0.08\*  (0.04) | *All NS* | 0.05\*  (0.02) | < -0.01  (0.02) |

Standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* *p* < 0.001, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \* *p* < 0.05 (two-tailed tests)

Also shown in the table, we find slight ingroup bias when it comes to ingroup identification and perceived group conflict. In both cases, the more strongly respondents identify with the ingroup, as well as the more group conflict they perceive, the more likely they are to view the focal actor’s behavior as morally right. The effect of condition is significantly moderated by ingroup identification (Δ2 *=* 0.05, *p* < 0.05), but not by group conflict. Figure S6.1 illustrates this moderating effect. As shown in the figure, the effect of ingroup identification is stronger in the revenge condition than the forgiveness condition. The marginal effect of ingroup identification in the forgiveness condition is 0.01, whereas it is 0.06 in the revenge condition. This is in part because forgiveness is seen as morally right at a relatively high rate even among those with low ingroup identification (predicted probability at lowest level is 0.72) compared to those with high ingroup identification (predicted probability at highest level is 0.78). In contrast, the predicted probability of viewing revenge as morally right is only 0.07 among low identifiers compared to 0.31 among high identifiers.

****

**Figure S6.1. Predicted Probabilities of Viewing a Behavior as Morally Right by Identity and Perceived Conflict**

Having shown that gender and ingroup identification moderate the effect of forgiveness on moral evaluations, we ask if these variables moderate the pathway from morality to status. Table S6.2 includes regressions of status on condition, moderators, and moral evaluation. As shown in the table, only perceived group conflict significantly moderates the effect of moral evaluation on status (b = 0.23, *p* < 0.001). Figure S6.2 illustrates this moderating effect. As shown in the figure, as perceived group conflict increases, viewing the focal character’s behavior as morally right is associated with increased status perceptions, whereas not viewing the behavior as morally right decreases perceived status.

In sum, we find individual-level variation in who is more likely to view forgiveness as morally right compared to revenge. Men and those who more strongly identify with the ingroup are more likely to view revenge as morally right than women and those with weaker ingroup identity. Whether an ingroup member’s behavior is seen a morally right is especially consequential for status when perceptions of group conflict are greatest. This suggests that groups become are concerned with the morality of their members’ behavior when conflict with outgroups is most intense. This may explain the intensity of political conflicts around issues such as affirmative action or income inequality.

**Table S6.2. Coefficients from Regressions of Status on Condition, Moral Evaluation, and Potential Moderators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Gender | Region | Ingroup Identification | Outgroup Conflict |
| Forgiveness | 0.50\*\*\* | 0.50\*\*\* | 0.51\*\*\* | 0.50\*\*\* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Morally Right | 0.66\*\*\* | 0.99\*\*\* | 0.93\*\* | -0.23 |
|  | (0.11) | (0.19) | (0.32) | (0.31) |
| Woman | -0.17 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.09) |  |  |  |
| Midwest |  | 0.09 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.15) |  |  |
| South |  | 0.12 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.15) |  |  |
| West |  | -0.04 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.16) |  |  |
| Ingroup Identification |  |  | 0.07 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.05) |  |
| Outgroup Conflict |  |  |  | -0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.05) |
| Morally Right |  |  |  |  |
| × Woman | 0.14 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.14) |  |  |  |
| × Midwest |  | -0.32 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.22) |  |  |
| × South |  | -0.33 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.21) |  |  |
| × West |  | -0.28 |  |  |
|  |  | (0.23) |  |  |
| × Ingroup Identification |  |  | -0.05 |  |
|  |  |  | (0.07) |  |
| × Outgroup Conflict |  |  |  | 0.23\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.07) |
| Group Motivation | 0.31\*\*\* | 0.31\*\*\* | 0.31\*\*\* | 0.31\*\*\* |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Constant | 3.62\*\*\* | 3.47\*\*\* | 3.25\*\*\* | 3.80\*\*\* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.14) | (0.22) | (0.22) |

Standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* *p* < 0.001, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \* *p* < 0.05 (two-tailed tests)

