

Supplemental Information

Social Impressions and Moral-Dilemma Judgments

Nyx L. Ng & Bertram Gawronski

University of Texas at Austin

The data, analysis codes, and research materials of the supplemental analyses are available at https://osf.io/h7pyj/?view_only=c16dcfa20f0e465eadccc3dca828874a.

Re-analyses using the NCI model

A potential criticism of the CNI model concerns its hierarchical structure (Baron & Goodwin, 2020, 2021). Because the positions of the *C* and *N* parameters in the CNI model processing tree are arbitrary, we re-analyzed the data of the two studies using an alternative model in which the positions of the *C* and *N* parameters are reversed (see Gawronski et al., 2020). We refer to this model as the NCI model.

Results of the re-analyses are provided in Tables S1 to S3. The correlational analyses largely yielded the same findings as the CNI model, with the strongest and only consistent correlation in both studies being the positive association between perceived morality and sensitivity to moral norms. The regression analyses also yielded the same primary finding that, across both studies, the only consistent significant association to emerge is between perceived morality and sensitivity to moral norms. All other previously significant effects that emerged using the CNI model in Study 2 became either non-significant or only had a marginal effect in the re-analyses using the NCI model.

Robustness against Dilemma Exclusion

An item-based analysis previously conducted by Gawronski et al. (2020) revealed that one of the 12 dilemmas used in the current research has low construct validity in the manipulation of moral norms (*abduction dilemma*). Moreover, four of the remaining 11 dilemmas can be criticized for confounding moral norms with whether the focal action requires interference with the action of someone else (*transplant dilemma*, *torture dilemma*, *vaccine dilemma*, and *tyrant-killing dilemma*). We thus excluded these five dilemma scenarios, re-

estimated the CNI model parameters, and re-analyzed the associations between the three impression dimensions and presumed moral-dilemma judgments. Results of this set of re-analyses are reported in Tables S4 to S6. The correlational analyses (Table S5) revealed a positive correlation between perceived competence and sensitivity to moral norms in both studies. In addition, the correlational analyses again yielded a significant positive correlation between perceived morality and sensitivity to moral norms in both studies. In contrast, the multiple-regression analyses (Table S6) yielded only a marginal positive association between perceived morality and sensitivity to moral norms in Study 1, although this positive association remained statistically significant in Study 2. It should be noted, however, that having only seven observations per dilemma type instead of twelve reduces the reliability of the individual-level parameter estimates, which reduces statistical power for the detection of actually existing effects (see Körner et al., 2020).

References

- Baron, J., & Goodwin, G. P. (2020). Consequences, norms, and inaction: A critical analysis. *Judgment and Decision Making, 15*(3), 421–442.
- Baron, J., & Goodwin, G. P. (2021). Consequences, norms, and inaction: Response to Gawronski et al. (2020). *Judgment and Decision Making, 16*(2), 566–595.
- Gawronski, B., Conway, P., Hütter, M., Luke, D. M., Armstrong, J., & Friesdorf, R. (2020). On the validity of the CNI model of moral decision-making: Reply to Baron and Goodwin (2020). *Judgment and Decision Making, 15*(6), 1054–1072.
- Körner, A., Deutsch, R., & Gawronski, B. (2020). Using the CNI model to investigate individual differences in moral dilemma judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 46*(9), 1392–1407.

Table S1. Descriptive statistics of NCI model parameters.

Study	Variables	Mean	<i>SE</i>	95% CI	Skewness	Kurtosis
Study 1	<i>C</i> parameter	0.32	0.02	[0.29, 0.35]	0.68	-0.55
	<i>N</i> parameter	0.45	0.01	[0.43, 0.48]	0.04	-0.72
	<i>I</i> parameter	0.64	0.01	[0.61, 0.67]	-0.17	-0.33
Study 2	<i>C</i> parameter	0.35	0.02	[0.31, 0.38]	0.65	-0.51
	<i>N</i> parameter	0.41	0.01	[0.39, 0.44]	-0.06	-0.90
	<i>I</i> parameter	0.57	0.01	[0.54, 0.60]	-0.31	0.06

Note. *C* parameter = sensitivity to consequences; *N* parameter = sensitivity to moral norms; *I*

parameter = general preference for inaction over action.

Table S2. Zero-order correlations between impression dimensions and NCI model parameters.

Study	Variable	1	2	3	4	5
Study 1	1. Morality	1				
	2. Sociability	.31***	1			
	3. Competence	.66***	.29***	1		
	4. <i>C</i> parameter	.05	.04	.03	1	
	5. <i>N</i> parameter	.25***	.09	.18**	.14*	1
	6. <i>I</i> parameter	-.01	.05	.02	.27***	.27***
Study 2	1. Morality	1				
	2. Sociability	.46***	1			
	3. Competence	.58***	.30***	1		
	4. <i>C</i> parameter	.07	.11*	.12*	1	
	5. <i>N</i> parameter	.22***	.19***	.09	.20***	1
	6. <i>I</i> parameter	.00	-.03	.01	.08	.03

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. *C* parameter = sensitivity to consequences; *N* parameter = sensitivity to moral norms; *I* parameter = general preference for inaction over action.

