

Supplementary Materials for
 Culture, Status, and Hypocrisy:

High-Status People Who Don't Practice What They Preach Are Viewed as Worse in the US than
 China

Table of Contents

Study 1 Supplementary Results 1

Study 2 Supplementary Results 5

Supplementary Tables 7

Pilot Study 1: Measured Competence 14

Pilot Study 2: The Netherlands Versus China 18

Within-Manuscript Meta-Analyses 26

Study 1 English Materials 27

Study 1 Chinese Materials 30

Study 2 English Materials 32

Study 2 Chinese Materials 36

Pilot Study 1 Materials 39

Pilot Study 2 English Materials 42

Pilot Study 2 Chinese Materials 46

References 51

Study 1 Supplementary Results

Moral judgment. In the 2 (culture: American vs. Chinese) by 2 (status: high vs. low) by 2 (transgression type: with vs. without contradictory preaching) repeated-measure ANOVA with only transgression type as within-participants factor, we also found significant main effects of culture, $F(1, 394) = 86.18, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.179$, status, $F(1, 394) = 10.95, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.027$, and transgression type, $F(1, 394) = 38.40, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.089$. Specifically, people generally condemned transgressions more harshly, when they were Americans ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.13$) rather than Chinese ($M = 3.98, SD = 0.99$), when the targets possessed high ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.18$) rather than low ($M = 3.78, SD = 1.04$) occupational status, and when the transgressions were without ($M = 3.45, SD = 1.03$) rather than with contradictory preaching ($M = 3.79, SD = 1.18$). However, the main effects were further qualified by the two-way interactions between transgression type and status, $F(1, 394) = 5.05, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = 0.013$, and between culture and status, $F(1, 394) = 4.21, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = 0.011$. Specifically, people perceived transgression with (vs. without) contradictory preaching more positively, particularly for low-status targets ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 4.01, SD = 1.03$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 3.54, SD = 1.01$; $F(1, 199) = 36.60, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.155$) than for high-status targets ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 3.57, SD = 1.28$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 3.36, SD = 1.405$; $F(1, 197) = 6.24, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = 0.031$). Moreover, Americans condemned high-status targets more harshly than low-status counterparts ($M_{\text{high}} = 2.95, SD = 1.21$; vs. $M_{\text{low}} = 3.43, SD = 0.98$; $F(1, 177) = 12.50, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.066$), the status-based difference on judgment was not revealed among Chinese observers ($M_{\text{high}} = 3.91, SD = 0.95$; vs. $M_{\text{low}} = 4.04, SD = 1.02$; $F(1, 217) = 1.29, p = .26, \eta_p^2 = 0.006$).

Moral impression. Study 1 also examined whether the findings on moral judgment of transgressions extended to moral impression of transgressors, given previous theorizing suggesting different mechanisms underlying behavior-centered versus person-centered moral evaluations (e.g., Uhlmann et al., 2015). In a parallel ANOVA examining moral impression of transgressors, we did not replicate the three-way culture by status by transgression type interaction effect ($F(1, 394) = 0.04, p = .84, \eta_p^2 < 0.001$), suggesting different mechanisms in cross-cultural judgments of behavior-centered transgression judgment versus person-centered transgressor impression. However, we found a significant main effect of transgression type, $F(1, 394) = 241.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.380$, and its interaction with culture, $F(1, 394) = 5.47, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = 0.014$. Participants generally evaluated transgressors who preached contradictory norms ($M = 2.66, SD = 1.03$) as less moral persons than open transgressors ($M = 3.24, SD = 0.84$), but more so among Americans ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 2.68, SD = 1.11$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 3.35, SD = 0.85$; $F(1, 178) = 107.00, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.375$) than among Chinese ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 2.65, SD = 0.97$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 3.16, SD = 0.81$; $F(1, 218) = 146.00, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.402$). None of other effects were significant ($ps > .21, \eta_p^2 < 0.004$).

Selfish motive attribution. In the ANOVA examining people's attribution of transgressions, we also found significant main effects of culture, $F(1, 394) = 46.98, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.107$, status, $F(1, 394) = 4.13, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = 0.010$, and transgression type, $F(1, 394) = 11.55, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.028$, such that participants evaluated transgressions as more selfish when they were Americans ($M = 5.76, SD = 1.01$) rather than Chinese ($M = 5.18, SD = 0.84$), when the

targets possessed high ($M = 5.54, SD = 0.97$) rather than low ($M = 5.34, SD = 0.95$) occupational status, and when the transgressions were without ($M = 5.50, SD = 0.93$) rather than with contradictory preaching ($M = 5.38, SD = 1.00$). Moreover, two-way interactions emerged between culture and status, $F(1, 394) = 4.66, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = 0.012$, and status and transgression type, $F(1, 394) = 6.90, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = 0.017$. Specifically, Americans inferred more selfish motives from high-status ($M = 5.93, SD = 0.95$) than low-status ($M = 5.56, SD = 1.04$) targets' transgressions, $F(1, 356) = 12.30, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.033$; however, status-based selfish motive attribution was not made by Chinese evaluators ($M_{\text{high}} = 5.18, SD = 0.85$, vs. $M_{\text{low}} = 5.18, SD = 0.84$; $F(1, 436) = 0.007, p = .93, \eta_p^2 < 0.001$). Finally, participants generally inferred less selfish motives from low-status targets' contradictory transgressions ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 5.23, SD = 0.97$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 5.46, SD = 10.92$; $F(1, 199) = 19.67, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.05$), but did not differ in attributions of high-status targets' different transgressions ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 5.52, SD = 1.00$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 5.55, SD = 0.95$; $F(1, 197) = 0.20, p = .65, \eta_p^2 = 0.001$).

Study 2 Supplementary Results

Moral judgment. In the between-participants culture by status by power by contradiction ANOVA, we also found a status by contradiction two-way interaction effect, $F(1, 960) = 10.89, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .011$. Contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressions were seen more positively for low-status ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 2.92, SD = 0.78$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 2.70, SD = 0.91$; $F(1, 500) = 8.48, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .017$) but not high-status targets ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 2.76, SD = 0.90$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 2.91, SD = 0.95$; $F(1, 472) = 3.39, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = 0.007$). Regardless of contradiction, a culture by status by power three-way interaction, $F(1, 960) = 5.58, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .006$, manifested that status and power interacted in their effects on Americans', $F(1, 483) = 5.40, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = 0.011$, but not Chinese, $F(1, 485) = 1.84, p = .18, \eta_p^2 = 0.004$, judgment of transgressions. Americans perceived transgressions more harshly for high-status holders, only when they had high, $F(1, 240) = 4.37, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = 0.018$, rather than low power, $F(1, 243) = 1.23, p = .27, \eta_p^2 = 0.005$. None of other effects emerged as significant ($ps > .28, \eta_p^2 < .001$).

Selfish motive attribution. In the ANOVA examining people's motive perception, again, Chinese participants ($M = 4.14, SD = 1.52$) generally perceived less selfish motives than their American counterparts ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.22$; $F(1, 960) = 21.82, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.022$). Moreover, contradictory transgressions were perceived more selfish ($M = 4.06, SD = 1.37$) than non-contradictory ones ($M = 4.60, SD = 1.36$; $F(1, 960) = 44.26, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.044$). A significant status by contradiction interaction effect also emerged, $F(1, 960) = 43.80, p < .001,$

$\eta_p^2 = 0.044$, suggesting that people perceived non-contradictory transgressions as less selfish, only when the targets had low ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 3.78$, $SD = 1.19$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 4.85$, $SD = 1.35$; $F(1, 500) = 87.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .149$) instead of high status ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 4.34$, $SD = 1.48$, vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 4.31$, $SD = 1.31$; $F(1, 472) = 0.05$, $p = .82$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$). None of other effects were significant ($ps > .28$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$).

Supplementary Discussion of Studies 1 and 2. As reported in the main text, only the culture by contradiction two-way and the culture by status by contradiction three-way interaction effects consistently emerged across the two studies. It is also noteworthy that the presumed cultural divergent evaluation of status-based contradictions only manifested in behavior-centered moral judgment but not person-centered moral impression (Study 1). This may relate to the fact that people from interdependent (vs. independent) cultures attribute behaviors less to dispositions but more to contexts (Nisbett et al., 2001). Broadly, it echoes previous research revealing different mechanisms of behavior-centered versus person-centered moral evaluations (e.g., Uhlmann et al., 2015).

Besides cultural independence/interdependence, Chinese and American also differ on their endorsement of vertical collectivism. We excluded this alternative explanation by showing that (1) the two cultures did not differ in evaluations of high- versus low-power contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressors, and that (2) power distance beliefs were not significantly correlated with the culture by status by contradiction three-way interaction effect.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1.