****

**Figure S6.2. Predicted Status by Identity and Perceived Conflict**

**Online Supplement 7: Vignette Text**

Key

Identity scenarios: 1 = national identity, 2 = sports, 3 = political party affiliation

Conditions: F = forgiving, R = Revenge, IM = individual motivation, GM = group motivation

National identity scenarios

Condition 1A: 1F/IM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down a crowded sidewalk at a tourist attraction in your home state. Two groups of tourists walk past you going in opposite directions. You can tell from their voices that the group walking in the same direction as you is American and the group walking in the opposite direction as you is from another country. You manage to walk past the crowd and are a few steps ahead of the group of American tourists when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see two men, one from each of the groups of tourists, in each other’s faces. The man from the group of foreign tourists is screaming at the man from the group of American tourists. You can make out part of the conversation. The foreign tourist yells, “Watch where you’re going, stupid American! All you Americans are such idiots!”

The American tourist looks at the other tourist and says, “Look, man, you and I don’t need to argue over this. I’m here to enjoy my vacation.” Before he can respond, the other tourist is called away by friends who insist he continue with them. The American tourist turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come here and enjoy my vacation without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 1B: 1F/GM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down a crowded sidewalk at a tourist attraction in your home state. Two groups of tourists walk past you going in opposite directions. You can tell from their voices that the group walking in the same direction as you is American and the group walking in the opposite direction as you is from another country. You manage to walk past the crowd and are a few steps ahead of the group of American tourists when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see two men, one from each of the groups of tourists, in each other’s faces. The man from the group of foreign tourists is screaming at the man from the group of American tourists. You can make out part of the conversation. The foreign tourist yells, “Watch where you’re going, stupid American! All you Americans are such idiots!”

The American tourist looks at the other tourist and says, “Look, man, people from our two countries don’t need to argue over this. We’re all here to enjoy our vacations.” Before he can respond, the other tourist is called away by friends who insist he continues with them. The American tourist turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come here and enjoy our vacation without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or people from other countries will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

Condition 1C: 1R/IM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down a crowded sidewalk at a tourist attraction in your home state. Two groups of tourists walk past you going in opposite directions. You can tell from their voices that the group walking in the same direction as you is American and the group walking in the opposite direction as you is from another country. You manage to walk past the crowd and are a few steps ahead of the group of American tourists when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see two men, one from each of the groups of tourists, in each other’s faces. The man from the group of foreign tourists is screaming at the man from the group of American tourists. You can make out part of the conversation. The foreign tourist yells, “Watch where you’re going, stupid American! All you Americans are such idiots!”

The American tourist shoves the other tourist and yells, “Hey man, watch what you say about me. You better back off!” Before he can respond, the other tourist is called away by friends who insist he continues with them. The American tourist turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come enjoy my vacation without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 1D: 1R/GM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down a crowded sidewalk at a tourist attraction in your home state. Two groups of tourists walk past you going in opposite directions. You can tell from their voices that the group walking in the same direction as you is American and the group walking in the opposite direction as you is from another country. You manage to walk past the crowd and are a few steps ahead of the group of American tourists when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see two men, one from each of the groups of tourists, in each other’s faces. The man from the group of foreign tourists is screaming at the man from the group of American tourists. You can make out part of the conversation. The foreign tourist yells, “Watch where you’re going, stupid American! All you Americans are such idiots!”

The American tourist shoves the other tourist and yells, “Hey man, watch what you say about Americans! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the other tourist is called away by friends who insist he continues with them. The American tourist turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come enjoy our vacations without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or people from other countries will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

**Sports Scenarios**

**Notes: Q4 textbox = respondent’s favorite team, Q8 textbox = team’s main rival, according to respondent.**

Condition 2A: 2F/IM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are on your way to meet friends at a [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] versus [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] game. As you walk from your car to find your friends, you walk past two groups of tailgaters. You can tell from their clothing that one of the groups of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans and the other group of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] tailgaters screaming at a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] tailgaters. You can make out part of the conversation. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan yells, “Watch where you put your stuff, jerk! All you [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans are such idiots!”

