

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT

Priming operates based on implicit memory, wherein exposure to one source of stimulus activates other related parts of memory in associative networks. This occurs through a process of spreading activation whereby the activation of certain memory nodes initiates an implicit search through memory for related information, making those associated concepts more accessible from memory and thus more able to be recalled and accurately reported (Kihlstrom, Beer, & Klein, 2003). Self-identity is itself a memory structure which can be activated through such priming (Kihlstrom et al., 2003; Leavitt, Reynolds, Barnes, Schilpzand, & Hannah, 2012). Further, self-knowledge is comprised of both semantic and episodic memory (Kihlstrom et al., 2003; D'Argembeau & Salmon, 2012). Semantic memory entails general knowledge of one's self (e.g., I am just, responsible, etc.). Episodic memory instead entails memories of specific experiences, such as particular times one was just or helped others. In the current research, we are focused primarily on semantic representations of self-identity – how individuals construe themselves. Yet, the simultaneous activation of episodic/autobiographical memories help refine general beliefs about ourselves through recalling what/how we were feeling, thinking, and acting in certain situations (D'Argembeau & Salmon, 2012).

Reference Not included in Main Manuscript

D'Argembeau, A., & Salmon, E. 2012. The neural basis of semantic and episodic forms of self-knowledge: insights from functional neuroimaging. In *Sensing in nature*: 276-290. Springer: United States.

Table S1: *The original 28 items used for Sample 1*

Accountable	Dutiful	Helpful	Principled
Caring	Equitable	Honest	Reliable
Committed	Fair	Honorable	Reputable
Compassionate	Forthright	Impartial	Responsible
Conscientious	Friendly	Just	Trustworthy
Dependable	Generous	Kind	Truthful
Disciplined	Hardworking	Noble	Virtuous

Table S2 Panel A: Summary of fit indices (model with 4 dimensions, 12 attributes)

Sample (sample size)	Role	Chi-square (deg. free)	<i>p</i>	<i>IFI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>
S1 & S2 (249)	Son/Daughter	111.75 (48)	.000	.95	.95	.073
S1 & S2 (249)	Friend	119.76 (48)	.000	.92	.92	.078
S1 & S2 (249)	Co-worker	86.72 (48)	.001	.96	.95	.057
S1 & S2(249)	Follower	96.71 (48)	.000	.96	.96	.064
S3 (216)	Employee	122.04 (48)	.000	.94	.94	.085
S4 (157)	Employee	94.84 (48)	.000	.95	.95	.079
S5 (164)	Son/Daughter	121.83 (48)	.000	.90	.90	.097
S5 (164)	Employee	93.44 (48)	.000	.93	.93	.076

Table S2 Panel B: Summary of fit indices (model with 1 dimension, 12 attributes)

Sample	Role	Chi-square (deg. free)	<i>p</i>	<i>IFI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>
S1 & S2 (249)	Son/Daughter	510.34 (54)	.000	.63	.62	.185
S1 & S2 (249)	Friend	448.64 (54)	.000	.57	.57	.172
S1 & S2 (249)	Co-worker	391.94 (54)	.000	.60	.60	.159
S1 & S2(249)	Follower	463.49 (54)	.000	.64	.63	.175
S3 (216)	Employee	670.14 (54)	.000	.48	.48	.230
S4 (157)	Employee	337.43 (54)	.000	.69	.69	.183
S5 (164)	Son/Daughter	347.74 (54)	.000	.57	.56	.183
S5 (164)	Employee	355.80 (54)	.000	.52	.52	.185

Table S2 Panel C: Chi-square tests of difference between models

Sample	Role	1 Dimension Chi-square (deg. free)	4 Dimension Chi-square (deg. free)	Difference Chi-square (deg. free)	<i>p</i>
S1 & S2 (249)	Son/Daughter	510.34 (54)	111.75 (48)	398.59 (6)	.000
S1 & S2 (249)	Friend	448.64 (54)	119.76 (48)	328.88 (6)	.000
S1 & S2 (249)	Co-worker	391.94 (54)	86.72 (48)	305.22 (6)	.000
S1 & S2(249)	Follower	463.49 (54)	96.71 (48)	366.78 (6)	.000
S3 (216)	Employee	670.14 (54)	122.04 (48)	548.10 (6)	.000
S4 (157)	Employee	337.43 (54)	94.84 (48)	242.59 (6)	.000
S5 (164)	Son/Daughter	347.74 (54)	121.83 (48)	225.91 (6)	.000
S5 (164)	Employee	355.79 (54)	93.44 (48)	262.35 (6)	.000

Note: In all samples and all roles, the model with four dimensions is a better fit than the model with one dimension. S = Sample. Sample sizes are shown in parentheses. The Chi-Square test of differences in Panel C are significant for all tests.

