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Supplementary material 1. Correlation coefficients between conformity scores and the two sub-scales of the conformity orientation scale.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scenario outline(Choice outline: cooperation / defection) | Correlation coefficient |
|  | Normative | Informational |
| Q1 | Fund-raising (donation / no donation) | .15 |  | .19 | \* |
| Q2 | Blood donation (donation / no donation) | .22 | \* | .25 | \* |
| Q3 | Beef (1000-yen / 500-yen) | .17 | \* | .13 |  |
| Q4 | Picking up trash (picking up / never) | .18 | \* | .29 | \* |
| Q5 | Bicycle parking (charge / free) | .10 |  | .23 | \* |
| Q6 | Buying-up (no payment / payment) | .19 | \* | .28 | \* |
| Q7 | Air conditioner (saving / no saving) | .11 |  | .27 | \* |
| Q8 | Traffic (bus / car) | .02 |  | .20 | \* |
| Q9 | Best before (short / long) | .26 | \* | .26 | \* |
| Q10 | Vote (vote / no voting) | .22 | \* | .20 | \* |
| Q11 | Sachets of soy sauce (one / two or more) | .08 |  | .18 | \* |
| Q12 | Soy sauce bottle lid (recycle / no recycle) | .20 | \* | .22 | \* |
| Q13 | Milk carton (recycle / no recycle) | .18 | \* | .26 | \* |
| Q14 | Cleaning up (work hard / cut corners) | .13 |  | .14 |  |
| Total |  | .27 | \* | .38 | \* |

\* *p* < .05

Note. We performed Bonferroni correction of p-values on correlations in each question. The results showed that the correlation coefficients between conformity scores and normative influence in Q9 and Total were significant, and those between conformity scores and informational influence in Q2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, and Total were statistically significant.

Supplementary material 2. Additional information on the relationships between conformity scores and two sub-scales of the conformity orientation scale (Yokota & Nakanishi, 2011)

The level of significance was set at 5% in this study. The relationships between conformity scores and the two sub-scales of conformity (normative influence: α = .93, informational influence: α = .72) were examined in each scenario. A positive association between informational and normative influence (*r* = .60) was shown. Following Fujikawa et al. (2021), conformity scores were calculated for each participant. For each pattern of four ingroup members’ cooperation rate (0%, 33.3%, 66.7%, and 100%) in each scenario, one point was counted if participants made the same choices as the response of a majority. If they conform to a minority, we count zero points. As the range of conformity score was from 0 to 4 for each pattern of ingroup cooperation rate, the maximum score was 56 (4 patterns and 14 scenarios), and higher scores indicated a stronger conformist to a majority. The results showed that the conformity score was positively correlated with informational influence in Q1, 5, 7, 8, and 11 and with normative influence in Q3. In Q2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 13, both sub-scales showed significant positive correlations with conformity scores but no correlation in Q14.