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**Re-Analysis of Authorship Data**

**Method**

**Additional survey items.** Because the Caruso et al. (2006) study was designed to test a different set of hypotheses from the hypotheses in the current paper, the original survey included several items that were irrelevant to our hypotheses. We therefore do not analyze these items but report them here for completeness.

After participants reported the percentage of the group’s total contributions for which they were responsible (described in the main text), they responded to five items measuring their satisfaction with their paper. These items were the following: How interested would you be in initiating a brand new line of research (independent of any current ongoing projects) with this same author group right now? (1=*Not at all interested*; 7=*Very interested*); How happy are you right now with the order in which your name was listed among the authors of this paper? (1=*Not at all happy*; 7=*Very happy*); How happy were you with the order in which your name was listed among the authors of this paper when the order was first decided? (1=*Not at all happy*; 7=*Very happy*); Compared to other colleagues with whom you have worked, how much did you enjoy working with your author group on this particular paper? (1=*Not at all*; 7=*Very much*); Since submitting this paper, have you actually initiated a brand new line of research (independent of any ongoing projects) with this same author group? (*Yes* or *No*).

Finally, at the end of the survey, participants indicated which method best described how the order of authorship was determined for their paper (*Alphabetically*, *Based on Contribution*, *Based on Seniority*, *Randomly*, or *Other*).

**Experiment 1: Study Groups**

**Method**

**Assignment to condition and sample sizes.** At the beginning of their first year, MBA students in this program are assigned to one of ten “sections” of students with whom they complete the required curriculum. We therefore randomly assigned each section to one of our three conditions, with the constraint that four of the ten sections be assigned to the control condition and three of the ten sections be assigned to each of the other-focused conditions. We chose to assign the “extra” section to the control condition so that we would have relatively equal sample sizes when comparing the explicitly other-focused condition to the implicitly other-focused condition. This explains why there are more participants in the control condition (*n*=282) than the implicitly other-focused (*n*=211) and explicitly other-focused (*n*=206) conditions.

**Additional survey items.** This experiment was conducted in the context of the Caruso et al. (2006) paper, which (as noted above) was designed to test a different set of hypotheses than the current paper. Thus, in addition to the items reported in the text, there were four other items at the end of the survey. We do not report these items in the main text because they are not directly relevant to our current hypotheses, but we report them here for completeness.

After participants recorded the percentage of the group’s contributions for which they were responsible (on the six items described in the main text), they rated: How does your study group from last semester compare to other study groups in your class at HBS [Harvard Business School, where this study was conducted]? These ratings were made on five topics: productivity and efficiency, satisfaction of members with the study group, contributions to class discussions, respect shown for other study group members, and grades that group members receive in class. The ratings were made on a scale from 1 (*My study group is much worse compared to other groups*) to 7 (*My study group is much better compared to other groups*). Participants then answered three items: How much did you enjoy working with your study group last semester? (1=*Not at all*; 7=*Very much*); How likely are you to want to work with this study group in the future? (1=*Not at all likely*; 7=*Very likely*); How much do you regret having worked with this group last semester? (1=*I have a lot of regret*; 7=*I have no regret*).

**Experiment 3: Remembered Groups**

**Results**

**Additional analyses.** In addition to the 2(group size: small vs. large) × 3(focus: control vs. other-focused you first vs. other-focused you last) between-subjects ANOVA on implied responsibility that we described in the main text, we analyzed the order effect of whether participants saw the percentage or absolute claiming measure first. Participants who saw the absolute measure first showed higher implied responsibility on the percentage measure than participants who saw the percentage measure first (*M*=165.4%, *SD*=162.1% vs. *M*=148.7%, *SD*=162.0%), *F*(1, 1950)=10.46, *p*<.01, *ηp*2=0.01. Item order interacted with focus condition, *F*(1, 1950)=3.81, *p*=.02, *ηp*2<0.01, such that groups who saw the absolute (vs. percentage) measure first claimed significantly more on the percentage measure in the control conditions (*M*=220.6%, *SD*=151.1% vs. *M*=188.3%, *SD*=133.9%), *t*(634)=2.85, *p*<.01, *d*=0.23, but not in the other-focused conditions, *ts*<1. Item order did not significantly interact with group size, *F*(1, 1950)=3.33, *p*=.07, *ηp*2=0.002, and there was no three-way interaction of order, group size, and focus condition, *F*(1, 1950)<1.

We also ran the 2(group size: small vs. large) × 3(focus: control vs. other-focused you first vs. other-focused you last) between-subjects ANOVA on the *absolute* measure of work contributed. At the individual level, participants in small groups (*M*=58.1, *SD*=33.7) felt they had contributed more than those in large groups (*M*=52.8, *SD*=36.8), *F*(1, 1956)=22.09, *p*<.01, *ηp*2=0.01. Focus condition did not affect felt contribution, *F*(2, 1956)<1, but group size interacted with focus condition, *F*(2, 1956)=4.97, *p*=.01, *ηp*2=0.01, such that participants in small groups felt they had contributed more than those in large groups only in the control condition (*M*=56.9, *SD*=22.8 vs. *M*=52.8, *SD*=25.6), *t*(634)=2.14, *p*=.03, *d*=0.17, and in the other-focused you last condition (*M*=60.0, *SD*=23.8 vs. *M*=50.0, *SD*=27.9), *t*(653)=4.97, *p*<.01, *d*=0.39, but not in the other-focused you first condition, *t*(669)<1.