Table S3: Dimension descriptive statistics, combined samples 1 & 2, and sample 5

Sample (Sample size)	Role	Benevolence	Justice	Obligation	Integrity
S1 & S2 (249)	Son/Daughter	4.38 (.64)	3.99 (.67)	4.47 (.59)	4.37 (.73)
S1 & S2 (249)	Friend	4.42 (.55)	4.04 (.62)	4.44 (.54)	4.53 (.57)
S1 & S2 (249)	Co-worker	3.91 (.72)	4.14 (.55)	4.67 (.44)	4.54 (.52)
S1 & S2(249)	Follower	3.86 (.78)	4.12 (.62)	4.75 (.39)	4.56 (.55)
S3 (216)	Employee	4.24 (.72)	4.40 (.54)	4.69 (.52)	4.62 (.46)
S4 (157)	Employee	4.30 (.64)	4.55 (.50)	4.71 (.45)	4.77 (.41)
S5 (164)	Son/Daughter	4.25 (.70)	4.00 (.63)	4.44 (.62)	4.29 (.67)
S5 (164)	Employee	3.71 (.73)	4.64 (.50)	4.15 (.55)	4.51 (.55)

Note: The score for each dimension was computed by adding the scores for each of the three items measuring each of the four dimensions and dividing by three. The values shown in the table represent the mean score for the dimension, with the standard deviation in parentheses. Patterns of mean differences for individual participants are more varied than the overall sample mean differences shown here.

S = Sample. Sample sizes are shown in parentheses.

Table S4: Test of differences by dimension across roles, samples 1 & 2, and sample 5

Samples 1 & 2 Combined	Benevolence	Justice	Obligation	Integrity
Son/Daughter – Friend	-.62 (.54)	-1.33 (.18)	-.96 (.34)	-3.30** (.00)
Son/Daughter – Co-worker	-8.81** (.00)	-3.67** (.00)	-5.22** (.00)	-3.42** (.00)
Son/Daughter – Follower	-8.72** (.00)	-3.20** (.00)	-6.99** (.00)	-3.81** (.00)
Friend – Co-worker	-10.63** (.00)	-3.13** (.00)	-6.42** (.00)	-0.23 (.82)
Friend – Follower	-9.59** (.00)	-2.39* (.02)	-7.99** (.00)	-0.72 (.47)
Co-worker – Follower	-1.29 (.20)	-0.77 (.44)	-3.33** (.00)	-0.72 (.47)
Sample 5				
Son/Daughter - Employee	-7.56** (.00)	-3.57** (.00)	-3.86** (.00)	-4.63** (.00)

Note: The values shown are the z-scores from a Wilcoxon Sign-Test comparing differences in scores for each dimension across all possible pairs of roles. The p-values are shown in parentheses below the associated z-score ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

Table S5 Panel A: Influence of overall moral identity on overall deviance (Sample 1)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	-.11	-1.01	.31	-.09	-.08	-.79	.43	-.07	.01	.09	.93	.01
Gender	-.06	-.69	.49	-.06	-.07	-.76	.45	-.07	-.10	-1.23	.22	-.10
Education	.16	1.57	.12	.14	.14	1.35	.18	.12	.11	1.14	.26	.09
Aquino-Intern					-.16	-1.81	.07	-.17				
Overall MI									-.46**	-5.44	.00	-.45
Adjusted R ²	.00				.02				.20			
Δ R ²	.00				.02*				.20**			