Table S3. Results of multiple-regression analyses regressing NCI model parameters onto the three impression dimensions.

Study	Variable	<i>C</i> parameter			<i>N</i> parameter			<i>I</i> parameter		
		B	95% CI	Adj. R^2	B	95% CI	Adj. R^2	B	95% CI	Adj. R^2
Study 1				-.01			.05			-.01
	Morality	0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]		0.04**	[0.02, 0.07]		-0.01	[-0.04, 0.02]	
	Sociability	0.01	[-0.02, 0.03]		0.00	[-0.02, 0.02]		0.01	[-0.01, 0.03]	
	Competence	-0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]		0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]		0.01	[-0.03, 0.05]	
Study 2				.01			.05			-.01
	Morality	-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]		0.04**	[0.01, 0.07]		0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	
	Sociability	0.02	[-0.01, 0.05]		0.02 [#]	[-0.00, 0.04]		-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]	
	Competence	0.03 [#]	[-0.01, 0.08]		-0.02	[-0.05, 0.02]		0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]	

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [#] $p < .10$. *C* parameter = sensitivity to consequences; *N* parameter = sensitivity to moral norms;

I parameter = general preference for inaction over action.

Table S4. Descriptive statistics of CNI model parameters estimated using the reduced dilemma set.

Study	Variables	Mean	<i>SE</i>	95% CI	Skewness	Kurtosis
Study 1	<i>C</i> parameter	0.16	0.01	[0.14, 0.18]	1.09	0.42
	<i>N</i> parameter	0.63	0.01	[0.61, 0.66]	-0.50	-0.34
	<i>I</i> parameter	0.65	0.02	[0.61, 0.68]	-0.51	-0.74
Study 2	<i>C</i> parameter	0.19	0.01	[0.17, 0.21]	0.97	0.27
	<i>N</i> parameter	0.60	0.02	[0.57, 0.63]	-0.43	-0.84
	<i>I</i> parameter	0.60	0.02	[0.56, 0.64]	-0.35	-1.04

Note. *C* parameter = sensitivity to consequences; *N* parameter = sensitivity to moral norms; *I* parameter = general preference for inaction over action.

Table S5. Zero-order correlations between impression dimensions and CNI model parameters estimated using the reduced dilemma set.

Study	Variable	1	2	3	4	5
Study 1	1. Morality	1				
	2. Sociability	.31***	1			
	3. Competence	.66***	.29***	1		
	4. <i>C</i> parameter	-.09 [#]	-.09	-.06	1	
	5. <i>N</i> parameter	.15**	.03	.12*	.10 [#]	1
	6. <i>I</i> parameter	.01	.05	.05	.07	.10
Study 2	1. Morality	1				
	2. Sociability	.46***	1			
	3. Competence	.58***	.30***	1		
	4. <i>C</i> parameter	.00	.11 [#]	.10 [#]	1	
	5. <i>N</i> parameter	.21***	.19***	.13*	-.04	1
	6. <i>I</i> parameter	-.06	-.10	-.01	.06	.10 [#]

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [#] $p < .10$. *C* parameter = sensitivity to consequences; *N*

parameter = sensitivity to moral norms; *I* parameter = general preference for inaction over action.

Table S6. Results of multiple-regression analyses regressing CNI model parameters (estimated using the reduced dilemma set) onto the three impression dimensions.

Study	Variable	C parameter			N parameter			I parameter		
		B	95% CI	Adj. R^2	B	95% CI	Adj. R^2	B	95% CI	Adj. R^2
Study 1				.00			.01			-.00
	Morality	-0.01	[-0.03, 0.01]		0.03 [#]	[0.00, 0.06]		-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	
	Sociability	-0.01	[-0.02, 0.01]		-0.00	[-0.03, 0.02]		0.01	[-0.02, 0.04]	
	Competence	0.00	[-0.02, 0.03]		0.01	[-0.03, 0.04]		0.02	[-0.02, 0.07]	
Study 2				.02			.05			.00
	Morality	-0.02 [#]	[-0.04, 0.00]		0.04*	[0.00, 0.07]		-0.01	[-0.05, 0.03]	
	Sociability	0.02*	[0.00, 0.03]		0.03 [#]	[0.00, 0.05]		-0.03	[-0.06, 0.01]	
	Competence	0.03*	[0.00, 0.05]		0.00	[-0.04, 0.04]		0.01	[-0.03, 0.06]	

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [#] $p < .10$. C parameter = sensitivity to consequences; N parameter = sensitivity to moral norms;

I parameter = general preference for inaction over action.