**Online Supplementary Materials**

*Post-Prediction Measures*

The following 10 measures were administered in this order to all participants after they made their prediction.

1. *Point differential*: “How many points do you think the [predicted winner] will win by?” Response options ranged from 1 to 80 in increments of 1.
2. *Subjective probability*: “What do you think is the probability that the [predicted winner] will defeat the [predicted loser]? Response options ranged from 0% to 100% in increments of 1%.
3. *Surprise*: “Will you be more surprised if the [visiting team] wins the game or if the [home team] wins the game?” They answered on a 7-point scale, where 1 = extremely surprised if the [visiting team] wins, 4 = not at all surprised by either outcome, and 7 = extremely surprised if the [home team] wins.
4. *Preference*: “Regardless of which team you predicted to win, do you prefer one team over another?” They answered on a 7-point scale, where 1 = strongly prefer the [visiting team], 4 = no preference for either team, and 7 = strongly prefer the [home team].
5. *Accuracy motivation*: “How motivated were you to make an accurate prediction?” They answered on a 7-point scale, where 1 = not at all motivated and 7 = extremely motivated.
6. *Prediction motivation*: “Why did you predict the [predicted winner] to win the game?” This question was open-ended and never analyzed.
7. *Prediction strategy*: “Which of these statements best explains why you predicted the [predicted winner] to win the game?” The response options were: (1) I genuinely believe they will win the game; (2) I do not genuinely believe they will win, but I want them to win; (3) I do not genuinely believe they will win, but I want them to lose, and (4) I just guessed, because I don’t have any idea which team is going to win the game.
8. *Loyalty*: “Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement: I predicted the [predicted winner] to win the game because I did not want to be disloyal to them.” They answered on a 7-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.
9. *Jinx*: “Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement: I predicted the [predicted winner] to win the game because I did not want to jinx them.” They answered on a 7-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.
10. *Game watching*: “Are you going to watch the game this Sunday/Monday?” They answered on a 5-point scale, where 1 = definitely not, 3 = maybe, and 5 = definitely.

Table S1 shows the means of the post-prediction measures, as well as the results of significance tests. For each measure, we conducted two analyses. In the “2 x 3” analysis, we regressed the measure on (1) Partisan, coded -1, 0, and 1 for inferior-team partisans, neutrals, and superior-team partisans, respectively, (2) Incentive, coded -1 and 1 for $5 and $50, respectively, and (3) the Partisan x Incentive interaction. The “2 x 2” analysis was identical, except that we collapsed superior-team partisans and inferior-team partisans into a single category; this Partisan variable was coded -1 for neutrals and 1 for partisans. Whereas the 2 x 3 analysis tests for differences between superior-team partisans and inferior-team partisans, the 2 x 2 analysis tests for differences between partisans and neutrals. The “Results” columns show which significant effects emerged in these analyses.

Table S1

Results of Post-Prediction Measures

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Inferior Team Partisans | Neutrals | Superior Team Partisans | Results |
|  | $5 | $50 | $5 | $50 | $5 | $50 | 2 x 3 | 2 x 2 |
| Subjective probability of superior team | 44.3% | 51.2% | 63.5% | 62.9% | 72.1% | 71.4% | *P* |  |
| Point differential of superior team | -1.4 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 7.1 | 7.5 | *P* |  |
| Surprise if superior team wins | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 | *P* |  |
| Accuracy motivation | 5.9 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.7 | *P, I* | *I* |
| Preference for superior team | 1.3 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 6.7 | *P* |  |
| % genuinely believing prediction | 76.6% | 84.6% | 82.9% | 81.3% | 86.5% | 85.6% |  |  |
| Loyalty | 2.8 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 |  | *P* |
| Jinx | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.7 |  | *P* |
| Game watching | 4.2 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.4 | *I* | *P*, *I* |

*Note*. Within each of the “Results” cells, a *P* denotes a significant main effect of Partisan and an *I* denotes a significant main of Incentive. Blank cells indicate no significant effects (i.e., all *p*s > .05). There were no significant Partisan x Incentive interactions.

 The first two rows of Table S1 show that optimism emerged on post-prediction measures. Compared to neutrals, superior-team (inferior-team) partisans estimated that the superior team (1) was significantly more (less) likely to win the game, and (2) would win by significantly more (fewer) points.

*Knowledge and Liking*

 The following table reports the means of the liking (1 = strongly dislike; 5 = neutral; 9 = strongly like) and knowledge (1 = nothing; 5 = almost everything) measures collected prior to the main survey, as well as results of regressions using the same predictors as in the analyses of the post-prediction measures reported above. The table shows that participants liked and knew more about their favorite teams than did neutrals.

Table S2

Liking and Knowledge Measures

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Inferior Team Partisans | Neutrals | Superior Team Partisans | Results |
|  | $5 | $50 | $5 | $50 | $5 | $50 | 2 x 3 | 2 x 2 |
| Liking of inferior team | 8.6 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.0 | *P* | *P* |
| Liking of superior team | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 8.6 | 8.8 | *P* | *P* |
| Knowledge of inferior team | 4.2 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | *P* | *P* |
| Knowledge of superior team | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 4.4 | *P* | *P, PI* |

*Note*. Within each of the “Results” cells, a *P* denotes a significant main effect of Partisan, and a *PI* denotes a significant Partisan x Incentive interaction. Blank cells indicate no significant effects (i.e., all *p*s > .05). There were no significant main effects of Incentive.