

## Web Appendix

### Beauty, Effort, and Misrepresentation: How Beauty Work Affects Judgments of Moral Character and Consumer Preferences

ADRIANA SAMPER  
LINYUN W. YANG  
MICHELLE E. DANIELS

This Web Appendix contains the supplementary trait inferences study described in the discussion of study 1A, 4 study pretests (the study 2 and 4 transformative and transience pretests, the study 2 effort manipulation check pretest, and the study 5 attributions pretest), supplementary results for our 4-item morality index across studies 3-6, all study means and standard deviations / errors, and factor analyses for studies 2-6.

## WEB APPENDIX A: SUPPLEMENTARY TRAIT INFERENCE STUDY

This study replicates studies 1A and 1B by once again testing trait inferences of Jenna. Similar to study 1A, this study includes a control condition to further delineate whether changes in perceptions of morality are being driven by high or low amounts of appearance-related effort. In addition, we measure and test whether perceived misrepresentation mediates the negative effect of effort on judgments of Jenna's moral character.

### Method

181 Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) participants (51.4% female,  $M_{Age} = 35.8$ ) completed this study in exchange for payment. The study employed a three condition (effort: high, low, control) between-subjects design. Participants first read the vignettes used in study 1A. Next, participants rated Jenna on the four moral traits used in study 1B (moral, ethical, genuine, sincere,  $\alpha = .94$ ). Participants then rated their agreement with four items gauging the extent to which Jenna was perceived as misrepresenting herself: 1) Jenna is trying to put forth an image of someone she is not, 2) Jenna is misrepresenting herself to others, 3) Jenna is trying to present herself as something that she is not, and 4) Jenna is misrepresenting her innate self (1 = Completely disagree, 7 = Completely agree;  $\alpha = .98$ ). Finally, participants completed a manipulation check by rating how much effort Jenna put into her morning routine (1 = Very low effort, 7 = Very high effort).

### Results and Discussion

We predicted that Jenna would be judged as less moral in the high effort condition compared to the low effort or control conditions and that this effect would be mediated by the perception that Jenna was misrepresenting herself. To test our predictions, all dependent variables were analyzed using a three-level (effort: high, low, control) one-way ANOVA, followed by a mediation analysis.

*Manipulation check.* Results revealed a main effect of effort ( $F(2, 178) = 150.92, p < .0001$ ). Confirming that our manipulation was successful, participants believed Jenna put more effort into her routine in the high relative to low effort condition ( $M_{High} = 6.51, SD = .66, M_{Low} = 3.23, SD = 1.38; F(1, 178) = 284.04, p < .0001$ ). The control condition ( $M_{Control} = 5.50, SD = .99$ ) fell between the high and low effort conditions and was significantly different from the high effort condition ( $F(1, 178) = 26.82, p < .0001$ ) and the low effort condition ( $F(1, 178) = 142.28, p < .0001$ ).

*Moral character.* Results revealed a significant main effect of effort ( $F(2, 178) = 8.27, p < .001$ ). As predicted, participants viewed Jenna as less moral in the high versus low effort condition ( $M_{High} = 4.82, SD = 1.08, M_{Low} = 5.58, SD = 1.00; F(1, 178) = 15.49, p < .001$ ) and in the high effort versus control condition ( $M_{Control} = 5.38, SD = 1.05; F(1, 178) = 8.54, p < .01$ ). Importantly, there was no difference between the low effort and control conditions ( $F(1, 178) = 1.07, p = .30$ ), suggesting that high but not low effort changed participants' perceptions of Jenna's moral character.

*Misrepresentation.* Results indicated a significant main effect of effort ( $F(2, 178) = 11.72, p < .0001$ ). As predicted, participants believed that Jenna misrepresented herself to a greater extent in the high versus low effort condition ( $M_{High} = 2.92, SD = 1.50, M_{Low} = 1.76, SD = 1.17; F(1, 178) = 23.06, p < .0001$ ) and the high effort versus control condition ( $M_{Control} = 2.19, SD = 1.26; F(1, 178) = 9.18, p < .01$ ). The low versus control conditions were marginally different ( $F(1, 178) = 3.28; p = .07$ ).