Descriptive information of (1) moral judgment and (2) motive perception in each culture (the US vs. China) by status (high vs. low) by behavioral contradiction (vs. non-contradiction) condition in Study 1.

Manipulations		Americans		Chinese		Total	
Contradiction	Status	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Moral Judgment							
Non-Contradiction	Low status	86	3.25 (0.98)	114	3.75 (0.98)	200	3.54 (1.01)
	High status	93	3.07 (1.12)	105	3.61 (0.92)	198	3.36 (1.05)
	Total	179	3.16 (1.06)	219	3.68 (0.95)	398	3.45 (1.03)
Contradiction	Low status	86	3.61 (0.95)	114	4.32 (0.98)	200	4.02 (1.03)
	High status	93	2.84 (1.28)	105	4.21 (0.88)	198	3.57 (1.29)
	Total	179	3.21 (1.20)	219	4.27 (0.93)	398	3.79 (1.18)
Motive Perception							
Non-Contradiction	Low status	86	5.71 (1.00)	114	5.27 (0.80)	200	5.45 (0.92)
	High status	93	5.82 (1.01)	105	5.31 (0.82)	198	5.55 (0.95)
	Total	179	5.77 (1.00)	219	5.29 (0.81)	398	5.50 (0.93)
Contradiction	Low status	86	5.42 (1.07)	114	5.09 (0.87)	200	5.23 (0.97)
	High status	93	6.05 (0.89)	105	5.06 (0.86)	198	5.52 (1.00)
	Total	179	5.75 (1.03)	219	5.07 (0.86)	398	5.38 (1.00)

Supplementary Table 2.

The multilevel mediation model of self-/other-oriented attribution (within-participants) in the effects of culture (between-participants), status (between-participants), transgression type (within-participants), and their interactions on moral judgment in Study 1.

	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
X → M coefficients			
Intercept	5.46 (0.03)	168.24	< .001
Culture → Attribution	-0.28 (0.03)	-8.76	< .001
Status → Attribution	0.09 (0.03)	2.90	.004
Contradiction → Attribution	-0.06 (0.03)	-1.85	.06
Culture × Status → Attribution	-0.09 (0.03)	-2.80	.005
Culture × Contradiction → Attribution	-0.05 (0.03)	-1.42	.16
Status × Contradiction → Attribution	0.06 (0.03)	1.71	.09
Culture × Status × Contradiction → Attribution	-0.07 (0.03)	-2.25	.03
X → M → Y coefficients			
Intercept	4.34 (0.22)	19.92	< .001
Culture → Behavior appraisal	0.35 (0.04)	9.34	< .001
Status → Behavior appraisal	-0.14 (0.04)	-3.78	< .001
Contradiction → Behavior appraisal	0.15 (0.04)	4.28	< .001
Culture × Status → Behavior appraisal	0.08 (0.04)	2.08	.04
Culture × Contradiction → Behavior appraisal	0.12 (0.04)	3.47	< .001
Status × Contradiction → Behavior appraisal	-0.06 (0.04)	-1.75	.08
Culture × Status × Contradiction → Behavior appraisal	0.07 (0.04)	1.93	.05
Attribution → Behavior appraisal	-0.14 (0.04)	-3.54	< .001

Supplementary Table 3.

Descriptive information of moral judgment in each culture (the US vs. China) by status (high vs. low) by power (high vs. low) by behavioral contradiction (vs. non-contradiction) condition in Study 2.

Status	Manipulations		Americans		Chinese		Total	
	Power	Contradiction	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Low status	Low power	Non-contradiction	56	2.65 (0.73)	59	2.72 (0.95)	115	2.69 (0.84)
		Contradiction	67	3.04 (0.64)	60	2.86 (0.80)	127	2.95 (0.72)
		Total	123	2.86 (0.70)	119	2.79 (0.88)	242	2.83 (0.79)
	High power	Non-contradiction	62	2.50 (0.94)	73	2.87 (0.97)	135	2.70 (0.97)
		Contradiction	61	2.81 (0.84)	64	2.95 (0.84)	125	2.88 (0.84)
		Total	123	2.66 (0.90)	137	2.91 (0.90)	260	2.79 (0.91)
Total	Non-contradiction	118	2.57 (0.85)	132	2.80 (0.96)	250	2.70 (0.91)	
	Contradiction	128	2.93 (0.74)	124	2.90 (0.82)	252	2.92 (0.78)	
	Total	246	2.76 (0.81)	256	2.85 (0.89)	502	2.81 (0.86)	
High status	Low power	Non-contradiction	52	2.98 (0.80)	45	2.79 (0.88)	97	2.89 (0.84)
		Contradiction	70	2.59 (0.82)	52	2.98 (1.00)	122	2.76 (0.91)
		Total	122	2.75 (0.83)	97	2.89 (0.94)	219	2.82 (0.88)
	High power	Non-contradiction	61	3.29 (0.95)	63	2.58 (0.99)	124	2.93 (1.03)
		Contradiction	58	2.50 (0.80)	73	2.95 (0.91)	131	2.76 (0.89)
		Total	119	2.91 (0.96)	136	2.78 (0.96)	255	2.84 (0.96)
Total	Non-contradiction	113	3.14 (0.89)	108	2.67 (0.95)	221	2.91 (0.95)	
	Contradiction	128	2.55 (0.81)	125	2.97 (0.94)	253	2.76 (0.90)	
	Total	241	2.83 (0.90)	233	2.83 (0.96)	474	2.83 (0.93)	
Total	Low power	Non-contradiction	108	2.81 (0.78)	104	2.75 (0.92)	212	2.78 (0.85)
		Contradiction	137	2.81 (0.77)	112	2.91(0.90)	249	2.86 (0.83)
		Total	245	2.81 (0.77)	216	2.84 (0.91)	461	2.82 (0.84)
	High power	Non-contradiction	123	2.89 (1.02)	136	2.74 (0.98)	259	2.81 (1.00)
		Contradiction	119	2.66 (0.83)	137	2.95 (0.87)	256	2.82 (0.86)
		Total	242	2.78 (0.94)	273	2.84 (0.94)	515	2.81 (0.94)
Total	Non-contradiction	231	2.85 (0.91)	240	2.74 (0.95)	471	2.80 (0.94)	
	Contradiction	256	2.74 (0.80)	249	2.93 (0.88)	505	2.84 (0.85)	
	Total	487	2.79 (0.86)	489	2.84 (0.92)	976	2.82 (0.89)	

Supplementary Table 4.

Descriptive information of motive perception in each culture (the US vs. China) by status (high vs. low) by power (high vs. low) by behavioral contradiction (vs. non-contradiction) condition in Study 2.

Status	Manipulations		Americans		Chinese		Total	
	Power	Contradiction	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Low status	Low power	Non-contradiction	56	5.13 (1.17)	59	4.61 (1.55)	115	4.87 (1.40)
		Contradiction	67	3.80 (.95)	60	3.64 (1.33)	127	3.72 (1.15)
		Total	123	4.41 (1.25)	119	4.12 (1.52)	242	4.27 (1.39)
	High power	Non-contradiction	62	5.22 (1.11)	73	4.50 (1.40)	135	4.83 (1.32)
		Contradiction	61	3.97 (1.06)	64	3.72 (1.39)	125	3.84 (1.24)
		Total	123	4.60 (1.25)	137	4.14 (1.44)	260	4.36 (1.37)
	Total	Non-contradiction	118	5.18 (1.14)	132	4.55 (1.46)	250	4.85 (1.35)
		Contradiction	128	3.88 (1.01)	124	3.68 (1.35)	252	3.78 (1.19)
		Total	246	4.50 (1.25)	256	4.13 (1.48)	502	4.31 (1.38)
High status	Low power	Non-contradiction	52	3.99 (1.02)	45	4.64 (1.60)	97	4.29 (1.35)
		Contradiction	70	5.05 (1.17)	52	3.58 (1.51)	122	4.42 (1.51)
		Total	122	4.59 (1.22)	97	4.07 (1.63)	219	4.36 (1.44)
	High power	Non-contradiction	61	3.86(0.86)	63	4.78 (1.47)	124	4.33 (1.29)
		Contradiction	58	4.97 (1.17)	73	3.70 (1.42)	131	4.26(1.46)
		Total	119	4.40 (1.16)	136	4.20 (1.54)	255	4.29(1.38)
	Total	Non-contradiction	113	3.92 (0.93)	108	4.72 (1.52)	221	4.31 (1.31)
		Contradiction	128	5.01 (1.17)	125	3.65 (1.45)	253	4.34 (1.48)
		Total	241	4.50 (1.19)	233	4.14 (1.57)	474	4.33 (1.40)
Total	Low power	Non-contradiction	108	4.58 (1.24)	104	4.62 (1.56)	212	4.60 (1.40)
		Contradiction	137	4.44 (1.24)	112	3.61 (1.41)	249	4.07 (1.38)
		Total	245	4.50 (1.24)	216	4.10 (1.57)	461	4.31 (1.41)
	High power	Non-contradiction	123	4.55 (1.20)	136	4.63 (1.43)	259	4.59 (1.33)
		Contradiction	119	4.46 (1.22)	137	3.71 (1.40)	256	4.06 (1.37)
		Total	242	4.50 (1.21)	273	4.17 (1.49)	515	4.32 (1.37)
	Total	Non-contradiction	231	4.56 (1.22)	240	4.63 (1.49)	471	4.60 (1.36)
		Contradiction	256	4.45 (1.23)	249	3.66 (1.40)	505	4.06 (1.37)
		Total	487	4.50 (1.22)	489	4.14 (1.52)	976	4.32 (1.39)

Supplementary Table 5.

