Lying Because We Care:
Compassion Increases Prosocial Lying

Supplemental Material

Study 1

Table 1a: Regression table for the effect of compassion on prosocial lying, controlling for positive affect, negative affect, personal distress, specific emotions, and social perceptions.

	Dependent variable:			
	Overall Evaluations			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Condition: compassion	-4.482***	-3.916**	-5.517***	-5.817***
	(1.610)	(1.765)	(1.456)	(1.515)
Time: shared	-0.723	-0.160	-2.623	-4.111
	(1.569)	(1.720)	(2.268)	(2.547)
Positive affect	6.146***			1.872
	(1.544)			(1.399)
Negative affect	-5.905			0.004
	(4.076)			(3.608)
Personal distress	5.495*			0.059
	(3.050)			(2.689)
Interested		0.934		
		(0.860)		
Distressed		0.789		
		(1.061)		
Excited		1.211		

	(1.638)
Upset	0.666
	(0.903)
Strong	-1.276
	(1.049)
Guilty	0.196
	(1.192)
Scared	-1.256
	(2.025)
Hostile	2.391
	(1.808)
Enthusiastic	2.707*
	(1.608)
Proud	-0.665
	(1.410)
Irritable	-1.922*
	(1.025)
Alert	-1.711*
	(0.911)
Ashamed	-3.155***
	(1.210)
Inspired	2.536**
	(1.217)
Determined	0.039
	(1.286)
Nervous	3.064*
	(1.672)

Attentive	-0.995		
	(0.811)		
Jittery	1.436		
	(1.578)		
Active	1.968*		
	(1.188)		
Afraid	0.996		
	(1.782)		
Optimistic		3.824***	3.711***
		(0.591)	(0.593)
Warm		-0.121	-0.073
		(0.699)	(0.697)
Agreeable		0.173	0.098
		(0.756)	(0.753)
Competent		1.817**	1.738**
		(0.815)	(0.819)
Open		-0.111	-0.189
		(0.601)	(0.600)
Likeable		0.349	0.291
		(0.839)	(0.843)
Trusting		-0.082	-0.035
		(0.767)	(0.767)
Trustworthy		2.117**	2.075**
		(0.826)	(0.824)
Likely to be female		-0.955*	-0.888
		(0.567)	(0.567)

Condition: compassion*time: shared	2.139**	2.003*	3.734***	2.787***
	(0.937)	(1.054)	(0.987)	(1.023)
Time: shared*positive affect	1.566*			1.856**
	(0.899)			(0.944)
Time: shared*negative affect	-3.243			-3.845
	(2.372)			(2.436)
Time: shared*personal distress	3.879**			4.071**
	(1.775)			(1.815)
Time: shared*interested		1.267**		
		(0.514)		
Time: shared*distressed		0.741		
		(0.634)		
Time: shared*excited		-2.901***		
		(0.979)		
Time: shared*upset		-0.045		
		(0.540)		
Time: shared*strong		-0.704		
		(0.627)		
Time: shared*guilty		-0.763		
		(0.712)		
Time: shared*scared		2.297*		
		(1.210)		
Time: shared*hostile		-1.711		
		(1.080)		
Time: shared*enthusiastic		1.608*		

	(0.961)		
Time: shared*proud	0.214		
	(0.842)		
Time: shared*irritable	0.524		
	(0.612)		
Time: shared*alert	0.221		
	(0.544)		
Time: shared*ashamed	-0.346		
	(0.723)		
Time: shared*inspired	0.243		
	(0.727)		
Time: shared*determined	0.979		
	(0.768)		
Time: shared*nervous	0.405		
	(0.999)		
Time: shared*attentive	-0.072		
	(0.484)		
Time: shared*jittery	-1.408		
	(0.943)		
Time: shared*active	0.422		
	(0.710)		
Time: shared*afraid	0.079		
	(1.064)		
Time: shared*optimistic		-0.485	-0.622
		(0.400)	(0.400)
Time: shared*warm		0.547	0.574
		(0.474)	(0.471)

Time: shared*agreeable			0.161	0.107
			(0.513)	(0.508)
Time: shared*competent			0.215	-0.038
			(0.553)	(0.553)
Time: shared*open			-0.617	-0.658
			(0.408)	(0.405)
Time: shared*likeable			0.225	0.140
			(0.569)	(0.569)
Time: shared*trusting			-0.237	-0.154
			(0.520)	(0.518)
Time: shared*trustworthy			0.881	0.837
			(0.560)	(0.557)
Time: shared*likely to be female			0.645*	0.783**
			(0.384)	(0.383)
Constant	18.984***	18.680***	4.453	2.653
	(2.695)	(2.878)	(3.345)	(3.773)
Observations	792	792	792	792
Log Likelihood	-3,017.998	-2,959.015	-2,953.394	-2,936.081
Akaike Inf. Crit.	6,059.997	6,010.031	5,954.789	5,932.163
Bayesian Inf. Crit.	6,116.092	6,225.060	6,066.978	6,072.400

Note: Positive affect items: interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, active; negative affect: distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, afraid; personal distress: distressed, upset, scared, nervous, afraid. Items to measure social perceptions of essay writer: optimistic, warm, agreeable, competent,

likeable, trusting, trustworthy, likely to be female. See main text for full description of items. $^{*}p < .10$; $^{**}p < .05$; $^{***}p < 0.01$.