*Mediation analysis.* We predicted that perceptions of misrepresentation would drive lower ratings of Jenna's moral character. To test this, we conducted a mediation analysis using effort as the dependent variable, misrepresentation as the mediator, and moral character as the dependent variable (Model 4, Hayes 2013). Because we had three levels in our independent variable, we used multicategorical mediation outlined in Hayes (2013). Specifically, we used argument 1 with the high effort condition set as our reference group. This method tests two pathways. The first (D1) compares the high effort condition to the low effort condition. The second (D2) compares high effort to the control condition. As predicted, the indirect path of effort on moral character through misrepresentation was significant in both pathways (D1:  $B = .44$ ,  $CI_{95}: .22, .76$ ; D2:  $B = .28$ ,  $CI_{95}: .10, .57$ ).

*Discussion.* This study further corroborates the results of study 1A and 1B in several ways. First, it replicates and extends the effects of appearance-related effort on ratings of moral traits by including a control condition. We do not find any differences between the control and low effort conditions, but perceptions of moral character are reduced when Jenna expends high effort getting ready. Second, this study demonstrates the mediating role of misrepresentation in the negative effort-morality link.

## WEB APPENDIX B: STUDY 2 PRETESTS

### 1. Transformativeness and Transience across Beauty Work Types Pretest (Cosmetics, Tanning, and Skincare)

We conducted a pretest with 155 female AMT participants ( $M_{Age} = 35.8$ ) to examine the degree to which make-up, self-tanning, and skincare were perceived as leading to transient and transformative changes in appearance. This pretest employed a 3-cell between-subjects design (beauty work type: cosmetics, tanning, skincare). The vignettes used were the same as those presented in study 2 (see App. C for vignettes) except that information regarding the amount of effort Jenna spent on her routine was removed.

After reading the vignette, participants answered three questions related to the transience of the beauty work performed: 1) To what extent did [beauty work type: brushing her hair and applying make-up / applying spray-on bronzer / applying skin cleanser and moisturizer] that afternoon permanently change Jenna's appearance for the barbeque? 2) To what extent do you think [beauty work type] had a lasting effect on Jenna's appearance at the barbecue? (both anchored at 1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much so) and 3) how long did the effects of [beauty work type] that afternoon last? (1 = A very short period of time, 7 = A very long period of time;  $\alpha = .75$ ).

Participants then answered three questions related to the transformativeness of the beauty work performed: 1) To what extent did [beauty work type] that afternoon alter Jenna's appearance for the barbeque? 2) To what extent did [beauty work type] that afternoon transform Jenna's appearance for the barbeque? and 3) To what extent did [beauty work type] lead to noticeable changes in Jenna's appearance? (all anchored at 1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much so;  $\alpha = .91$ ).

All predictions were tested with a one-way between-subjects ANOVA.

*Transience.* No main effect was found on transience, indicating that all three beauty work types were perceived as resulting in similarly transient changes ( $F < 1$ , *ns*). Further supporting this, there were also no significant contrasts between any of the beauty work types ( $M_{Skincare} = 3.45$ ,  $SD = 1.45$ ,  $M_{Tanning} = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 1.38$ ,  $M_{Cosmetics} = 3.42$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ; all  $F < 1$ ).

*Transformativeness.* As expected, results indicated a main effect of beauty work type ( $F(2, 152) = 25.15, p < .0001$ ). Skincare was rated as less transformative relative to cosmetics ( $M_{\text{Skincare}} = 3.11, M_{\text{Cosmetics}} = 4.78; F(1, 152) = 42.43, p < .0001$ ) and tanning ( $M_{\text{Tanning}} = 4.58; F(1, 152) = 32.62, p < .0001$ ). Make-up and tanning did not differ in transformativeness ( $F < 1, ns$ ).

## 2. Effort Manipulation across Beauty Work Types Pretest (Cosmetics, Tanning, and Skincare)

We conducted a pretest with 187 female AMT participants ( $M_{\text{Age}} = 36.4$ ) to ensure that effort was perceived as greater across high versus low effort conditions within beauty work types. This study employed the same 2 (effort: high, low) x 3 (beauty work type: cosmetics, tanning, skincare) between-subjects design as study 2. After reading the vignette from study 2, participants answered the questions, “How much effort did Jenna put into getting ready for the barbeque?” (1 = Very low effort, 7 = Very high effort).