Main variables with significant correlations.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Culture									
2. Contradiction		-.02							

3. Culture × contradiction	.03	.00							
4. Status × contradiction	.02	-.03	-.02						
5. Power × contradiction	.03	.06	.06	.02					
6. Culture × status × power	.02	.02	.00	.03	.02				
7. Culture × status × contradiction	.03	-.02	-.03	.00	.03	-.04			
8. Motive	-.13***	-.19***	-.16***	.20***	-.01	.04	-.23***		
9. Power distance	.50***	-.02	.04	.03	.02	.00	.04	-.09**	
10. Judgment	.03	.02	.09**	-.11***	-.02	-.08**	.16***	-.31***	.12***

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Supplementary Table 6.

The mediation model of self-/other-oriented attribution in the effects of culture, status, contradiction, and their interactions (all as between-participants factors) on moral judgment in Study 2.

Predictor	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i> 95% CI [LL, UL]	<i>beta</i>	<i>beta</i> 95% CI [LL, UL]	<i>sr</i> ²	<i>sr</i> ² 95% CI [LL, UL]	<i>r</i>
<i>X</i> → <i>M</i> coefficients							
(Intercept)	4.32**	[4.24, 4.40]					
Culture	-0.18**	[-0.26, -0.10]	-0.13	[-0.18, -0.07]	.02	[.00, .03]	-.13**
Status	-0.00	[-0.08, 0.08]	-0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.00
Power	0.02	[-0.06, 0.10]	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.00
Contradiction	-0.27**	[-0.35, -0.19]	-0.19	[-0.25, -0.14]	.04	[.02, .06]	-.19**
Culture × status	0.03	[-0.05, 0.11]	0.02	[-0.04, 0.08]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.01
Culture × power	0.01	[-0.07, 0.09]	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.00
Culture × contradiction	-0.22**	[-0.30, -0.14]	-0.16	[-0.21, -0.10]	.02	[.01, .04]	-.16**
Status × power	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.03
Status × contradiction	0.27**	[0.19, 0.35]	0.20	[0.14, 0.25]	.04	[.02, .06]	.20**
Power × contradiction	0.02	[-0.06, 0.10]	0.01	[-0.04, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.01
Culture × status × power	0.05	[-0.04, 0.13]	0.03	[-0.03, 0.09]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.04
Culture × status × contradiction	-0.32**	[-0.40, -0.24]	-0.23	[-0.29, -0.17]	.05	[.03, .08]	-.23**
Culture × power × contradiction	0.00	[-0.08, 0.08]	0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.01
Status × power × contradiction	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.07]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.02
Culture × status × power × contradiction	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.07]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.02
<i>X</i> → <i>M</i> → <i>Y</i> coefficients							
(Intercept)	3.57**	[3.38, 3.75]					
Selfish motive	-0.17**	[-0.22, -0.13]	-0.27	[-0.34, -0.21]	.06	[.03, .09]	-.31**
Culture	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.04]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.03
Status	0.02	[-0.04, 0.07]	0.02	[-0.04, 0.08]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.01
Power	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.05]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.01
Contradiction	-0.03	[-0.08, 0.03]	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.03]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.02

Culture × status	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.03]	-0.03	[-0.09, 0.03]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.03
Culture × power	0.01	[-0.04, 0.06]	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.01
Culture × contradiction	0.04	[-0.01, 0.09]	0.05	[-0.02, 0.11]	.00	[-.00, .01]	.09**
Status × power	0.01	[-0.05, 0.06]	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.02
Status × contradiction	-0.05	[-0.10, 0.01]	-0.05	[-0.11, 0.01]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-.11**
Power × contradiction	-0.02	[-0.07, 0.04]	-0.02	[-0.08, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-.02
Culture × status × power	-0.06*	[-0.11, -0.01]	-0.07	[-0.13, -0.01]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-.08**
Culture × status × contradiction	0.08**	[0.03, 0.14]	0.09	[0.03, 0.15]	.01	[-.00, .02]	.16**
Culture × power × contradiction	0.04	[-0.02, 0.09]	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	.00	[-.00, .01]	.04
Status × power × contradiction	-0.01	[-0.06, 0.05]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	.00
Culture × status × power × contradiction	0.03	[-0.02, 0.09]	0.04	[-0.02, 0.10]	.00	[-.00, .01]	.04

Note. A significant *b*-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. *b* represents unstandardized regression weights. *beta* indicates the standardized regression weights. *sr*² represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *r* represents the zero-order correlation. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01.

Pilot Study 1: Measured Competence

We present two Pilot Studies, examining how competence perception (Pilot Study 1) or a manipulation of competence (Pilot Study 2) influence cultural understanding of word-deed contradictions. Pilot Study 1 examined how perceived competence in different cultures (the US versus China) influences moral judgment of contradictory transgressions to moral values as defined by occupations (as compared to open transgressions without contradictory work ethics). We explored whether tolerance of contradictions – as reflected with holistic thinking – would account for cultural attitudes toward word-deed contradictory transgressions.

Method

Participants and design. We employed a 2 (culture: American vs. Chinese) by 2 (transgression type: contradictory vs. non-contradictory) between-participants design. We targeted a final $N = 400$ ($n = 100$ per condition to examine interaction effects; Simmons et al., 2018). We predetermined to recruit 500 online participants, that is, 250 participants from each culture based on the consideration that we would use one check question to select attentive participants (“It is important that you pay attention; please choose the last option indicating strongly agree”; Oppenheimer et al., 2009). Two hundred and forty-six American participants completed our survey on Prolific; two hundred and twelve of them (96 males; $M_{\text{age}} = 31.0$ years, $SD = 10.3$) passed the check question and were included in further analyses. Through the sample service of the Chinese survey platform SoJump, two hundred and fifty-six Chinese participants

(100 males; $M_{\text{age}} = 32.0$ years, $SD = 6.7$) completed our survey and were all included in further analyses¹.

Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to either the contradictory or non-contradictory transgression condition, each reading six short scenarios in a random sequence (for all the scenario, see below in “Pilot Study 1 Materials”). The scenarios were presented in participants’ native languages. In the non-contradiction condition (American $n = 105$, Chinese $n = 128$), participants read six different targets’ transgressive behavior (e.g., “James [‘Zhang Feng’ in Chinese] sends gifts to a high school principal to get his daughter enrolled”), while participants in the contradictory transgression condition (American $n = 107$, Chinese $n = 128$) additionally read about the targets’ contradictory missions at work (e.g., “James as a magistrate advocates fairness in education systems”). After reading each scenario, participants indicated their perceptions of the target’s competence (“Do you think James is capable/intelligent?” $\alpha = .86$ across 12 items) and the target’s behaviors (as “understandable/reasonable/moral”; $\alpha = .79$ across 18 items) on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *extremely*. Participants eventually completed the Dialectical Self Scale, indicating their agreement (on a 7-point scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) with various statements about their perceptions of contradiction, cognitive change, and behavioral change (e.g., “I often find that things will contradict each other”; $\alpha = .82$ across 32 items; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2015).

¹ As in Study 1 in the main text, the Chinese platform embedded the check question in the default screening procedure. We thus could not access the data of participants who failed the question, or contrast the results before vs. after the exclusion.

Results

We included (1) culture (American = 0, Chinese = 1), transgression type (non-contradictory = 0, contradictory = 1), perceived competence ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.95$; mean-centered), (2) their two-way and (3) three-way interactions respectively in a three-step linear regression model. We found significant main effects of culture ($B = 0.30$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = 10.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$, 95% CI [0.24, 0.35]), transgression type ($B = -0.32$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = -10.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$, 95% CI [-0.38, -0.26]), and competence ($B = 0.66$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = 21.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .50$, 95% CI [0.60, 0.72]), suggesting that people generally judged the transgressions more leniently when they were Chinese, when the behavior was non-contradictory to their work ethics, and when they perceived the transgressors as competent. Despite the non-significant two-way interactions ($ps > .33$, $\eta_p^2 < .002$), crucial to our research question, we found a marginal culture by contradiction by competence three-way interaction ($B = 0.06$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = 1.78$, $p = .08$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, 95% CI [-0.006, 0.12]).

