

Supporting Information

Piff et al. 10.1073/pnas.1118373109

SI Text

Study 1. Reliability of coding vehicle status and driver sex and age. To verify that the coding of vehicle status and drivers' perceived sex and age was consistent and reliable, coders independently coded a set of 24 vehicles at a separate time and location from the main study. While coding each vehicle, the coders stood within proximity of one another but at a distance that prevented each coder's codes from being visible to the other coders. There was high agreement among the four coders for vehicle status ($\alpha = 0.95$), driver sex ($\alpha = 0.98$), and driver age ($\alpha = 0.87$).

Study 2. Reliability of coding vehicle status and driver sex and age. The coders used in study 2 were the same as those in study 1. Details concerning the procedures used to establish reliability in coding of vehicle status and driver sex and age are presented above.

Study 3. Measure of unethical decision-making. For the measure of unethical decision-making (1), each participant read the following instructions: "For the next task, you will read several short descriptions of different situations. For each situation, please imagine as vividly as you can that you are in this situation. So, imagine for every situation that you act out the behaviors described. For each situation, you have to indicate how likely it is that you would engage in the behaviors described. It is very important to be able to picture yourself in a certain situation. When you are able to imagine that you are in a certain situation, you are also able to predict what you would do and what you would not do if you were in such a situation. Being able to make such predictions for yourself is very important. Now, try to imagine that you are in the situations that will be described, and indicate for each situation how likely it is that you would behave in that way." Participants then responded to each item on a scale ranging from 1 (not likely) to 7 (highly likely). These items were:

1. You work in a fast-food restaurant in downtown Berkeley. It's against policy to eat food without paying for it. You came straight from classes and are therefore hungry. Your supervisor isn't around, so you make something for yourself and eat it without paying.
2. You work as an office assistant for a department at UC Berkeley. You're alone in the office making copies and realize you're out of copy paper at home. You therefore slip a ream of paper into your backpack.
3. You're preparing for the final examination in a class where the professor uses the same examination in both sections. Some of your friends somehow get a copy of the examination after the first section. They are now trying to memorize the right answers. You don't look at the examination, but just ask them what topics you should focus your studying on.
4. You've waited in line for 10 min to buy a coffee and muffin at Starbucks. When you're a couple of blocks away, you realize that the clerk gave you change for \$20 rather than for the \$10 you gave him. You savor your coffee, muffin and free \$10.
5. You get the final examination back from your professor and you notice that he's marked correct three answers that you got wrong. Revealing this error would mean the difference between an A and a B. You say nothing.
6. Your accounting course requires you to purchase a software package that sells for \$50. Your friend, who is also in the class, has already bought the software and offers to lend it to you. You take it and load it onto your computer.

7. Your boss at your summer job asks you to get confidential information about a competitor's product. You therefore pose as a student doing a research project on the competitor's company and ask for the information.
8. You are assigned a team project in one of your courses. Your team waits until the last minute to begin working. Several team members suggest using an old project out of their fraternity/sorority files. You go along with this plan.

Validation of measure of unethical decision-making. This measure of unethical decision-making tendencies has been validated in several ways in past research (1). First, business ethics experts agreed that the behaviors described in the eight scenarios violated ethical principles. Second, scores on the measure were correlated with reports of having actually engaged in several other unethical behaviors, such as exaggerating accomplishments and taking money from others. Finally, in a separate validation study, individuals with higher scores on the measure were more likely to keep \$8 that they were mailed, ostensibly by mistake, for completing a survey that they had not completed, relative to those with lower scores.