A two-way between-subjects ANOVA on Jenna’s perceived effort revealed the expected main effect of effort ( $F(1, 181) = 149.82, p < .0001$ ), where the high (vs. low) effort condition yielded higher ratings in the cosmetics ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.45, SD = 1.06, M_{\text{Low}} = 3.22, SD = 1.42; F(1, 181) = 63.50, p < .0001$ ), tanning ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.73, SD = 1.08, M_{\text{Low}} = 3.82, SD = .93; F(1, 181) = 49.24, p < .0001$ ), and skincare conditions ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.48, SD = 1.00, M_{\text{Low}} = 3.36, SD = 1.37; F(1, 181) = 39.63, p < .0001$ ). We also found a marginal main effect of beauty work type ( $F(2, 181) = 2.52, p = .08$ ) where tanning was rated as requiring more effort than cosmetics ( $M_{\text{Tanning}} = 4.80, SD = 1.39, M_{\text{Cosmetics}} = 4.29, SD = 1.68; F(1, 181) = 4.60, p < .05$ ) and marginally more effort than skincare ( $M_{\text{Skincare}} = 4.47, SD = 1.59; F(1, 181) = 2.82, p = .09$ ). Cosmetics and skincare domains were not rated differently in terms of effort ( $F < 1, ns$ ). Because our primary focus is on examining the effect of effort within each domain, we do not expect this marginal main effect to compromise our results. We did not find a significant two-way interaction ( $F < 1, ns$ ).

## WEB APPENDIX C: STUDY 4 TRANSFORMATIVENESS AND TRANSIENCE PRETEST ACROSS BEAUTY WORK TYPES (EXERCISE AND COSMETICS)

We conducted a pretest with 104 AMT participants (51.9% female,  $M_{\text{Age}} = 34.7$ ) to ensure that exercise and cosmetics intended to enhance appearance were perceived as equally transformative, yet cosmetics was perceived as leading to more transient changes than exercise.

The pretest followed a similar structure to the transformativeness/transience pretest used in study 2, except we compared cosmetics to exercise. Paralleling the prior transformativeness/transience pretest, participants were randomly assigned to either the cosmetics or exercise condition where they saw vignettes identical to those of study 4 (see Appendix F) with the effort manipulation removed.

We adapted the transience and transformativeness measures in the study 2 beauty work domain pretest to fit the study 3 vignettes. Participants answered the following measures: 1) To what extent does [beauty work type: brushing her hair and applying make-up / exercising] every morning permanently change Jenna’s appearance? 2) To what extent do you think [beauty work type] every morning has a lasting effect on Jenna’s appearance? (both anchored at 1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much so), and “How long do the effects of [beauty work type] every morning last?” (1 = A very short period of time, 7 = A very long period of time;  $\alpha = .82$ ).

Participants then answered three measures to assess the transformativeness of the beauty work type: 1) To what extent does [beauty work type] every morning alter Jenna's appearance? 2) To what extent does [beauty work type] every morning transform Jenna's appearance? 3) To what extent does [beauty work type] lead to noticeable changes in Jenna's appearance?" (all anchored at 1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much so;  $\alpha = .81$ ).

A one-way between-subjects ANOVA showed that using exercise was rated as resulting in significantly more permanent (i.e., less transient) changes than cosmetics ( $M_{\text{Cosmetics}} = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ,  $M_{\text{Exercise}} = 5.39$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ;  $F(1, 102) = 127.09$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). There was no difference in transformativeness between the two beauty work domains ( $M_{\text{Cosmetics}} = 5.12$ ,  $SD = .93$ ,  $M_{\text{Exercise}} = 5.15$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ;  $F(1, 102) = .02$ ,  $p = .89$ ).

#### WEB APPENDIX D: STUDY 5 ATTRIBUTIONS MANIPULATION PRETEST

We conducted a pretest with 159 AMT participants (57.6% female,  $M_{\text{Age}} = 38.2$ ) to test our attributions manipulation. This pretest employed a 2 (effort: high, low) x 2 (beauty work attribution: internal, external) between-subjects design. Participants read the same high and low effort vignettes used in the cosmetics domain from study 2. In the external attribution condition, participants also read that Jenna hoped to make a good first impression on potential employers who would be at the barbeque (see App. G for verbiage). In the internal attribution condition, they did not read any additional information.