Table S5 Panel B: Influence of overall moral identity on overall deviance (Sample 2)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	-.07	-.81	.42	-.07	-.05	-.52	.61	-.05	.03	.41	.68	.03
Gender	-.08	-.89	.38	-.08	-.06	-.66	.51	-.06	-.06	-.69	.49	-.06
Education	.06	.66	.51	.06	.02	.22	.83	.02	.01	.08	.94	.01
Aquino-Intern					-.30**	-3.43	.00	-.30				
Overall MI									-.48**	-5.79	.00	-.47
Adjusted R ²	-.01				.08				.20			
Δ R ²	-.01				.09**				.21**			

Table S5 Panel C: Influence of overall moral identity on overall ethical intentions (Sample 2)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	.19*	2.09	.04	.19	.16	1.90	.06	.16	.11	1.26	.21	.10
Gender	.03	.37	.71	.03	-.01	-.12	.91	-.01	.01	.08	.94	.01
Education	-.10	-1.07	.29	-.10	-.05	-.62	.53	-.05	-.04	-.528	.61	-.04
Aquino-Intern					.41**	4.91	.00	.40				
Overall MI									.41**	4.81	.00	.40
Adjusted R ²	.03				.18				.17			
Δ R ²	.03				.15**				.14**			

Note: Sample sizes range from 121 for Sample 1 and from 124 to 125 for Sample 2 due to missing values. The values shown represent standardized beta estimates and adjusted R² values. Aquino-Intern is the 5-item Internalization scale from Aquino & Reed (2002). A single score was computed by averaging the responses to the five items. MI = Moral Identity. Overall MI is our Overall MI Mean measure (see Figure 1). We computed a single score by averaging the responses to the 12 items across each of the four roles. “Part” is the semi-partial correlation. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table S6 Panel A: Influence of overall moral identity on overall deviance (Sample 1)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	-.11	-1.01	.31	-.09	-.08	-.79	.43	-.07	.01	.10	.92	.01
Gender	-.06	-.69	.49	-.06	-.07	-.76	.45	-.07	-.10	-1.23	.22	-.10
Education	.16	1.57	.12	.14	.14	1.35	.18	.12	.11	1.11	.27	.09
Aquino-Intern					-.16	-1.81	.07	-.16	-.02	-.24	.82	-.02
Overall MI									-.45**	-5.06	.00	-.42
Adjusted R ²	.00				.02				.19			
Δ R ²	.00				.02*				.17**			

Table S6 Panel B: Influence of overall moral identity on overall deviance (Sample 2)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	-.07	-.81	.42	-.07	-.05	-.52	.61	-.05	.04	.44	.66	.04
Gender	-.08	-.89	.38	-.08	-.06	-.66	.51	-.06	-.05	-.58	.56	-.05
Education	.06	.66	.51	.06	.02	.22	.83	.02	-.01	-.11	.91	-.01
Aquino-Intern					-.30**	-3.43	.00	-.30	-.15	-1.70	.09	-.14
Overall MI									-.41**	-4.68	.00	-.38
Adjusted R ²	-.01				.08				.21			
Δ R ²	-.01				.09**				.21**			

Table S6 Panel C: Influence of overall moral identity on ethical intentions (Sample 2)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i>
Age	.19*	2.09	.04	.19	.16	1.90	.06	.16	.10	1.28	.20	.10
Gender	.03	.37	.71	.03	-.01	-.12	.91	-.01	-.02	-.24	.81	-.02
Education	-.10	-1.07	.29	-.10	-.05	-.62	.53	-.05	-.02	-.27	.79	-.02
Aquino-Intern					.41**	4.91	.00	.40	.30**	3.48	.00	.28
Overall MI									.29**	3.37	.00	.27
Adjusted R ²	.03				.18				.24			
Δ R ²	.03				.15**				.06**			

Note: Sample sizes range from 121 for Sample 1 and from 124 to 125 for Sample 2 due to missing values. The values shown represent standardized beta estimates and adjusted R² values. Aquino-Intern is the 5-item Internalization scale from Aquino & Reed (2002). A single score was computed by averaging the responses to the five items. MI = Moral Identity. Overall MI is our Overall MI Mean measure (see Figure 1). We computed a single score by averaging the responses to the 12 items across each of the four roles. MI = Moral Identity. “Part” is the semi-partial correlation. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.