We further used Model 3 of the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2012), to investigate how people from different cultures evaluated the same transgressions depending on their contradiction to work ethics and perceived competence of transgressors (see Figure S1). We found a significant interaction between contradiction and competence among Americans ($B = -0.11$, $SE = 0.05$, $t = -2.01$, $p = .04$, 95% CI [-0.21, -0.003]) but not Chinese ($B = 0.01$, $SE = 0.04$, $t = 0.28$, $p = .78$, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.09]). While Chinese did not judge contradictory versus non-contradictory transgressions differently depending on perceived competence of the transgressors,

Americans evaluated transgressions contradictory to work ethics more harshly when the actors were considered high ($B = -0.43$, $SE = 0.06$, $t = -6.96$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-0.56, -0.31]) rather than low ($B = -0.23$, $SE = 0.07$, $t = -3.24$, $p = .001$, 95% CI [-0.37, -0.09]) on competence.




Figure S1. The culture by competence (perceived) by contradiction three-way interaction effect on moral judgment in Pilot Study 1. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

We further explored whether holistic thinking ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.60$) would play a role in cultural perceptions of word-deed contradictory transgressions. Although holistic thinking predicted more lenient attitudes toward transgressive behaviors ($r = .18$, $p < .001$), the current sample did not reveal a significant cultural difference on holistic thinking style (American = 0, Chinese = 1; $r = -.03$, $p = .49$). None of other factors, including the culture by contradiction by competence interaction ($r = .02$, $p = .73$), significantly correlated with holistic thinking ($r_s > .07$, $p > .15$).

Pilot Study 2: The Netherlands Versus China

Pilot Study 2 sampled from college students in the Netherlands versus China, and examined the role of competence by manipulating the student transgressors' academic achievement. We also explored the role of wealth (conceptualized as the student targets' family income) in moral judgments of contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressions. Both personal competence and ascribed wealth/resource can influence the targets' chances to do as they say, and may both influence observer judgments when they fail to do so. Moreover, we tested transgressions characterized by word-deed contradictions in a laboratory setting, where the targets made a self-serving (vs. impartial) distribution while claiming it through an objective dice-rolling procedure. This conceptualization of contradictory transgression was revised from one of the earliest empirical work on moral hypocrisy (Batson et al., 1997, 1999). We presume that a contradictory claim of fairness should make a selfish distribution seem less moral, when the student targets have high academic achievement (i.e., competence) but not high family income (i.e., wealth), while the above effect should be more salient among observers from independent (e.g., the Netherlands) than interdependent cultures (e.g., China).

Method

Participants and design. We employed a 2 (culture: Dutch vs. Chinese) by 2 (transgression type: openly selfish distribution vs. selfish distribution with a fair claim) by 2 (wealth: high vs. low family income) by 2 (competence: high vs. low academic achievement)

mixed design with only culture as a between-participants factor. We targeted a final $N = 400$, that is, $n = 200$ from each culture, to detect a small within-participants competence by transgression type interaction effect ($\eta_p^2 = .01$, $\alpha = .05$ with 80% power). Two hundred and twelve students (61 males; $M_{\text{age}} = 22.63$ years, $SD = 4.4$) were recruited on campus of a university in the Netherlands, receiving flyers with a link to access the online English survey, and provided with small gifts (e.g., a chocolate bar) when they agreed to participate. The translated Chinese survey was distributed on the student online forum of a Chinese mainland university. Two hundred Chinese students (53 males; $M_{\text{age}} = 20.85$ years, $SD = 1.7$) completed the survey and were each rewarded ¥10 ($\approx \$1.4$) afterwards. We included all 412 participants in further analyses.

Procedure. After completing basic demographic information, participants read descriptions of an ostensible lab study (i.e., a dictator game), and then evaluated eight gender-anonymous dictators in a random sequence (see below in “Pilot Study 2 English [Chinese] Materials”).

The rules of the dictator game elaborated as below. The student targets were asked to play the role of a distributor and assign €10 (¥10 in Chinese) between themselves and an anonymous partner in private cubicles. They were provided with three options: (1) giving €8 (¥8; in Chinese, the same below) to the self and €2 (¥2) to a partner, (2) giving €5 (¥5) to the self and €5 (¥5) to a partner, or (3) rolling two six-sided dice to decide between the above two options. The rules for dice rolling was: (a) when both dice show six (1/36 chance), the distributor should (1) give €8 to the self and €2 to a partner, and (b) when any of the two dice shows a number

other than six (35/36 chance), the distributor should (2) give €5 to the self and €5 to a partner.

Following the rules of the dictator game, participants indicated their understanding of the game on two questions, “Did the distributors have a high chance to win themselves €8 if they rolled the dice?” (on a 7-point scale from 1 = *definitely no* to 7 = *definitely yes*) and “If a distributor claimed to have rolled the dice to win him-/herself €8, how likely was he/she lying?” (on a 7-point scale from 1 = *very unlikely* to 7 = *very likely*), to examine their understanding of the game scenario.

Participants were then asked to evaluate eight ostensible distributors based on their answer sheets, which indicated their family income, academic achievement, and answers to two questions about dictator choices with yellow highlighters. We manipulated family income with a question “What is your gross household income as compared to the general Dutch [Chinese] population?” where the answer “Top 10%” represented the high-income and “Middle 40%” represented the relatively low-income conditions. Academic achievement was manipulated by answers to the question “What is your average academic grade?” The high and low achievement conditions were respectively represented by the choices of “From 8.0 to 8.5” (representing “Good”) and “From 5.5 to 6.0” (representing “Sufficient”) in Dutch (on a 10-point scale) while “From 90 to 94” (representing “Good”) to “From 65 to 69” (representing “Sufficient”) in Chinese (on a 100-point scale). We administered the manipulation of transgression type through answers to two questions about (1) the final choice between €8/€2 (¥8/¥2) and €5/€5 (¥5/¥5) and (2) whether or not the above choice was determined by one-time dice rolling (Yes/No). Given

participants' perceptions of a low chance to reach €8/€2 (¥8/¥2) through dice rolling and a corresponding high chance of cheating in contradiction with the alleged objective procedure (checked by the two questions following the game rules), we conceptualized dictators who claimed to have rolled the dice to reach €8/€2 (¥8/¥2) as contradictory transgressors—in contrasts with those who reached €8/€2 (¥8/¥2) without claiming to have rolled the dice (and hence were openly selfish actors; as in Batson et al., 1999).

After seeing each answer sheet, participants from both cultures answered one question: “How immoral or moral do you think this person’s behaviors were in the distribution task?” (On a 9-point scale ranging from -4 = *Extremely immoral* to 4 = *Extremely moral*).

Results

We first examined how participants from respective cultures understood the described rules and dictators' behaviors. With independent sample *t*-tests, we first found that people from the two cultures (Dutch: $M = 1.62$, $SD = 1.45$; Chinese: $M = 1.51$, $SD = 0.90$) did not differ in their perceived extremely low chance of winning €8 (¥8) through dice rolling, $t(410) = 0.98$, $p = 0.33$, $d = 0.09$. However, despite the minimal ambiguity (i.e., 35/36 chance) of deception when the targets claimed to have rolled the dice once to win themselves €8 (¥8), Chinese participants ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 1.67$) were less likely to consider it as deceptive than Dutch participants (Dutch: $M = 5.48$, $SD = 1.96$), $t(410) = 2.12$, $p = 0.04$, $d = 0.21$. We therefore controlled for participants' individual difference on perceived deception as a covariate in the following analyses, which did not change the patterns of significance in our main analyses.

Moral judgment. We conducted a repeated-measure ANOVA to examine the cultural differences on how people evaluate transgressions and how such evaluations depend on competence (as academic achievement) and wealth (as family income). Firstly, we found that competence and wealth had different effects on people's moral judgment. People from both cultures (the culture by competence interaction: $F(1, 409) = 0.003, p = .95, \eta_p^2 < 0.001$) condemned selfish distributions *less* when enacted by targets with high ($M = 0.11, SD = 1.18$) rather than low academic achievement ($M = -0.01, SD = 1.10$; the main effect of competence: $F(1, 409) = 5.79, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$). Without cultural consensus (the main effect of wealth: $F(1, 409) = 1.00, p = .32, \eta_p^2 = 0.002$), people from the two cultures assessed family income information differently in their appraisal of selfish behaviors (the culture by wealth interaction: $F(1, 409) = 10.16, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$). Dutch participants condemned the transgressions *more* when enacted by targets with high ($M = -0.37, SD = 1.66$) than low family income ($M = 0.01, SD = 1.46$), $F(1, 409) = 41.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.09$, while the difference was largely reduced among Chinese participants (high income: $M = 0.22, SD = 1.71$; vs. low income: $M = 0.33, SD = 1.50$; $F(1, 409) = 3.36, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$).