Study 4. Manipulation of social-class rank. For the manipulation of social-class rank (2), participants were presented with an image of a ladder with 10 rungs and given the following instructions: "Think of the ladder as representing where people stand in the United States. These are people who are the worst (best) off—those who have the least (most) money, least (most) education, and the least (most) respected jobs. In particular, we'd like you to think about how YOU ARE DIFFERENT FROM THESE PEOPLE in terms of your own income, educational history, and job status. Where would you place yourself on this ladder relative to these people at the very bottom (top)? Please place a large 'X' on the rung where you think you stand." After indicating where they feel they stood relative to those at the very bottom or very top of the ladder, participants received the following directions: "Now imagine yourself in a getting acquainted interaction with one of the people you just thought about from the ladder above. Think about how the DIFFERENCES BETWEEN YOU might impact what you would talk about, how the interaction is likely to go, and what you and the other person might say to each other. Please write a brief description about how you think this interaction would go."

Measure of unethical decision-making. The measure used to assess unethical decision-making (1) was the same as in study 3.

Study 5. Hypothetical negotiation task instructions. For the hypothetical negotiation task (3), participants read the following instructions: "For the next part of the study, imagine that you are an employer for a company in a salary negotiation with a job candidate. The president of the company has instructed you to negotiate as LOW a salary as possible for this individual. Below, you will be given several pieces of information to keep in mind as you enter this negotiation scenario:

1. The job the candidate is applying for will be eliminated in 6 mo due to an organizational restructuring. The candidate DOES NOT have this information.
2. The candidate strongly desires to remain in the same job for at least 2 y and will accept a lower starting salary in return for a verbal commitment of job stability.

3. There are no other qualified candidates being considered at the present time. The candidate is unaware of the lack of other qualified candidates.
4. A failure to fill the position quickly with a qualified applicant would negatively impact your yearly performance review. Furthermore, if you are able to negotiate a salary below a certain amount, you will receive an end-of-year bonus."

Measure of attitudes toward greed. For the measure of attitudes toward greed (4), participants indicated their agreement with each of the following items on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). These items were:

1. To be a successful person in this society, it is important to make use of every opportunity.
2. It is not morally bad to think first of one's own benefit and not other people's.
3. One should be concerned with the benefit to the group as a whole rather than with one's own benefit. (Reverse-scored)
4. An individual's pursuit of self-interest should be allowed only insofar as it will not jeopardize the public welfare. (Reverse-scored)
5. I like competition.
6. It is very disgusting to exploit other people to further one's own self-interest. (Reverse-scored)
7. There should be more emphasis in school on the kind of education which helps students to be more concerned with the welfare of the society or groups rather than their own personal benefit. (Reverse-scored)

Study 6. Measure of attitudes toward greed. The measure used to assess attitudes toward greed (4) was the same as in study 5.

Study 7. Manipulation of attitudes toward greed. For the greed-is-good prime, participants received the following instructions: "Please take a few minutes to think of ways in which acting greedily and pursuing your self-interest can be good. For example, being greedy, or prioritizing self-interest, may allow you to be successful and achieve your professional goals. Please think of three additional ways in which greed can be good and write them in the boxes below." For the neutral prime, participants received the following instructions: "Please take a few minutes to think about the things you do in an average day. For example, one might go

to work or spend time at the gym. Please think of three things that you do in an average day and write them in the boxes below." All participants were presented with three text boxes in which to type their answers.

Manipulation check items. Participants indicated their agreement with five items assessing their positive beliefs about greed, adapted from prior research (5). Participants rated their agreement on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The specific items were:

1. Overall, greed is good.
2. Overall, greed is moral.
3. I should pursue my own self-interest.
4. I should be greedy.
5. It is good to be greedy.

Propensity to engage in unethical behavior items. To assess individual propensities to engage in unethical behavior (6), participants were instructed to indicate how likely they would be to engage in each of the listed behaviors on a scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 7 (very likely). These behaviors were:

1. Use office supplies, Xerox machine, and stamps for personal purposes.
2. Make personal long-distance phone calls at work.
3. Waste company time surfing on the internet, playing computer games, and socializing.
4. Borrow \$20 from a cash register overnight without asking.
5. Take merchandise and/or cash home.
6. Give merchandise away for free to personal friends.
7. Abuse the company expense accounts and falsify accounting records.
8. Receive gifts, money, and loans (bribery) from others due to one's position and power.
9. Lay off 500 employees to save the company money and increase one's personal bonus.
10. Overcharge customers to increase sales and earn a higher bonus.
11. Give customers "discounts" first and then secretly charge them more money later (bait and switch).
12. Make more money by deliberately not letting clients know about their benefits.

