**Supplementary Material**

**SM1 – Manipulation of social support for egalitarian values and related results**

In the present study, we initially also manipulated numerical support for egalitarian values. Just before participants read the text describing the principle of “equality and non-discrimination” as a fundamental aspect of a functional modern society, they were informed of the results of an alleged recent opinion survey. Depending on the condition (minority vs. majority support), it was said that “18% [82%] of the individuals declared supporting the content of the text without hesitation. Thus, only a minority [a large majority] of the inhabitants supports unconditionally social equality.”

The reason to include this manipulation was that previous work had found numerical support for the values at stake to moderate the self-licensing effect, a majority support leading to self-licensing and a minority support to consistency (Lalot, Falomir-Pichastor, & Quiamzade, 2018). Moreover, a fit effect had been identified between regulatory focus and numerical support: individual’s strength of prevention orientation was a better predictor of attitudes when support was a majority, whereas strength of promotion orientation was a better predictor when support was a minority (Falomir-Pichastor, Mugny, Gabarrot, & Quiamzade, 2011; Falomir-Pichastor, Mugny, Quiamzade, & Gabarrot, 2008). Hence, because of the relations between numerical support and regulatory focus, on the one hand, and numerical support and moral credentials, on the other hand, it seemed relevant to include this variable in the study. However, since regulatory focus, numerical support, and moral credentials were never studied all together, we did not have a specific hypothesis regarding the impact of numerical support but considered it in a more exploratory way.

Anyhow, the numerical support manipulation was found to have no effect on the dependent variable, nor did it influence the other variables’ effects: a 2 (numerical support: majority vs. minority) × 2 (moral credentials: low vs. high) × continuous (attitude towards immigrants, standardised) × continuous (regulatory focus difference score, standardised) full-factorial ANOVA revealed a main effect of initial attitude, *F*(1, 329) = 22.9, *p* < .001, η2p = .065, a marginal credentials × regulatory focus interaction, *F*(1, 329) = 3.77, *p* = .053, η2p = .011, a marginal attitude × regulatory focus interaction, *F*(1, 329) = 2.96, *p* = .086, η2p = .009, and, most importantly, the expected credentials × attitude × regulatory focus interaction, *F*(1, 329) = 15.2, *p* < .001, η2p = .044. No other effect, and none of the terms including numerical support, was significant, *F*s < 1.35, *p*s > .25.
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**SM2 – Analyses on separate scores of promotion / prevention focus**

We report here the analysis considering separate scores of promotion and prevention focus instead of a difference score. We first checked for an effect of the national sample but it played strictly no role. Hence, for simplification purposes, we report the results of the analyses not including this variable. We ran a robust regression model (MM-estimator) including moral credentials (-1 = low credentials, 1 = high credentials), intergroup attitudes (standardised), promotion focus score (standardised), prevention focus score (standardised), and all their interactions on the measure of support for affirmative action. The analysis revealed a main effect of initial attitude, so that more positive intergroup attitudes predicted a stronger support for affirmative action, *b* = .30, 95% CI [.15, .45], *t*(329) = 3.96, *p* < .001, η2p = .044. The expected credentials × attitude × prevention interaction was significant, *b* = -.48, 95% CI [-.80, -.15], *t*(329) = -2.89, *p* = .004, η2p = .024, and so was the credentials × attitude × promotion interaction, *b* = .47, 95% CI [.22, .72], *t*(329) = 3.65, *p* < .001, η2p = .037.

We then decomposed the interactions with regard to our hypotheses, starting with the prevention focus (see Figure B.1). Amongst prevention-oriented participants (prevention score +1 *SD*), initial intergroup attitudes positively predicted support for affirmative action in the low credentials (control) condition, *b* = .65, 95% CI [.30, 1.00], *t*(329) = 3.67, *p* < .001, but this link disappeared in the high credentials condition, *b* = -.29, 95% CI [-.87, .30], *t*(329) = -0.97, *p* = .33. When intergroup attitudes were more positive (+1 *SD*), support was significantly lower in the credentials than in the control condition, *b* = -.81, 95% CI [-1.19, -.42], *t*(329) = -4.14, *p* < .001. When attitudes were less positive (-1 *SD*), the two credentials conditions did not significantly differ from each other, *b* = .05, 95% CI [-.44, .55], *t*(329) = 0.21, *p* = .83.

We then turned to the second interaction, involving the promotion focus (see Figure B.2). Amongst promotion-oriented participants (promotion score +1 *SD*), initial attitudes were positively related to support for affirmative action in the credentials condition, *b* = .92, 95% CI [.38, 1.45], *t*(329) = 3.37, *p* < .001, and this link disappeared in the low credentials (control) condition, *b* = -.03, 95% CI [-.37, .30], *t*(329) = -0.20, *p* = .84. When initial attitudes were more positive (+1 *SD*), support was stronger in the credentials than in the control condition, *b* = .47, 95% CI [.08, .86], *t*(329) = 2.38, *p* = .018. When initial attitudes were less positive (-1 *SD*), support was stronger in the control condition, *b* = -.48, 95% CI [-.94, -.02], *t*(329) = -2.04, *p* = .042. Hence, in the present study globally similar results emerge when considering a stronger tendency towards one focus (+1 *SD*) or a weaker tendency towards the other focus (-1 *SD*).

*Figure B.1*. Support for affirmative action as a function of credentials, initial intergroup attitudes, and prevention focus, controlling for promotion focus.

*Figure B.2*. Support for affirmative action as a function of credentials, initial intergroup attitude, and promotion focus, controlling for prevention focus.