Crucial to our main hypothesis, we found a marginally significant three-way interaction among culture, transgression type, and competence (see Figure S2), $F(1, 409) = 3.50, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$, but not among culture, transgression type, and wealth, $F(1, 409) = 0.32, p = .57, \eta_p^2 = 0.001$, or the four-way interaction ($F(1, 409) = 1.49, p = .22, \eta_p^2 = 0.004$). Targets' academic achievement influenced Dutch, $F(1, 210) = 4.33, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$, but not Chinese, $F(1, 198)$

= 1.79, $p = .18$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$, students' moral perception of contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressions. Chinese perceived contradictory transgressions more positively, regardless of the targets' high ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 0.53$, $SD = 1.54$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 0.14$, $SD = 1.51$) or low academic achievement ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = 0.33$, $SD = 1.50$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 0.09$, $SD = 1.56$). In contrast, Dutch students evaluated contradictory transgressions more negatively, especially so when the targets were high ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = -0.35$, $SD = 1.47$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = 0.10$, $SD = 1.54$; $F(1, 210) = 10.85$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$) rather than low ($M_{\text{contradiction}} = -0.39$, $SD = 1.49$; vs. $M_{\text{non-contradiction}} = -0.07$, $SD = 1.30$; $F(1, 210) = 5.62$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$) on competence (i.e., academic achievement).

There were also significant main effects of culture, $F(1, 409) = 19.16$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$, and transgression type, $F(1, 409) = 34.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.08$. People evaluated selfish distributions as less moral when contradictorily claiming fairness ($M = 0.03$, $SD = 1.36$; vs. not, $M = 0.07$, $SD = 1.36$), or when they were Dutch ($M = -0.18$, $SD = 1.44$) rather than Chinese ($M = 0.27$, $SD = 1.48$). Replicating earlier findings (Efron, Markus, et al., 2018), a significant culture by transgression type interaction effect, $F(1, 409) = 10.91$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$, indicated that Dutch evaluated selfish distributions as less moral when accompanied with ($M = -0.34$, $SD = 1.90$; versus without $M = -0.01$, $SD = 1.90$) claims of fairness, $F(1, 409) = 7.21$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$, while Chinese evaluated contradictory ($M = 0.40$, $SD = 1.97$; vs. non-contradictory, $M = 0.16$, $SD = 1.95$) transgressions more positively, $F(1, 409) = 4.04$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$). None of

the other effects significantly predicted people's moral appraisals of transgressions ($ps > .50$, $\eta_p^2 < 0.001$).




Figure S2. The culture by competence (as academic achievement) by contradiction three-way interaction effect on moral judgment in Pilot Study 2. † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Discussion of Pilot Studies 1 and 2. Both Pilot Studies revealed a marginal three-way culture by competence by contradiction interaction effect, suggesting that only people from independent cultures (e.g., the US and the Netherlands) – but not interdependent cultures (e.g., China) – judged high- (vs. low-) competence targets' contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressions more harshly. However, the marginal findings should be interpreted with caution, and may suggest a possible difference between competence and prestige-based status. High competence is an essential foundation of social prestige (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). But without their asymmetrical influence on social others (e.g., others' stronger tendencies to defer to their

preaching), high- (vs. low-) competence targets may not necessarily induce the culturally divergent judgment of word-deed contradictions.

Moreover, our findings did not show significant influences of (1) toleration of contradictions (as reflected with holistic thinking in Study 1) or (2) ascribed wealth (as operationalized as student targets' family income in Study 2) on the cultural evaluations of contradictory (vs. non-contradictory) transgressions. (1) The culturally divergent judgment of contradictions emerged despite a non-significant cultural difference on holistic thinking. And (2) ascribed wealth did not influence the extent to which independent versus interdependent cultures evaluate word-deed contradictions (i.e., a non-significant three-way wealth by culture by contradiction interaction effect). The latter findings may also corroborate the non-significant power by culture by contradiction interaction effect in Study 2 in the main text, by suggesting that people from independent versus interdependent cultures evaluate status-based contradictions differently, mainly given their cultural independence/interdependence but not vertical-collectivistic endorsement.

Within-Manuscript Meta-Analyses

We conducted two parallel meta-analyses (Goh et al., 2016), respectively with (1) the two studies in the main text and (2) with four studies including the two pilot studies, using fixed effects in which the mean effect size (i.e., mean correlation) was weighted by sample size. All correlations were Fisher's z transformed for analyses and converted back to Pearson correlations for presentation.

Supporting our hypothesis, across the two studies ($k = 2$, $N = 1,374$), we found a significant three-way interaction effect among status, contradiction, and culture, $r_m = 0.15$, $Z = 5.67$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.100, 0.206]. The effect remained significant across the four studies ($k = 4$, $N = 2,254$), in both fixed-effect ($r_m = 0.13$, $Z = 6.02$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.086, 0.168]) and fully random-effect tests ($r_m = 0.13$, $Z = 5.96$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.085, 0.169]).

Study 1 English Materials

Scenario 1

[High competence condition: between-participants]

Thomas is a high-ranked research director in a marketing research company. As a high-ranked research director, he coordinates his team in analyzing market data and presenting market reports to meet client companies' demands.

[Low competence condition: between-participants]

Thomas is an intern in a marketing research company. As an intern, he analyses market data and presents market report to meet client companies' demands.

After reading the above information, please answer:

What is Thomas's position in the marketing research company?

High-ranked research director/Assistant investigator/Intern

[Behavior]

Recently, Thomas has undertaken a new project. After two-week preparation, Thomas submitted a satisfactory marketing report and successfully reached a cooperation agreement with the client company. However, Thomas falsified some data and exaggerated the market prospect of the client's product.

After reading the above information, please answer:

Did Thomas falsify his data report in this project?

Yes

No

[Contradiction: within-participants]

Months before Thomas falsified data, he once published a short essay in the company's internal magazine discussing the importance of research ethics in marketing research. In his essay, he advocates that marketing investigators should always keep their integrity in

data processing. He condemns those who present false results to meet clients' expectations or to reach a partnership.

Above is ALL information about Thomas. After reading all information, please answer:

Which of the following sentences can better represent Thomas's opinion in the essay?

Falsifying data reports to clients is always acceptable.

Falsifying data reports is acceptable only when it is beneficial to our own company.

Falsifying data reports is unacceptable under any circumstances.

Scenario 2

[High competence condition: between-participants]

Ashley is an attending physician working in a hospital. As an attending physician, she also takes charge of a regular meeting per month among medical staff in her hospital.

[Low competence condition: between-participants]

Ashley is a medical intern working in a hospital. As a medical intern, she also helps organize a regular meeting per month among medical staff in her hospital.

After reading the above information, please answer:

What is Ashley's position in the hospital?

Attending physician /Nurse/Medical intern

[Behavior]

Recently, Ashley's mother got sick and was sent to the hospital where she worked. Her mother's physician informed the families that her mother needed to have surgery to fully recover. Ashley requested the physician to prioritize her mother's treatment and schedule the surgery as soon as possible.

After reading the above information, please answer:

Did Ashley request to give her relatives preferential treatment?

Yes

No

[Contradiction: within-participants]

Weeks before Ashley's mother got sick, Ashley gave a brief speech in the monthly meeting of the medical staff. In her speech, she called on all the fellows to respect their profession as physicians and to treat every patient equally and patiently. She also condemned those who give their relatives preferential treatment and commit irregularities in the medical field.

Above is ALL information about Ashley. After reading all information, please answer:

Which of the following sentences can better represent Ashley's opinion in the speech?

It is totally understandable for physicians to give their relatives preferential treatment.

Sometimes physicians can be allowed to give their relatives preferential treatment.

Physicians should never give their relatives preferential treatment.