Next, participants rated six attribution items adapted from Russell's (1982) Causal Dimension Scale. These consisted of three external attribution items: To what extent was Jenna's behavior driven by 1) external factors, 2) other people, and 3) factors beyond her control, and three internal attribution items: To what extent was Jenna's behavior driven by 1) internal factors, 2) herself, and 3) factors within her control (all anchored at 1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much so). The internal items were reverse coded. All items were combined such that higher values corresponded to greater external attributions ( $\alpha = .80$ ).

A 2 x 2 ANOVA on the attribution index revealed only a main effect of beauty work attribution ( $F(1, 155) = 12.19$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and no significant two-way interaction ( $F < 1$ , *ns*). Participants attributed Jenna's beauty work to external causes more in the external (i.e., when she wanted to make a good first impression) relative to the internal attribution condition (i.e., when no additional information was presented;  $M_{\text{External}} = 3.58$ ,  $SD = .99$ ,  $M_{\text{Internal}} = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ) confirming that this manipulation was successful.

#### WEB APPENDIX E: RESULTS FOR 4-ITEM MORAL CHARACTER SCALE ACROSS STUDIES 3-6 (MORAL, ETHICAL, GENUINE AND SINCERE)

##### Study 3

A 2 (effort: high, low) x 3 (attractiveness: attractive, average, no image information) between-subjects ANOVA on our four-item morality index ( $\alpha = .91$ ) revealed main effects of effort ( $F(1, 450) = 32.17$ ,  $p < .0001$ ) and attractiveness ( $F(2, 450) = 2.95$ ,  $p = .05$ ), which were qualified by a significant two-way interaction ( $F(2, 450) = 4.24$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). Karen's moral character was rated more negatively when she engaged in high relative to low effort beauty work in both the average attractiveness ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.06$ ,  $SD = .99$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.56$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ;  $F(1, 450) = 9.63$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and no image conditions ( $M_{\text{High}} = 4.67$ ,  $SD = .96$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.55$ ,  $SD = .85$ ;  $F(1, 450) = 29.03$ ,  $p < .0001$ ).

However, in the high attractiveness condition, effort level had no effect on moral character ratings ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.27$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.49$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ;  $F(1, 450) = 1.72$ ,  $p = .19$ ).

#### Study 4

A 2 (effort: high, low) x 2 (beauty work type: cosmetics, exercise) ANOVA on the four-item morality index ( $\alpha = .92$ ) revealed only a significant two-way interaction ( $F(1, 198) = 17.25$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). In the cosmetics domain, Jenna's moral character was rated less favorably when she engaged in higher effort ( $M_{\text{High}} = 4.83$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.44$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ;  $F(1, 198) = 9.45$ ,  $p < .01$ ). However, the pattern reversed in the exercise domain such that Jenna's moral character was rated *more* favorably when she engaged in higher effort ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.41$ ,  $SD = .85$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 4.87$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ;  $F(1, 198) = 7.82$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

#### Study 5

A 2 (effort: high, low) x 2 (attribution: internal, external) ANOVA on the four-item morality index ( $\alpha = .93$ ) revealed only a significant two-way interaction ( $F(1, 294) = 5.61$ ,  $p = .02$ ). As predicted, in the internal attribution condition, Jenna was rated as less moral in the higher effort condition ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.11$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.54$ ,  $SD = .91$ ;  $F(1, 294) = 6.79$ ,  $p = .01$ ). However, in the external attribution condition, participants did not rate Jenna differently based on effort ( $M_{\text{High}} = 5.58$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.45$ ,  $SD = .93$ ;  $F < 1$ , *ns*).

