**Variables**

1. Independent Variable
   1. Domain of past good deed
      1. Same domain, different domain, control (no past good deed)
2. Dependent Variables
   1. Act judgments
      1. How wrong was it for Barry James to [use cocaine OR sexually harass the waitress]? (1-5, not wrong at all to extremely wrong)
      2. How much blame does Barry James deserve for [using cocaine OR sexually harassing the waitress]? (1-5, no blame to extreme blame)
      3. How much punishment does Barry James deserve for [using cocaine OR sexually harassing the waitress]? (1-5, no punishment to extreme punishment)
   2. Character judgments
      1. Do you think that Barry James is mainly a good person or a bad person? (1-7, extremely good to extremely bad)
      2. Do you think Barry James has good moral standards? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
      3. How trustworthy is Barry James? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
   3. Emotion: Facial Endorsements
      1. Forced choice of faces: Which set of faces best expresses your feelings toward Barry James?
         1. Choose between three anger faces and three disgust faces taken from MSFDE
      2. Continuous ratings
         1. How strongly do you feel this emotion towards Barry James? (1-5, not at all to extremely, 3 angry faces from MSFDE shown)
         2. How strongly do you feel this emotion towards Barry James? (1-5, not at all to extremely, 3 disgusted faces from MSFDE shown)
   4. Emotion: Words
      1. How strongly do you feel each of the following emotions towards Barry James? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
         1. Anger items: anger, infuriated, outraged
         2. Disgust items: repulsed, disgust, sickened
   5. Hypocrisy
      1. Is Barry James a hypocrite? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
      2. Is Barry James a phony? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
      3. Is Barry James a fake? (1-5, not at all to extremely)
   6. Disgust Scale-Revised (exploratory)

**Hypotheses**

Hypothesis testing focuses on the contrast of different domain and control, since this most clearly contrasts good character with absence of character information. The same domain condition is somewhat more complex since there are competing forces of past good deeds and hypocrisy. Therefore, analyses involving the same domain condition are exploratory.

1. Character/act ratings
   1. Different domain should have better character and less bad act than control. Domain should have a stronger effect on character evaluations than on act evaluations (suggests that licensing effect is more about character than act evaluations)
2. Disgust/anger ratings
   1. Forced choice: greater choice of disgust for control compared to different domain
   2. Disgust/Anger continuous ratings:
      1. Domain should have a stronger effect on disgust than on anger
3. Regressions
   1. Disgust and character:
      1. Disgust should predict character ratings better than anger ratings
   2. Disgust, anger and act ratings:
      1. Both disgust and anger should predict act ratings
4. Mediations
   1. Character/Disgust:
      1. The effect of Domain on disgust (controlling for anger) should be mediated by character evaluations
5. Exploratory analyses
   1. Hypocrisy
      1. Same domain should be more hypocritical than different domain (replication of Effron effect)
      2. Exploratory analyses of the relationships between hypocrisy, character, anger, disgust in the same domain-control contrast
   2. Effect of individual differences in trait disgust (Disgust Scale-Revised) on other dependent variables

