Supplementary Materials:

Power and Moral Dilemma Judgments:

Distinct Effects of Memory Recall versus Social Roles

Bertram Gawronski & Skylar M. Brannon

University of Texas at Austin

Process Dissociation Analyses

Process dissociation (PD) scores were calculated in line with the procedures described by Conway and Gawronski (2013), using the probabilities of *action* responses on moral dilemmas with proscriptive norms involving benefits of action that are either greater than the costs of action (i.e., incongruent dilemmas) or smaller than the costs of action (i.e., congruent dilemmas).

Experiment 1a

There was no significant effect of the power manipulation on the *U* parameter, $t(138) = 0.49$, $p = .626$, $d = 0.010$, or the *D* parameter, $t(138) = 0.85$, $p = .397$, $d = 0.220$ (see Table S1).

Experiment 1b

There was no significant effect of the power manipulation on the *U* parameter, $t(118) = 0.06$, $p = .953$, $d = 0.089$, or the *D* parameter, $t(118) = 1.30$, $p = .195$, $d = 0.155$ (see Table S1).

Experiment 2a

There was no significant effect of the power manipulation on the *U* parameter, $t(89) = 0.64$, $p = .525$, $d = 0.134$. The *D* parameter showed a marginal effect, such that participants tended to show a higher score on *D* parameter in the high power condition compared to the low power condition, $t(89) = 1.78$, $p = .078$, $d = 0.387$ (see Table S1).

Experiment 2b

There was no significant effect of the power manipulation on the *U* parameter, $t(118) = 0.40$, $p = .687$, $d = 0.074$, or the *D* parameter, $t(118) = 1.25$, $p = .213$, $d = 0.229$ (see Table S1).

Experiment 3

A 2 (Power) × 2 (Manipulation) ANOVA revealed no significant main or interaction effects on the *U* parameter (all Fs < 1, all ps > .362; see Table S1). The same ANOVA on the *D* parameter revealed a significant two-way interaction of Power and Manipulation, $F(1, 251) =$

4.92, $p = .027$, $\eta_p^2 = .019$ (see Table S1). Further analyses revealed that participants who were assigned to a high-power role tended to show a greater *D* score compared to participants were assigned to a low-power power role, $t(125) = 1.78$, $p = .078$, $d = 0.32$. There was no significant effect of the power manipulation in the memory recall condition, $t(126) = 1.36$, $p = .178$, $d = 0.24$.

Table S1. Means and standard deviations of *U* and *D* process dissociation parameters. Scores can range from 0 to 1. The neutral reference value for the *U* parameter is 0. The neutral reference value for the *D* parameter is 0.5.

	U Parameter		*D* Parameter	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Study 1a (memory recall)				
low power	.27	.25	.74	.25
high power	.26	.23	.69	.26
Study 1b (memory recall)				
low power	.26	.26	.66	.27
high power	.24	.24	.62	.27
Study 2a (social roles)				
low power	.28	.23	.72	.29
high power	.25	.23	.81	.17
Study 2b (social roles)				
low power	.24	.22	.72	.23
high power	.25	.23	.67	.25
Study 3 (memory recall)				
low power	.27	.27	.77	.24
high power	.31	.22	.71	.26
Study 3 (social roles)				
low power	.30	.23	.70	.26
high power	.31	.23	.77	.24