#### Study 6

A 2 (effort: high, low) x 2 (slogan attribution: internal, external) ANOVA on the four-item morality index ( $\alpha = .93$ ) revealed only a two-way interaction ( $F(1, 137) = 4.87$ ,  $p = .03$ ). Planned contrasts revealed that as predicted, participants in the internal attribution condition viewed Colorescience customers as less moral in the higher effort conditions ( $M_{\text{High}} = 4.36$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 5.08$ ,  $SD = .94$ ;  $F(1, 137) = 6.82$ ,  $p = .01$ ). However, participants in the external attributions condition showed no such difference ( $M_{\text{High}} = 4.89$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ,  $M_{\text{Low}} = 4.73$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ;  $F < 1$ , *ns*).

## WEB APPENDIX F: STUDY MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

All means and standard deviations presented in the manuscript are included. Cases where there were only significant main effects (e.g., manipulation checks) are specified.

Study 1A	Low Effort		Control Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD/SE	Mean	SD/SE	Mean	SD/SE
Dependent Variable						
Effort Manipulation Check	3.56	1.47	5.25	1.08	6.21	1.02
Immoral Behaviors	2.72	0.12*	2.74	0.12*	3.30	0.12*
Filler Behaviors	5.30	0.12*	5.13	0.12*	5.32	0.12*

\*Standard error is reported for within-subjects measures

Study 1B	Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean/Proportion	SD/SE	Mean/Proportion	SD/SE
Dependent Variable				
Effort Manipulation Check	3.43	1.28	6.42	1.04
Moral Trait Sorting	.91**	0.02*	.82**	0.02*
Filler Trait Sorting	.86**	0.02*	.89**	0.01*
Moral Trait Timing (Log transformed)	.43	.02*	.51	.02*
Filler Trait Timing (Log transformed)	.45	.02*	.47	.02*

\*Standard error is reported for within-subjects measures

\*\*Proportion of participants sorting trait as “Jenna”

Study 2	Cosmetics				Tanning				Skincare			
	Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable												
Moral Character	5.81	0.86	5.12	1.08	5.66	0.87	4.97	1.23	5.45	1.05	5.33	1.17
Misrepresentation	1.43	0.78	2.33	1.32	2.10	1.19	3.03	1.66	1.74	1.08	1.91	1.16
Excessiveness	4.14	0.87	5.02	0.95	4.27	0.94	5.04	1.09	3.96	0.97	4.91	1.01

Study 3	High Attractiveness				Average Attractiveness				Control (No Image Information)			
	Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable												
Moral Character (A & R 2002)	5.59	0.99	5.46	1.00	5.62	0.95	5.21	0.93	5.52	0.87	4.90	0.86
Misrepresentation	1.75	0.91	2.39	1.26	1.75	0.97	3.03	1.50	1.67	0.95	3.02	1.57
Immoral Behaviors	2.86	1.43	3.10	1.70	2.80	1.40	3.55	1.59	2.60	1.39	3.88	1.69
	Effort (Main Effect)				Attractiveness (Main Effect)							
	Low		High		High		Average		No Image			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Effort Manipulation Check	3.55	1.38	6.35	1.09	5.14	1.73	4.70	2.04	5.02	1.82		
Vanity	4.13	1.15	6.03	1.06	5.25	1.37	4.80	1.61	5.19	1.35		

Study 4	Cosmetics				Exercise			
	Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable								
Effort Manipulation Check	3.43	1.49	6.40	1.07	5.30	1.18	6.54	0.73
Moral Character (A & R 2002)	5.37	0.98	4.99	0.93	5.02	0.92	5.49	0.86
Misrepresentation	1.87	1.15	2.95	1.49	2.68	1.33	2.01	1.14
Immoral Behaviors	3.16	1.54	3.78	1.63	3.80	1.44	3.33	1.53
Vanity	3.73	1.03	6.03	0.82	5.56	0.91	6.08	0.79

Study 5	Internal Attribution				External Attribution			
	Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable								
Moral Character (A & R 2002)	5.52	0.82	5.16	1.16	5.45	0.80	5.51	0.98
Misrepresentation	1.87	0.96	2.44	1.59	2.15	1.13	2.04	1.08