Study 1 Chinese Materials

Scenario 1

[High competence condition: between-participants]

王磊是一名市场调研公司的高级研究主管。作为一名高级研究主管，他负责协调团队成员分析市场数据并提交调研报告，来满足客户公司的需求。

[Low competence condition: between-participants]

王磊是一名市场调研公司的实习生。作为一名实习生，他负责分析市场数据并提交调研报告，来满足客户公司的需求。

根据以上所有信息，请回答：

以下哪个是王磊在市场调研公司的职位？

高级研究主管/助理研究员/实习生

[Behavior]

最近，王磊开始负责一个新项目。经过两个星期的准备，王磊向客户提交了报告，客户非常满意，与王磊的公司成功签订了合作协议。然而，王磊伪造了部分数据并且夸大了客户产品的未来市场占有率。

根据以上所有信息，请回答：

王磊是否在项目报告中伪造了数据信息？是/否

[Contradiction: within-participants]

在王磊伪造数据的几个月之前，他曾在公司的内部刊物上发表过一篇文章，探讨市场研究伦理的重要性。在他的文章中，他主张研究人员在数据分析中应当时刻秉持诚实守信的原则。他的文章也谴责了那些为了让客户满意或者为了达成合作而伪造结果的行为。

以上是关于王磊的全部信息。根据以上所有信息，请回答：

下面哪句话准确地描述了王磊在文章中的观点？

在给客户的报告中伪造数据是可以接受的行为。

伪造数据是可以接受的，但是前提是对公司有利。

伪造数据在任何情况下都是不可接受的。

Scenario 2

[High competence condition: between-participants]

张丽是医院的一名主治医师。作为一名主治医师，她同时负责组织医院里每月一次的医护人员例行会议。

[Low competence condition: between-participants]

张丽是医院的一名实习医生。作为一名实习医生，她同时负责协助组织医院里每月一次的医护人员例行会议。

根据以上所有信息，请回答：

以下哪个是张丽在医院里的职位？

主治医师/护士/实习医生

[Behavior]

最近，张丽的母亲生病了，住进了她工作的医院。母亲的主治医师告诉家属们她的母亲需要做手术才能痊愈。张丽拜托主治医师优先为自己的母亲治病并且尽快安排手术。

根据以上所有信息，请回答：

张丽是否要求给她的亲戚特殊优待？是/否

[Contradiction: within-participants]

在张丽母亲生病的几周前，张丽在医护人员的例会上做过一个简短报告。在演讲中，她号召所有的同辈要尊重医生这个职业，平等耐心地对待每一位病患。在演讲中，她同时谴责了在医疗领域给亲戚特殊优待等违规行为。

以上是关于张丽的所有信息。根据以上所有信息，请回答：

以下哪句话准确地描述了张丽在演讲中的观点？

医生给自己的亲戚特殊优待是完全可以理解的。

医生偶尔可以被允许给自己的亲戚特殊优待。

医生绝不应该给自己的亲戚特殊优待。

Study 2 English Materials

[Manipulations of power and status: between-participants]

Below you will read about four persons and their life episodes. They have different names, different jobs, and live in different places. But they have something in common, specifically as below:

[High status high power]

Among their work groups, families, friends, and other groups to which they belong, these persons have a great deal of status. That is to say, they have prestige, are highly respected and held in high esteem. People look up to them and value their opinions. At the same time, these persons have a great deal of power. That is to say, they have a lot of control over important resources and play a significant role in determining others' outcomes. In our daily life, they can be the manager of a company, the dean of a college, the team leader of a project, etc.

[High status low power]

Among their work groups, families, friends, and other groups to which they belong, these persons have a great deal of status. That is to say, they have prestige, are highly respected and held in high esteem. People look up to them and value their opinions. However, these persons have very little power. That is to say, they basically have no control over important resources and play an insignificant role in determining others' outcomes. In our daily life, they can be an ex-Olympic athlete, an emeritus professor of a university, an author of an online column, etc.

[Low status high power]

Among their work groups, families, friends, and other groups to which they belong, these persons have very little status. That is to say, they lack prestige, are not very respected or held in high esteem. People do not look up to them or value their opinions. However, these persons have a great deal of power. That is to say, they have a lot of control over important resources and play

a significant role in determining others' outcomes. In our daily life, they can be a loan clerk of a bank, a bouncer of a celebrity, the boss's relative of a family business, etc.

[low power low status]

Among their work groups, families, friends, and other groups to which they belong, these persons have very little status. That is to say, they lack prestige, are not very respected or held in high esteem. People do not look up to them or value their opinions. At the same time, these persons have very little power. That is to say, they basically have no control over important resources and play an insignificant role in determining others' outcomes. In our daily life, they can be an intern who runs errands, a waiter in a restaurant, a front desk clerk in a hotel, etc.

[Manipulation of Contradiction: between-participants]

[Contradictory transgression]

Scenario 1:

John [Emma] seems to be very concerned about environmental protection. He often persuades others to recycle and cut down uses of plastic goods.

John [Emma] often orders plastic-wrapped delivery food and asks for extra disposable dinnerware to avoid doing the dishes.

Scenario 2:

Leo [Emily] seems to be very concerned about charity activities. When he knows about volunteering and donation activities from reliable acquaintances, he often talks others into these activities.

Leo [Emily] rarely volunteers in, or donates to, any charity causes, even though he learns about these causes through reliable acquaintances.

Scenario 3:

David [Sophia] seems to be very concerned about driving safety issues. He often preaches to others the importance of safe driving and the irresponsibility of drunk driving.

David [Sophia] likes going to bars after work. He has been pulled over more than once because of drunk driving or speeding after drinking with his colleagues or friends.

Scenario 4:

Thomas [Helen] seems to be very concerned about the dangers of second-hand smoking. He often tells his colleagues and friends to avoid smoking when others are around, and advocates harsher penalties for smoking in public places.

Thomas [Helen] is a regular smoker. He sometimes smokes at friends' house parties, and complains about his experiences of being ticketed for smoking in public places.

[Non-contradictory transgression]

Scenario 1:

John [Emma] seems to be very concerned about charity activities. When he knows about volunteering and donation activities from reliable acquaintances, he often talks others into these activities.

John [Emma] often orders plastic-wrapped delivery food and asks for disposable dinnerware to avoid doing the dishes.

Scenario 2:

Leo [Emily] seems to be very concerned about environmental protection. He often persuades others to recycle and cut down uses of plastic goods.

Leo [Emily] rarely volunteers in, or donates to, any charity causes, even though he learns about these causes through reliable acquaintances.

Scenario 3:

David [Sophia] seems to be very concerned about the dangers of second-hand smoking. He often tells his colleagues and friends to avoid smoking when others are around, and advocates harsher penalties for smoking in public places.

David [Sophia] likes going to bars after work. He has been pulled over for a few times because of drunk driving or speeding after drinking with his colleagues or friends.

Scenario 4:

Thomas [Helen] seems to be very concerned about driving safety issues. He often preaches to others the importance of safe driving and the irresponsibility of drunk driving.

Thomas [Helen] is a regular smoker. He sometimes smokes at friends' house parties, and complains about his experiences of being ticketed for smoking in public places.

[Questions for each scenario]

How generous or selfish do you think [name]'s reasons are for preaching environmental protection/charity activities/driving safety/the dangers of second-hand smoking?

Do you think that [name] preaches environmental protection/charity activities/driving safety/the dangers of second-hand smoking because he [she] cares more about doing what is the best for other people versus what is the best for himself [herself]?

To what extent do you think [name]'s use of disposable dinnerware/inaction in volunteering and donation activities/driving offences/behavior of smoking in public places is moral?

To what extent do you think [name]'s use of disposable dinnerware/inaction in volunteering and donation activities/driving offences/behavior of smoking in public places is ethical?

To what extent do you think [name]'s use of disposable dinnerware/inaction in volunteering and donation activities/driving offences/behavior of smoking in public places is acceptable?