**Methods**

1. Sample
   1. Sample Size
      1. A power analysis using G\*Power 3.1.9.3, indicates that 100 participants are needed to power a Domain (different vs. control) x Emotion (anger vs. disgust) interaction with partial eta squared of 0.02 (small effect size) at 80% power. This is conservative since Giner-Sorolla and Chapman (2017) found medium-large effects of the character manipulation on disgust. However, Fritz & MacKinnon recommend a sample of 148 for 80% power to detect a mediated effect with small to medium effects of X on M and M on Y. To allow for data cleaning we therefore decided on N = 200.
   2. Sample Source
      1. Mturk workers with US IP addresses, more than 500 hits and > 95% hit approval rate
   3. Pilot data
      1. 20 subjects were run to make sure there were no technical problems with the questionnaire and to determine appropriate pay based on average completion time. The data were not analyzed and no changes were needed. Therefore, the 20 pilot subjects will be included in the full sample.
2. Data Cleaning
   1. Participants who complete the study in less than ½ of the sample median completion time will be dropped
   2. At the end of the study, subjects will be asked what the principal was accused of. Subjects who answer this question incorrectly will be dropped provided that not more than 15% of subjects answer incorrectly.
3. Scenarios
   1. Same domain
      1. Sexual Harassment
         1. Principal advocates against sexual harassment, sexually harasses a woman
      2. Drug Abuse
         1. Principal advocates against drug abuse, gets caught with cocaine
   2. Different domain
      1. Sexual Harassment
         1. Principal advocates against drug abuse, sexually harasses a woman
      2. Drug Abuse
         1. Principal advocates against sexual harassment, gets caught with cocaine
   3. Control
      1. Sexual Harassment
         1. Principal sexually harasses a woman (no past good deed)
      2. Drug Abuse
         1. Principal gets caught with cocaine (no past good deed)
4. Procedure
   1. Participants view and agree to a consent form
   2. Participants see 1 of the 6 scenarios
   3. Filler questions about newsworthiness of the articles(s)
   4. Participants see act, character, emotion word, facial emotion endorsement and hypocrisy questions (see above) presented in separate blocks, in random order. Within each block, the order of the questions is randomized.
   5. Participants see the DSR
   6. Participants see the attentional manipulation check question, provide demographics and are debriefed.

**Analysis Plan**

Type of moral transgression (drug abuse vs. sexual harassment) will be included as a counterbalancing factor in analyses.

1. Character/act ratings
   1. The three character ratings will be averaged together and the three act items will be averaged together
   2. Control should have worse character than same domain (mitigating effect of past good deeds).
      1. Plan: Between-subjects ANOVA with factor of Domain (Control, Different)
   3. Domain should have a stronger effect on character evaluations than on act evaluations (suggests that licensing effect is more about character than act evaluations)
      1. Plan: Mixed ANOVA with factors of Domain (Control, Different) and Judgment Type (act vs. character), with follow-up simple effects ANOVAs and t-tests.
2. Disgust/anger ratings
   1. Forced choice: Choice will be coded 0 for anger and 1 for disgust, so means represent percent of participants who choose disgust.
      1. Greater choice of disgust for control compared to different domain
         1. Plan: chi-square test
   2. Continuous ratings:
      1. Disgust word items will be averaged together and anger word items will be averaged together.
      2. We will compute the correlation between disgust and anger for the word items and for the face items. Items with disgust-anger correlations greater than r = 0.70 will not be analyzed. If both word and face items are r < 0.70, both will be used, standardized and averaged
      3. Domain should have a stronger effect on disgust than on anger
         1. Plan: Mixed ANOVA with factors of Domain and Emotion Type (disgust vs. anger), plus follow-up simple effects ANOVAs within each emotion
3. Regressions
   1. Disgust, anger and character ratings:
      1. Disgust should predict character ratings better than anger ratings
         1. Plan: Whole sample multiple regression with disgust and anger ratings as simultaneous IVs and character as the DV. Then test for difference between two dependent betas.
   2. Disgust, anger and act ratings:
      1. Both disgust and anger should predict act judgments
         1. Plan: Whole sample multiple regression with disgust and anger ratings as simultaneous IVs and act judgments as the DV. Then test for difference between two dependent betas.
4. Mediations
   1. Character/Disgust:
      1. The effect of Domain on disgust (controlling for anger) should be mediated by character evaluations
         1. The PROCESS macro for SPSS will be used to conduct a bias-corrected bootstrapped mediation analysis (5000 resamples). Domain will be the X variable, Disgust the Y and Character the M. Anger will be entered as a covariate.
5. Exploratory analyses
   1. Hypocrisy
      1. The three hypocrisy items will be averaged together
         1. Same domain should be more hypocritical than different domain (replication of Effron effect)
            1. Plan: independent-samples t-tests
         2. Exploratory analyses of the relationships between hypocrisy, character, anger, disgust in the same domain-control contrast
   2. Effect of individual differences in trait disgust (Disgust Scale-Revised) on other dependent variables