[SPACE]

The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan looks at the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan and says, “Look, man, you and I don’t need to argue over this. I’m just here to enjoy the game.” Before he can respond, the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan is called away by friends who insist he head into the game with them. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come watch the game without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 2B: 2F/GM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are on your way to meet friends at a [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] versus [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] game. As you walk from your car to find your friends, you walk past two groups of tailgaters. You can tell from their clothing that one of the groups of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans and the other group of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] tailgaters screaming at a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] tailgaters. You can make out part of the conversation. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan yells, “Watch where you put your stuff, jerk! All you [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans are such idiots!”

The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan looks at the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan and says, “Look, man, [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans and [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans don’t need to argue over this. We’re all just here to enjoy the game.” Before he can respond, the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan is called away by friends who insist he head into the game with them. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come watch the game without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other."

Condition 2C: 2R/IM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are on your way to meet friends at a [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] versus [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] game. As you walk from your car to find your friends, you walk past two groups of tailgaters. You can tell from their clothing that one of the groups of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans and the other group of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] tailgaters screaming at a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] tailgaters. You can make out part of the conversation. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan yells, “Watch where you put your stuff, jerk! All you [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans are such idiots!”

The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan shoves the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan and yells, “Hey man, watch what you say about me. You better back off!” Before he can respond, the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan is called away by friends who insist he head into the game with them. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come watch the game without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 2D: 2R/GM

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

 Suppose you are on your way to meet friends at a [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] versus [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] game. As you walk from your car to find your friends, you walk past two groups of tailgaters. You can tell from their clothing that one of the groups of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans and the other group of tailgaters are [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] tailgaters screaming at a man from the group of [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] tailgaters. You can make out part of the conversation. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan yells, “Watch where you put your stuff, jerk! All you [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans are such idiots!”

The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan shoves the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan and yells, “Hey man, watch what you say about [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fans! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fan is called away by friends who insist he head into the game with them. The [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q4] fan turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come watch the game without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or [INSERT TEXTBOX RESPONSE FROM Q8] fans will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

**Political Party Scenarios**

Condition 3A: 3F/IMD

Democratic Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Republican Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Republican group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you bleeding-heart liberal! All you Democrats are such idiots!”

The Democrat looks at the Republican and says, “Look, man, you and I don’t need to argue over this. I’m just here to express my opinion.” Before he can respond, the Republican is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Democrat turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come here and exercise my rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Republican Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Republican Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Democratic group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you right-wing nut job! All you Republicans are such idiots!”

The Republican looks at the Democrat and says, “Look, man, you and I don’t need to argue over this. I’m just here to express my opinion.” Before he can respond, the Democrat is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Republican turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come here and exercise my rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 3B: 3F/GM

Democratic Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Republican Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Republican group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you bleeding-heart liberal! All you Democrats are such idiots!”

The Democrat looks at the Republican and says, “Look, man, Democrats and Republicans don’t need to argue over this. We're all just here to express our opinions.” Before he can respond, the Republican is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Democrat turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come exercise our rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or Republicans will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

Republican Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Republican Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Democratic group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you right-wing nutjob! All you Republicans are such idiots!”

The Republican looks at the Democrat and says, “Look, man, Republicans and Democrats don’t need to argue over this. We're all just here to express our opinions.” Before he can respond, the Democrat is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Republican turns to a friend and says “I tried to reason with that guy, otherwise he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come exercise our rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or Democrats will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

Condition 3C: 3R/IM

Democratic Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Republican Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Republican group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you bleeding-heart liberal! All you Democrats are such idiots!”

The Democrat shoves the Republican and says, “Hey man, watch what you say about me! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the Republican is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Democrat turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come exercise my rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Republican Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Republican Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Democratic group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you right-wing nutjob! All you Republicans are such idiots!”

The Republican shoves the Democrat and says, “Hey man, watch what you say about me! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the Democrat is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Republican turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing if he ever saw me again. I should be able to just come exercise my rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that you need to stand up for yourself or people will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why I’m always looking out for myself.”