Study 2 Chinese Materials

[Manipulations of power and status: between-participants]

下面你将会读到四个人以及他们的生活片段。他们有着不同的姓名，不同的职业，生活在不同的城市。但是他们有一些共同特点，具体如下：

[High status high power]

在他们的工作团队，家人，朋友，以及他们所属的其他团体当中，这些人都拥有很高的地位。也就是说，他们享有很高的声望，受到高度重视与尊敬。人们视他们为榜样并且看重他们的意见。同时，这些人拥有很大的权力。也就是说，他们掌控着很多重要的资源并且能在很大程度上决定其他人的利害得失。在我们的日常生活当中，这些人可能是某公司的经理，某学院的院长，某个项目的主管，等等。

[High status low power]

在他们的工作团队，家人，朋友，以及他们所属的其他团体当中，这些人都拥有很高的地位。也就是说，他们享有很高的声望，受到高度重视与尊敬。人们视他们为榜样并且看重他们的意见。但是，这些人拥有的权力很小。也就是说，他们对于重要资源的掌控极少，对于他人的利害得失也基本没有什么影响力。在我们的日常生活当中，这些人可能是前奥运运动员，荣誉教授，网络专栏的作家，等等。

[Low status high power]

在他们的工作团队，家人，朋友，以及他们所属的其他团体当中，这些人拥有的地位都很低。也就是说，他们缺乏声望，不怎么受到重视和尊敬。人们不怎么看重他们的意见，更不会视他们为榜样。但是，这些人拥有很大的权力。也就是说，他们掌控着很多重要的资源并且能在很大程度上决定其他人的利害得失。在我们的日常生活当中，这些人可能是银行的贷款业务员，名人的保镖，家族企业老板的亲戚，等等。

[Low status low power]

在他们的工作团队，家人，朋友，以及他们所属的其他团体当中，这些人拥有的地位都很低。也就是说，他们缺乏声望，不怎么受到重视和尊敬。人们不怎么看重他们的意见，更

不会视他们为榜样。同时，这些人拥有的权力很小。也就是说，他们对于重要资源的掌控极少，对于他人的利害得失也基本没有什么影响力。在我们的日常生活当中，这些人可能是跑腿的实习生，餐厅的服务员，酒店的前台招待，等等。

[Manipulation of Contradiction: between-participants]

[Contradictory transgression]

Scenario 1:

刘伟（刘敏）看起来很关心环保问题。他经常劝说周围的人废物利用并减少使用塑料制品。

刘伟（刘敏）经常订购塑料包装的外卖食物。为了不洗碗筷，他还会索要额外的一次性餐具。

Scenario 2:

张强（张静）看起来很关心慈善事业。当他从可信的熟人那里听说志愿服务或者捐赠活动时，他常常鼓励其他人参与其中。

张强（张静）很少参加任何名义的志愿服务或者捐赠活动，即使这些活动是由可靠的熟人介绍来的。

Scenario 3:

王磊（王艳）看起来很关心驾车安全事宜。他常常跟身边的人强调，驾驶安全非常重要，酒驾是对他人安全不负责的行为。

王磊（王艳）喜欢下班后喝两杯。他已经不止一次因为跟朋友或同事喝酒后驾车或者超速被抽检。

Scenario 4:

李杰（李娟）看起来很关心二手烟的危害。他常常告诉周围的同事和朋友，尽量不要在别人面前抽烟。他还提倡加强对公共场所吸烟行为的管制。

李杰（李娟）是个烟民。他有时会在朋友家聚会时抽烟。他还会抱怨在公共场所吸烟时被罚款的经历。

[Non-contradictory transgression]

Scenario 1:

刘伟（刘敏）看起来很关心慈善事业。当他从可信的熟人那里听说志愿服务或者捐赠活动时，他常常鼓励其他人参与其中。

刘伟（刘敏）经常订购塑料包装的外卖食物。为了不洗碗筷，他还会索要额外的一次性餐具。

Scenario 2:

张强（张静）看起来很关心环保问题。他经常劝导周围的人废物利用并减少使用塑料制品。

张强（张静）很少参加任何名义的志愿服务或者捐赠活动，即使这些活动是由可靠的熟人介绍来的。

Scenario 3:

王磊（王艳）看起来很关心二手烟的危害。他常常告诉周围的同事和朋友，尽量不要在别人面前抽烟。他还提倡加强对公共场所吸烟行为的管制。

王磊（王艳）喜欢下班后喝两杯。他已经不止一次因为跟朋友或同事喝酒后驾车或者超速被抽检。

Scenario 4:

李杰（李娟）看起来很关心驾车安全事宜。他常常跟身边的人强调，驾车安全非常重要，酒驾是对他人安全不负责的行为。

李杰（李娟）是个烟民。他有时会在朋友家聚会时抽烟。他还会抱怨在公共场所吸烟时被罚款的经历。

[Questions for each scenario]

你觉得【姓名】宣传环保行为/慈善活动/驾车安全/二手烟危害是出于善意的还是自私的动机？

你觉得【姓名】宣传环保行为/慈善活动/驾车安全/二手烟危害是因为想做对别人最好的事还是做对自己最好的事？

在多大程度上，你觉得【姓名】使用一次性餐具/不参与志愿或捐赠活动/违章驾驶/在公共场合吸烟的行为是道德的？

在多大程度上，你觉得【姓名】使用一次性餐具/不参与志愿或捐赠活动/违章驾驶/在公共场合吸烟的行为是符合伦理的？

在多大程度上，你觉得【姓名】使用一次性餐具/不参与志愿或捐赠活动/违章驾驶/在公共场合吸烟的行为是可以理解的？

Pilot Study 1 Materials

Names in English: James Emma Leo Lily Simon Sophia Mike

Names in Chinese: 张峰 孙梅 王军 李玲 赵勇 吴静 韩健

[Scenario 1]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In his work, James as a magistrate advocates fairness in education systems.

In his life, he sends gifts to a high school principal to get his daughter enrolled.

在工作中，张峰作为一名地方法官主张教育体系应该保证公平。

在生活中，他为了女儿升入某高中给校长送礼。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

James sends gifts to a high school principal to get his daughter enrolled.

张峰为了女儿升入某高中给校长送礼。

[Scenario 2]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In her work, Emma as a nurse working in the emergency room advocates terminal patients to donate their organs to save others' lives.

In her life, she strongly objects to her parents' decision for organ donation when they die.

在工作中，孙梅作为一名急诊护士鼓励绝症患者捐献器官救助其他人的生命。

在生活中，她强烈反对对自己父母去世后捐献器官。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

Emma strongly objects to her parents' decision for organ donation when they die.

孙梅强烈反对对自己父母死后捐献器官。

[Scenario 3]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In his work, Simon as a doctor claims that every life should be respected and treated equally.

In his life, he requests another doctor to prioritize his mother's treatment.

在工作中，赵勇作为一名医生主张所有患者都应当得到平等的尊重与救治。

在生活中，他拜托其他医生优先为自己的母亲治病。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

Simon requests a doctor to prioritize his mother's treatment.

赵勇拜托医生优先为自己的母亲治病。

[Scenario 4]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In her work, Lily as a kindergarten teacher instructs other parents to be patient and reasonable with their kids.

In her life, she sometimes punishes her children physically.

在工作中，李玲作为一名幼儿园老师教导其他家长对待孩子要有耐心，与孩子讲道理。

在生活中，她有时会体罚自己的孩子。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

Lily sometimes punishes her children physically.

李玲有时会体罚自己的孩子。

[Scenario 5]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In his work, Mike as a firefighter pledges to serve public safety.

In his life, he promptly fled the scene alone when his residential building caught fire.

在工作中，韩健作为一名消防员宣誓为公共安全服务。

在生活中，他在自己的住宅楼着火时迅速独自逃出了火灾现场。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

Mike promptly fled the scene alone when his residential building caught fire.

韩健在自己的住宅楼着火时迅速独自逃出了火灾现场。

[Scenario 6]

[Between-participants: contradictory condition]

In her work, Sophia as a high school teacher condemns her students to plagiarize from the Internet for homework assignments.

In her life, she sometimes copies online paragraphs to finish her reports.

在工作中，吴静作为一名高中教师批评她的学生在完成家庭作业时上网抄袭。

在生活中，她有时会照抄网上的内容来完成自己的报告。

[Between participants: non-contradictory condition]

Sophia sometimes copies online paragraphs to finish her reports.

吴静有时会照抄网上的内容来完成自己的报告。

[Measures in each scenario]

Do you think ...[Name] is capable/intelligent?

Do you think ...[Name]'s behavior of ... (e.g., [Scenario 1] sending gifts to a high school principal to get his daughter enrolled) is moral/understandable/reasonable?

Pilot Study 2 English Materials

The to-be-presented persons are student participants in a psychology lab experiment on campus. They (as DISTRIBUTORs) were asked to assign €10 between themselves and others (as RECIPIENTs).

-Below you should first know how the DISTRIBUTORs made their choices-

[Page break]

The DISTRIBUTORs were seated in PRIVATE cubicles and were each provided with two six-sided dice on a table.

That is to say, NO ONE ELSE except themselves knows how exactly they made decisions.



Each DISTRIBUTOR had two options:

- (1) Giving €8 to the self and €2 to a RECIPIENT
- (2) Giving €5 to the self and €5 to a RECIPIENT


The DISTRIBUTOR and the RECIPIENT then received the amount of money as indicated.

The DISTRIBUTORs could choose from (1) €8/€2 and (2) €5/€5 at their own will, OR roll two six-sided dice ONCE to help them decide. The dice rolling required:

- (a) IF both dice show six (1/36 chance), the DISTRIBUTOR should (1) give €8 to the self and €2 to the RECIPIENT
- (b) IF any of the two dice shows a number other than six (35/36 chance), the DISTRIBUTOR should (2) give €5 to the self and €5 to the RECIPIENT

[Page break]

The rules for DISTRIBUTORs can also be briefed below:



After reading the above instructions, please answer some questions accordingly:

Were DISTRIBUTORs free to choose by themselves, instead of rolling the dice, if they wanted?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Not sure (3)

Validation: (when choosing other than Yes) Your answer is not correct. DISTRIBUTORs were free to choose from (1) \$8/\$2, or (2) \$5/\$5, and (3) rolling the dice.