Study 3

Paragraph about the charity shown to participants in the Prosocial Lie condition in Study 3

The AMF [Against Malaria Foundation] *provides long-lasting insecticide-treated nets and has them distributed in developing countries to prevent malaria, a disease that kills over a million people a year. Insecticide-treated bed nets prevent deaths and many other non-fatal cases of malaria and are relatively inexpensive. AMF has been chosen as the #1 most effective charity in the world by GiveWell, a non-profit organization that conducts in-depth research aimed to determine how much good a given charity accomplishes (in terms of lives saved, lives improved, etc.) per dollar spent.*

Table 2a: Regression table for the effect of compassion on clearly dishonest responses, controlling for positive affect, negative affect, personal distress, and personality traits.

	Dependent variable:			
	Clearly Dishonest Responses			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Condition: compassion	9.139**	16.087***	7.901**	8.836*
	(4.466)	(5.939)	(3.805)	(4.604)
Positive affect	2.029			2.172

	(3.383)		(3.556)
Negative affect	2.373		3.813
	(8.557)		(9.150)
Personal distress	-4.445		-5.243
	(7.493)		(8.097)
Interested		-1.509	
		(2.612)	
Distressed		2.785	
		(2.805)	
Excited		0.252	
		(3.936)	
Upset		-5.145*	
		(2.872)	
Strong		2.757	
		(2.798)	
Guilty		-0.726	
		(3.217)	
Scared		-6.809*	
		(3.607)	
Hostile		1.342	
		(2.790)	
Enthusiastic		-3.487	
		(3.055)	
Proud		2.633	
		(3.195)	
Irritable		1.406	

	(2.112)		
Alert	-1.645		
	(2.424)		
Ashamed	1.203		
	(3.367)		
Inspired	-0.733		
	(2.632)		
Determined	0.881		
	(2.273)		
Nervous	4.879		
	(3.482)		
Attentive	0.451		
	(2.138)		
Jittery	-2.187		
	(2.690)		
Active	1.456		
	(3.066)		
Afraid	2.179		
	(4.025)		
Conscientiousness		5.539	5.730
		(7.169)	(7.242)
Neuroticism		-2.238	-2.426
		(3.199)	(3.300)
Openness		-3.351	-4.224
		(6.013)	(6.241)
Extraversion		2.176	0.919

			(5.934)	(6.177)
Agreeableness			-1.427	-2.277
			(3.884)	(4.054)
Constant	57.053***	58.142***	56.069	63.061*
	(5.308)	(6.366)	(35.887)	(37.165)
Observations	134	134	132	132
R^2	0.038	0.153	0.045	0.051
Adjusted R^2	0.009	-0.006	-0.001	-0.019
Residual Std. Error	21.361 (df = 129)	21.516 (df = 112)	21.539 (df = 125)	21.730 (df = 122)
F Statistic	1.290 (df = 4;129)	0.963 (df = 21;112)	0.977 (df = 6;125)	0.731 (df = 9;122)

Note: Positive affect items, negative affect items, and personal distress predictors are the same as those in Table 1a. Big 5 personality traits are conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness, extraversion, and agreeableness. Models that included personality traits have two less observations due to a computer malfunction that resulted in missing data for those variables for two responses. *p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < 0.01.

Table 3a: Regression table for the effect of compassion on ambiguously dishonest responses, controlling for positive affect, negative affect, personal distress, and personality traits.

	Dependent variable:			
	Ambiguously Dishonest Responses			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Condition: compassion	10.234***	16.222***	8.081**	10.046**

	(3.860)	(5.134)	(3.298)	(3.970)
Positive affect	3.228			3.398
	(2.924)			(3.066)
Negative affect	1.065			2.081
	(7.396)			(7.889)
Personal distress	-4.950			-5.309
	(6.476)			(6.981)
Interested		0.408		
		(2.258)		
Distressed		1.656		
		(2.424)		
Excited		0.046		
		(3.402)		
Upset		-4.476*		
		(2.483)		
Strong		2.163		
		(2.419)		
Guilty		-1.129		
		(2.781)		
Scared		-5.120		
		(3.118)		
Hostile		1.205		
		(2.412)		
Enthusiastic		-3.503		
		(2.641)		
Proud		3.306		

