

Supplementary Results for Study 9

Here we present a preliminary test that we ran prior to the Study 9 reported in the paper. This study is identical to Study 9, except that it used a different manipulation of anonymity. The patterns of results were the same as Study 9, except for the results regarding the modulation of partner choice.

Methods

A total of 402 workers from Amazon Mechanical Turk were recruited to participate. A total of 37 participants (9.2%) were excluded based on preregistered exclusion criteria. This left data from a total of 365 participants (47% Male; Mean age = 40.50, $SD = 12.84$) to be analysed.

There were four conditions in this study. Half of the participants were randomly assigned to read about a CEO who is deciding whether or not to partner with a wealthy overseas manufacturer who can benefit the company's profit margin but does not treat their workers with care. Participants in this group were then randomly assigned to read that the CEO either accepted or rejected the partnership with the manufacturer. The other half of the participants were randomly assigned to read about a CEO who is deciding whether or not to partner with a small overseas manufacturer who cannot benefit the company's profit margin but does treat their workers with care. Participants in this group were then randomly assigned to read that the CEO either accepted or rejected the partnership with the manufacturer.

After reading about the chooser's decision, participants evaluated the chooser on how trustworthy and moral, how emotional and logical, and how warm and competent they seemed. We measured perceived warmth with four items (warm, good-natured, tolerant, and sincere) and we measured perceived competence with five items (competent, confident, independent, competitive, and intelligent). These items were previously validated in prior research

(Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009). In alignment with our previous studies, we then averaged our measures of morality, trustworthiness, emotionality, and warmth into one index to indicate perceived morality. We also averaged our measures of logicity and competence into one index to indicate perceived competence.

Next, participants were asked to what extent they would want to work for the CEO, purchase products from the CEO's company, and invest in the CEO's company. We then averaged these three measures into one index to indicate desire to associate with the CEO. Then participants were asked if they were the CEO, whether they would have chosen or rejected the manufacturer they read about. To manipulate the anonymity of the choice, half of the participants were also told to imagine that their decision would be made public to their family and friends and potential consumers.

Finally, participants completed a modified measure of trait Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), narcissism, and psychopathy (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Before conducting this study, methods, hypotheses, and analysis plans were preregistered and can be accessed at:

<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=ab7bu8>

Results

Test of Hypothesis 1

Participants rated those who rejected the able manufacturer as more moral ($M = 7.27$, $SD = 1.13$ vs. $M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.31$), $t(186) = 26.15$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.83$ and more competent ($M = 6.47$, $SD = 1.34$ vs. $M = 5.24$, $SD = 2.09$), $t(186) = 4.81$, $p < .001$, $d = .70$ relative to those who chose the able manufacturer.

87v90 Participants rated those who chose the willing manufacturer as more moral ($M = 6.72$, $SD = 1.32$ vs. $M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.62$), $t(175) = 12.80$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.93$ and more competent

($M = 6.59$, $SD = 1.37$ vs. $M = 5.79$, $SD = 1.75$), $t(175) = 3.38$, $p = .001$, $d = .51$, relative to those who rejected the willing manufacturer.

Bootstrapped results using 10,000 resamples showed a moderated mediation effect, such that perceived morality mediated the effect of prospective manufacturer type on desire to associate with the CEO when both rejecting the prospective manufacturer and when choosing the prospective manufacturer (Reject: $b = -3.85$, $SE = 0.258$, 95% CI = -4.36, -3.36) (Chose: $b = 4.68$, $SE = 0.258$, 95% CI = 4.17, 5.18). The index of moderated mediation was also significant (index = 8.53, $SE = .402$, 95% CI = 7.74, 9.31).

Test of Hypothesis 2b

Next, we examined whether participants' desire to choose or reject certain partners varies depending upon the incentive structure of their environment. Specifically, in the treatment condition, participants were asked to imagine as CEO that they wanted to build a reputation as an ethically responsible brand and signal to their consumers that they care about social issues. They were also told that their consumers would be aware of their choice as CEO. In the control condition participants were simply asked who they would choose to partner with as CEO. There was a directional, albeit non-significant effect, of the treatment condition on desire to partner with the willing manufacturer ($M = 6.63$, $SD = 2.19$ vs. $M = 6.24$, $SD = 2.06$), $t(175) = 1.22$, $p = .22$, $d = .18$. There was no effect of the treatment condition on desire to partner with the able manufacturer ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 2.45$ vs. $M = 2.34$, $SD = 2.06$), $t(186) = .78$, $p = .44$, $d = .11$.

Test of Hypothesis 3

We found that one's desire to partner with the able manufacturer was positively correlated with trait Machiavellianism ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), trait Psychopathy ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), and trait Narcissism ($r = .27$, $p < .001$). We also found that one's desire to partner with the

willing manufacturer was negatively, albeit non-significantly, correlated with trait Machiavellianism ($r = -.13, p = .08$), trait Psychopathy ($r = -.03, p = .66$), and trait Narcissism ($r = -.06, p = .40$).

Bootstrapped results using 10,000 resamples showed Dark Triad traits to be a significant moderator of the relationship between prospective manufacturer type on desire to choose the manufacturer. Results indicated that prospective manufacturer type ($b = 8.96, SE = .96, p < .001$) and Dark Triad traits ($b = 1.42, SE = .22, p < .001$) were both associated with desire to choose the manufacturer. The interaction between prospective manufacturer type and Dark Triad traits was also significant ($b = -1.71, SE = .32, p < .001$), suggesting that the effect of prospective manufacturer type on desire to choose the manufacturer depended on Dark Triad traits. Together, the variables accounted for approximately 51% of the variance in desire to choose the manufacturer, $R^2 = .51, F(3, 361) = 123.74, p < .001$.