What was the chance to win €8 for themselves if the DISTRIBUTORs rolled the dice?

1/6 (≈ 16.7%) (1)

1/9 (≈ 11.1%) (2)

1/12 (≈ 8.3%) (3)

1/36 (≈ 2.8%) (4)

Validation: (when choosing other than 1/36) Your answer is not correct. DISTRIBUTORs could gain \$8 only when the two six-sided dice both showed six.

[Page break]

-Below please put yourself in the shoes of a JUDGE-

The DISTRIBUTORs made choices PRIVATELY. As a JUDGE, your information about each DISTRIBUTOR is only an ANSWER SHEET including some demographic information and his/her answers to two questions.

An example is shown below. The DISTRIBUTORs answered the questions with yellow highlighter pens.

ANSWER SHEET

YOUR ROLE IN THE GAME: **Distributor**

YOUR PARTICIPANT NUMBER: **D1_43**

YOUR CHOICE OF DISTRIBUTION:

1. Giving €8 to yourself and €2 to a RECIPIENT
2. Giving €5 to yourself and €5 to a RECIPIENT

HOW DID YOU COME UP WITH THE CHOICE?

1. I rolled the dice once to make the above choice
2. I did not let the dice decide

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

WHAT IS YOUR GROSS HOUSHOLD INCOME AS COMPARED TO THE GENERAL DUTCH POPULATION?

1. Top 0.1%
2. Top 1%
3. Top 5%
4. Top 10%
5. Second 10%
6. 60% to 80%
7. Middle 40%
8. Bottom 50%

WHAT IS YOUR AVERAGE ACADEMIC GRADE?

1. Above 8.5
2. From 8.0 to 8.5
3. From 7.5 to 8.0
4. From 7.0 to 7.5
5. From 6.5 to 7.0
6. From 6.0 to 6.5
7. From 5.5 to 6.0
8. Below 5.5

[Page break]

As a JUDGE, you need to evaluate the DISTRIBUTORs when you see his/her demographic information together with his/her answers to the two questions.

[Page break]

Next you will start to see the information of some different DISTRIBUTORS.

Please think carefully about each individual DISTRIBUTOR and his/her information on the ANSWER SHEET, and make your evaluations based on your gut feelings.

Pilot Study 2 Chinese Materials

感谢您参与本次问卷调查。这是一项关于人际知觉与判断的研究。你将会看到8个不同的人在同一情境中做出的不同选择，他们均被要求将10元分配给自己以及另一名同伴。

【分页】

指导语

在第一次见面时，即使对对方完全不了解，我们也能通过极少的信息（比如对方的某一个行为）而迅速形成对这个人的整体印象。

这项研究将会随机向你呈现8个不同的人以及他们在同一情境中做出的不同选择。请你根据提供的信息对每个人做出符合你直觉的判断。

请仔细阅读以下指导语。你需要正确回答一些关于指导语的问题，才能正式开始实验任务。

【分页】

你即将看到的人是一些曾经参加过本校心理学实验的学生。他们（作为分配者）被要求将10元分配给他们自己和另一个陌生人（作为接受者）。

—首先你需要了解分配者是如何做出选择的—

【分页】

分配者被安排在一个私密的实验室房间，房间的桌子上配有两枚六面骰子。

在这个房间里，除了他们自己，没有人知道他们做出选择的具体过程。



每个分配者都有两个分配方案：

- (1) 8元给自己，2元给接受者

(2) 5元给自己，5元给接受者


实验结束时，分配者和接受者两方都会根据分配者的选择获得相应的报酬。

同时，分配者既可以自己直接决定，也可以通过扔骰子的方式帮他们决定选择（1）8元/2元还是（2）5元/5元。扔骰子需要遵循以下规则：

- (a) 如果两个骰子都是6朝上，分配者应该给自己8元，给接受者2元
- (b) 如果任何一个骰子不是6朝上，分配者应该给自己5元，给接受者5元

【分页】

简而言之，分配者的规则如下图所示：



根据以上指导语，请回答几个问题：

分配者是否可以根据自己的意愿选择分配方案，而不扔骰子决定？

是 (1)

否 (2)

不确定 (3)

提示：（选择非“是”时）你的回答是错误的。分配者可以在（1）8元/2元（2）5元/5元，以及（3）扔骰子之间自由选择。

提示：（选择非“1/36”时）你的回答是错误的。分配者可以在（1）8元/2元（2）5元/5元，以及（3）扔骰子之间自由选择。

如果分配者扔骰子决定分配方案，有多大概率能赢得8元？

1/6 ($\approx 16.7\%$) (1)

1/9 ($\approx 11.1\%$) (2)

1/12 ($\approx 8.3\%$) (3)

1/36 ($\approx 2.8\%$) (4)

提示：（选择非“1/36”时）你的回答是错误的。分配者只有在两个骰子都是6朝上时才能赢得8元。

如果分配者通过扔骰子来决定分配方案，你觉得他/她赢得8元的可能性有多大？（1=非常小，7=非常大）

【分页】

—接下来请你站在第三方的立场上看待分配者的行为—

分配者在私密的实验室房间内做出选择。作为第三方，你只知道每个分配者在一张答题卡上提供的信息，其中包括一些个人背景信息以及他/她回答的两个问题。

答题卡的内容如下所示。分配者用黄色荧光笔标记自己的答案。

【答题卡示例】

答题卡

你在任务中的角色：分配者

你的被试编号：D1_43

你的选择是：

1. 给自己¥8，给接受者¥2 2. 给自己¥5，给接受者¥5

你是如何做出以上选择的？

1. 我扔了一次骰子做出以上选择 2. 我没有扔骰子，自己做出以上选择

个人信息

与大多数中国人相比，您如何描述您的家庭总收入（税前）？

前 0.1%

前 1%

前 5%

前 10%

前 10% ~20%

前 60%~80%

中间 40%

低于 50%

你的学业平均成绩水平：

高于 95

90~94

85~90

80~84

75~79

70~74

65~69

低于 65

【分页】

作为第三方，你需要根据每个分配者的个人背景信息以及他/她回答的两个问题对他/她做出评价。

在开始评价分配者之前，请再次回忆分配者的规则，并回答两个问题

如果分配者扔骰子决定分配方案，有多大概率能赢得8元？

1/6 ($\approx 16.7\%$) (1)

1/9 ($\approx 11.1\%$) (2)

1/12 ($\approx 8.3\%$) (3)

1/36 ($\approx 2.8\%$) (4)

如果一名分配者在答题卡上说自己通过扔一次骰子的方式得到给自己¥8的结果，他/她有多大可能在说谎？（1=可能性很小，7=可能性很大）

【分页】

接下来你将会看到不同分配者的相关信息。

请认真思考每个分配者在答题卡上提供的信息，然后根据你的直觉与感受做出判断。请选择“>>”开始正式实验。

随机顺序呈现以下8种实验条件：

【高收入—高成就—伪善】

【高收入—低成就—伪善】

【低收入—高成就—伪善】

【低收入—低成就—伪善】

【高收入—高成就—自私】

【高收入—低成就—自私】

【低收入—高成就—自私】

【低收入—低成就—自私】

【在每种实验条件下】

你觉得这名分配者在分配任务中的行为是不道德的还是道德的？（-4=非常不道德，0=中立，4=非常道德）

References

- Batson, C. D., Kobrynowicz, D., Dinnerstein, J. L., Kampf, H. C., & Wilson, A. D. (1997). In a very different voice: Unmasking moral hypocrisy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1335-1348. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1335>
- Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., Seufferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J. A. (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 525-537. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.77.3.525>
- Goh, J. X., Hall, J. A., & Rosenthal, R. (2016). Mini meta-analysis of your own studies: Some arguments on why and a primer on how. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(10), 535-549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12267>
- Hayes, A. F. (2012). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 351-398. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211628>
- Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review*, 108(2), 291-310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.2.291>

Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks:

Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social*

Psychology, 45(4), 867-872. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.009>

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2018). False-positive citations. *Perspectives on*

Psychological Science, 13(2), 255-259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617698146>

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Srivastava, S., Boucher, H. C., English, T., Paletz, S. B., Peng, K. (2015).

The Dialectic Self Scale. Unpublished manuscript, California Polytechnic State

University, San Luis Obispo.

Uhlmann, E. L., Pizarro, D. A., & Diermeier, D. (2015). A person-centered approach to moral

judgment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(1), 72–81.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614556679>