	(2.762)		
Irritable	1.254		
	(1.826)		
Alert	-1.879		
	(2.095)		
Ashamed	0.772		
	(2.911)		
Inspired	-1.594		
	(2.275)		
Determined	0.692		
	(1.965)		
Nervous	4.380		
	(3.010)		
Attentive	0.709		
	(1.848)		
Jittery	-1.106		
	(2.326)		
Active	1.717		
	(2.650)		
Afraid	0.963		
	(3.480)		
Conscientiousness		5.261	5.441
		(6.214)	(6.244)
Neuroticism		-2.486	-2.459
		(2.773)	(2.845)
Openness		-2.759	-3.679
		(5.212)	(5.381)

Extraversion			2.999 (5.143)	1.293 (5.326)
Agreeableness			-1.511 (3.366)	-2.443 (3.495)
Constant	60.694*** (4.588)	59.645*** (5.503)	56.625* (31.105)	65.202** (32.044)
Observations	134	134	132	132
R^2	0.060	0.172	0.061	0.077
Adjusted R^2	0.031	0.017	0.016	0.009
Residual Std. Error	18.463 (df = 129)	18.599 (df = 112)	18.669 (df = 125)	18.735 (df = 122)
F Statistic	2.067* (df = 4;129)	1.108 (df = 21;112)	1.362 (df = 6;125)	1.137 (df = 9;122)

Note: All predictors are the same as those in Table 2a. Models that included personality traits have two less observations due to a computer malfunction that resulted in missing data for those variables for two responses. $^{*}p < .10$, $^{**}p < .05$, $^{***}p < 0.01$.

Results with Block Included as a Factor

For each dependent variable (clearly dishonest responses, ambiguously dishonest responses, honest responses), we conducted a 2 (Emotion: compassion vs. neutral) x 2 (Lie Type: prosocial vs. selfish) x 2 (Block: first vs. second) mixed-model ANOVA with repeated measures on the block factor. Although we did not have a priori expectations about interactions between block and either emotion or lie type, we included block as a factor given the possibility that dishonesty would increase in the second block due to fatigue or depleted self-control (e.g. Mead, Baumeister, Gino, Schweitzer, & Ariely, 2009).

For clearly dishonest responses, there was a significant Emotion x Lie Type interaction, $F(1,428) = 6.51$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2_p = .01$. Participants in the compassion condition ($M = 63.61$, $SD = 23.60$) exhibited significantly more prosocial lying than did those in the neutral condition ($M = 57.66$, $SD = 19.16$), $t(212) = 2.03$, $p = .04$, $d = .28$), $t(212) = 2.03$, $p = .04$, $d = .28$. There was not a statistically significant difference between selfish lying in the compassion condition ($M = 53.79$, $SD = 19.18$) versus in the neutral condition ($M = 57.91$, $SD = 19.78$), $p = .12$. While there was no main effect of emotion on lying ($p = .66$), there was a significant main effect of lie type, $F(1,428) = 5.28$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, such that participants engaged in more lying in the prosocial lie conditions ($M = 60.52$, $SD = 21.56$) than in the selfish lie conditions ($M = 56.00$, $SD = 19.57$). There were no other main effects or interactions ($ps > .40$)

Similar results were obtained for ambiguously dishonest responses. There was again a significant Emotion x Lie Type interaction, $F(1,428) = 5.96$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2_p = .01$. Those in the compassion condition ($M = 66.78$, $SD = 20.29$) exhibited significantly more prosocial lying than did those in the neutral condition ($M = 60.89$, $SD = 16.26$), $t(212) = 2.35$, $p = .02$, $d = .32$. There was not a statistically significant difference between selfish lying in the compassion condition ($M = 58.83$, $SD = 16.39$) versus in the neutral condition ($M = 61.26$, $SD = 17.54$), $p > .25$. There was no main effect of emotion condition on lying ($p > .25$), but there was a significant main effect of lie type, $F(1,428) = 4.45$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, such that participants engaged in more lying in the prosocial lie condition ($M = 63.72$, $SD = 18.50$) than in the selfish lie condition ($M = 60.14$, $SD = 17.02$). Additionally, there was a main effect of block, $F(1,428) = 4.56$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, such that participants engaged in more prosocial lying in the second block than in the first ($M = 62.43$, $SD = 18.89$) than in the second ($M = 61.40$, $SD = 18.17$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions ($ps > .50$).

Finally, we examined honest responses. As predicted, there was no significant Emotion x Lie Type interaction, (p = .29). There were also no main effects of induction, lie type, or block on honest responses (ps > .10). There was a marginally significant Emotion x Block interaction (F(1, 428) = 3.10; p = .08, η^2_p = .01), such those in the compassion condition (M = 78.92, SD = 15.23) exhibited less honest responses than those in the neutral condition (M = 79.19, SD = 12.55) in the first block, but more honest responses in the second block (M_{second} = 80.05, SD_{second} = 14.12 vs. M_{first} = 78.34, SD_{first} = 13.62). However, neither of these differences reached statistical significance (ps > .20).

References

Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., & Ariely, D. (2009). Too tired to tell the truth: Self-control resource depletion and dishonesty. *Journal of Experimental Social psychology*, *45*(3), 594-597.