1. Detert JR, Treviño LK, Sweitzer VL (2008) Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. *J Appl Psychol* 93:374–391.
2. Piff PK, Kraus MW, Côté S, Cheng BH, Keltner D (2010) Having less, giving more: The influence of social class on prosocial behavior. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 99:771–784.
3. Aquino K, Freeman D, Reed A, II, Felps W, Lim VK (2009) Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: The interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 97:123–141.

4. Yamagishi T, Sato K (1986) Motivational bases of the public goods problem. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 50:67–73.
5. Wang L, Malhotra D, Murnighan JK (2011) Economics education and greed. *Acad Manag Learn Educ* 10:643–660.
6. Chen YJ, Tang TLP (2006) Attitude toward and propensity to engage in unethical behavior: Measurement invariance across major among university students. *J Bus Ethics* 69:77–93.

Table S1. Proportion of cars that cut in front of other vehicles at a four-way intersection (from study 1) or cut off a pedestrian waiting at a crosswalk (from study 2) as a function of vehicle status

Vehicle status	Study 1: Cutting at four-way intersection			Study 2: Yielding for pedestrian at crosswalk		
	Yielded for vehicles	Cut off vehicles	Cut (%)	Yielded for pedestrian	Cut off pedestrian	Cut (%)
1 (lowest)	24	2	7.7	5	0	0
2	31	2	6.1	20	8	28.6
3	99	15	13.2	42	19	31.1
4	67	7	9.5	25	20	44.4
5 (highest)	19	8	29.6	7	6	46.2

Table S2. Zero-order correlations (above the diagonal) and partial correlations (below the diagonal) between vehicle status and cutting in front of other vehicles at a four-way intersection, controlling for time of day, driver's sex and age, and amount of traffic, in study 1

Variable	Vehicle status	Cut off vehicles
Vehicle status	—	0.12*
Cut off vehicles	0.12*	—

* $P < 0.05$.

Table S3. Zero-order correlations (above the diagonal) and partial correlations (below the diagonal) between vehicle status and cutting off a pedestrian waiting at a crosswalk, controlling for time of day, driver's age and sex, and pedestrian sex, in study 2

Variable	Vehicle status	Cut off pedestrian
Vehicle status	—	0.18*
Cut off pedestrians	0.17*	—

* $P < 0.05$.

Table S4. Zero-order correlations (above the diagonal) and partial correlations (below the diagonal) between social class and unethical decision-making, controlling for age, sex, and ethnicity, in study 3

Variable	Social class	Unethical decision-making
Social class	—	0.23*
Unethical decision-making	0.20*	—

* $P < 0.05$.

Table S5. Zero-order correlations (above the diagonal) and partial correlations (below the diagonal) between social class, attitudes toward greed, and probability of telling the job candidate the truth, controlling for participant sex, age, ethnicity, religiosity, and political orientation, in study 5

Variable	Social class	Attitudes toward greed	Probability of telling the truth
Social class	—	0.36**	-0.24*
Attitudes toward greed	0.36**	—	-0.35**
Probability of telling the truth	-0.25*	-0.34**	—

Higher scores on the attitudes toward the greed variable indicate more favorable attitudes toward greed. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$.

Table S6. Zero-order correlations (above the diagonal) and partial correlations (below the diagonal) between social class, attitudes toward greed, and cheating behavior, controlling for participant sex, age, ethnicity, religiosity, and political orientation, in study 6

Variable	Social class	Attitudes toward greed	Cheating
Social class	—	0.17*	0.14 [†]
Attitudes toward greed	0.16*	—	0.20**
Cheating	0.15*	0.18*	—

Higher scores on the attitudes toward the greed variable indicate more favorable attitudes toward greed. [†] $P = 0.05$, * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$.