Condition 3D: 3R/GM

Democratic Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Republican Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Republican group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you bleeding-heart liberal! All you Democrats are such idiots!”

The Democrat shoves the Republican and says, “Hey man, watch what you say about Democrats! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the Republican is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Democrat turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come exercise our rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or Republicans will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

Republican Party Ingroup

**Please read the following description of a social situation.**

Suppose you are walking down the street when you walk past two groups of protestors. You can tell from the signs that they are holding that one of the groups of protesters probably belongs to the Republican Party and the other group of protesters probably belongs to the Democratic Party. You manage to walk a few steps past them when you hear a commotion. You turn around to see a man from the group of Democratic Party protesters screaming at a man from the group of Republican Party protesters. You can make out part of the conversation. The man from the Democratic group yells, “Watch where you’re swinging that sign, you right-wing nutjob! All you Republicans are such idiots!”

The Republican shoves the Democrat and says, “Hey man, watch what you say about Republicans! You better back off!” Before he can respond, the Democrat is called away by friends who insist he come with them. The Republican turns to a friend and says “If I didn’t push that guy, he’d probably just do the same thing to the next one of us he sees. We should be able to just come exercise our rights without dealing with people like that. It just shows that we need to stand up for ourselves or Democrats will think it’s ok to act like that. This is why we're always looking out for each other.”

**Online Supplement 8: Coding Procedures**

A team of five coders, supervised by members of the research team, worked on coding the morality variables, including helping to identify additional categories during open coding. This coding followed our general coding procedure: all survey responses and all categories were independently coded by at least three coders, using Microsoft Excel. After all coders completed their work, their coding was combined to calculate interrater reliability using the ReCal web service (Freelon 2010). If the coders’ agreement scored below our minimum threshold (a Krippendorf’s alpha of .9), the team reviewed and discussed disagreements, and then all cases on which all coders did not agree were recoded in another round of coding. These cycles of coding and re-coding continued until coders had reached sufficient interrater reliability, at which point we used consensus coding in which at least three of the coders together reviewed and discussed all remaining coding disagreements and assigned a final code. If coders were still unsure, they discussed specific cases with senior members of the research team.

  While the moral evaluation codes followed this standard process, the codes for moral accounts deviated somewhat. In early rounds of coding, the coders identified cases that did not fit well into our initial codes, ultimately leading to the addition of two novel codes to our codebook. Once we added these novel codes to our codebook, the coders went back through to independently code all cases again, using the updated codebook. From there, the combination of coding, calculation of interrater reliability, and so on proceeded as described above.

1. These items included: *It is of great importance for me to be a* [a member of in-group]; *I see myself as quite different from other* [members of in-group]. (R); *I don’t think of* [in-group] *as part of who I am* (R); and *Being a member of* [in-group] *is an important reflection of who I am*, *I am proud to be a member of* [the in-group]; *I am glad I am a member of* [in-group]; *The* [in-group] *is united*; *I would prefer to be* [in a different group] (R); *The* [in-group] *successes are my successes*. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The perceived conflict items included: *In general,* [ingroup members] *and* [outgroup members] *easily like each other*; *In general*, [ingroup members] *and* [outgroup members] *easily dislike each other; The relationship between* [ingroup] *and* [outgroup] *is positive*; [ingroup] *and* [outgroup] *generally compete with each other*; *In general, there is a lot of conflict between* [ingroup] *and* [outgroup]. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. We also explored other demographic moderators, like race, age, and political party affiliation, but find relatively few consistent effects so do not present them here. Instead, we focus on the theoretically-inspired moderators in the text. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. First differences are the differences in predicted probabilities within condition. For example, in the “Gender” Column of Table S6.1, in the “Moderator marginal effect” section at the bottom of the table, the entry of .02 in the “Forgiveness” row indicates that the predicted probability of viewing forgiveness as morally right is .02 greater for women (with about 77% of women and 75% of men viewing forgiveness as morally right). Second differences are the differences in these marginal effects across the revenge and forgiveness conditions. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)