Study 6	Internal Attribution				External Attribution			
	Low Effort		High Effort		Low Effort		High Effort	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dependent Variable								
Moral Character (A & R 2002)	5.22	0.83	4.58	1.16	4.63	1.22	5.04	0.92
Customer Misrepresentation	2.12	1.13	2.95	1.76	2.55	1.61	2.95	1.42
Purchase Intentions	5.43	1.24	4.31	1.74	4.74	1.87	5.06	1.31
	Effort (Main Effect)							
	Low		High					
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Effort Manipulation Check	2.49	1.29	4.18	1.58				

**WEB APPENDIX G: FACTOR LOADINGS COMPARING MORALITY AND MISREPRESENTATION**

**Study 2**

Item	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings	
	Morality	Misrepresentation
<i>Morality</i>		
Moral	0.95	
Ethical	0.95	
Sincere	0.92	
Genuine	0.84	
<i>Misrepresentation*</i>		
Image		0.95
MisrepSelf		0.93
Present		0.97
MisrepInnate		0.94

\*The four misrepresentation items were:

1. Image: Jenna is trying to put forth an image of someone she is not
2. MisrepSelf: Jenna is misrepresenting herself to others
3. Present: Jenna is trying to present herself as something that she is not
4. MisrepInnate: Jenna is misrepresenting her innate self

**Study 3**

Item	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings		
	Morality	Misrepresentation	Immoral Behaviors
<i>Morality - Four Item</i>			
Moral	0.83		
Ethical	0.83		
Sincere	0.80		
Genuine	0.76		
<i>Morality - Aquino and Reed (2002)</i>			
Caring	0.89		
Compassionate	0.94		
Fair	0.90		
Friendly	0.81		
Generous	0.89		
Helpful	0.87		
Hardworking	0.53		
Kind	0.87		
Honest	0.86		
<i>Misrepresentation</i>			
Image		0.94	
MisrepSelf		0.93	
Present		0.97	
MisrepInnate		0.91	
<i>Immoral Behaviors**</i>			
BoardPlane			0.81
InflateExp			0.84
LieToSuperv			0.88
LieToIns			0.78

\*\*The four immoral behaviors items were:

1. BoardPlane: Board a plane before her number was called
2. InflateExp: Inflate her business expense report
3. LieToSuperv: Lie to a supervisor about progress on a project
4. LieToIns: Lie to an insurance company

**Study 4**

Item	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings		
	Morality	Misrepresentation	Immoral Behaviors
<i>Morality - Four Item</i>			
Moral	0.82		
Ethical	0.91		
Sincere	0.81		
Genuine	0.77		
<i>Morality – Aquino and Reed (2002)</i>			
Caring	0.93		
Compassionate	0.84		
Fair	0.88		
Friendly	0.76		
Generous	0.87		
Helpful	0.84		
Hardworking	0.43	-0.48	
Kind	0.84		
Honest	0.87		
<i>Misrepresentation</i>			
Image		0.86	
MisrepSelf		0.90	
Present		0.91	
MisrepInnate		0.90	
<i>Immoral Behaviors</i>			
BoardPlane			0.76
InflateExp			0.73
LieToSuperv			0.90
LieToIns			0.73

**Study 5**

Item	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings	
	Morality	Misrepresentation
<i>Morality - Four Item</i>		
Moral	0.86	
Ethical	0.80	
Sincere	0.82	
Genuine	0.81	
<i>Morality – Aquino and Reed (2002)</i>		
Caring	0.96	
Compassionate	0.91	
Fair	0.88	
Friendly	0.76	
Generous	0.85	
Helpful	0.89	
Hardworking	0.64	
Kind	0.92	
Honest	0.87	
<i>Misrepresentation</i>		
Image		0.93
MisrepSelf		0.94
Present		0.96
MisrepInnate		0.92

**Study 6**

Item	Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings	
	Customer Morality	Misrepresentation
<i>Customer Morality - Four Item</i>		
Moral	0.86	
Ethical	0.81	
Sincere	0.86	
Genuine	0.81	
<i>Customer Morality – Aquino and Reed (2002)</i>		
Caring	0.87	
Compassionate	0.89	
Fair	0.84	
Friendly	0.83	
Generous	0.88	
Helpful	0.84	
Hardworking	0.78	
Kind	0.90	
Honest	0.66	
<i>Misrepresentation</i>		
Image		0.95
MisrepSelf		0.95
Present		0.96
MisrepInnate		0.93