*Results*

Opened data set at 11:15am PDT on April 11, 2019

First 750 analyzed at 11:40am PDT on April 11, 2019; re-analyzed 3:05pm 4/11/2019

Second 750 analyzed at 11:51am PDT on April 11, 2019; re-analyzed 3:07pm 4/11/2019

Total sample analyzed at 11:56am PDT on April 11, 2019; re-analyzed 3:09pm 4/11/2019

The Luth survey company recruited participants to take part in the study. We set a target sample size of 1,500 participants, to be collected in two waves of 750. Luth collects data from participants in 20 minute sessions, and considers a complete survey to be one in which the participant finishes the entire 20-minute session. Because each session contains a number of studies, there is inevitably dropout between the first and last study in the session; this means that although ~1500 participants completed the total session, 2,159 participants completed the target study (“Orientation”). Similarly, although we refer to participants being split into two waves of 750, more than 750 participants completed the target study in each wave (wave 1 *n* = 983, wave 2 *n* = 1,083). The waves of the study are identified by when data collection began (6/14/18 for wave 1 and after 11:00am on 6/16/18 for wave 2.) After excluding participants who failed a pre-registered attention check (participants were asked to recall which condition they were in) the total sample consisted of 1,586 participants.

**Wave 1 Results**

828 Wave 1 participants completed the target study and correctly answered the pre-registered attention check item.

This design was a 2-cell design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions in which they were told to answer each question either in less than 11 seconds or in more than 11 seconds. Participants then completed a 10-item subset of the social desirability scale. We coded socially desirable responses as 1 and non-socially desirable responses as 0. We calculated the dependent variable by summing participants’ responses to the social desirability scale. We then conducted a one-way ANOVA with 10,000 bootstrap resamples and found a significant effect of condition, *z* = 3.55, *p* < .001. An investigation of the marginal means reveals an effect consistent with what was predicted, as participants in the *fast* condition responded in a more socially desirable manner (*MFast* = 4.917339, *SE* = .1082043 *MSlow* = 4.289157, *SE* = .1398502).

Stata script:

keep if wave==1

bootstrap, reps(10000) seed(1): anova soc\_des\_total condition

**Wave 2 Results**

758 Wave 2 participants completed the target study and correctly answered the pre-registered attention check item.

This design was a 2-cell design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions in which they were told to answer each question either in less than 11 seconds or in more than 11 seconds. Participants then completed a 10-item subset of the social desirability scale. We coded socially desirable responses as 1 and non-socially desirable responses as 0. We calculated the dependent variable by summing participants’ responses to the social desirability scale. We then conducted a one-way ANOVA with 10,000 bootstrap resamples and found a significant effect of condition, *z* = 4.53, *p* < .001. An investigation of the marginal means reveals an effect consistent with what was predicted, as participants in the *fast* condition responded in a more socially desirable manner (*MFast* = 4.892473, *SE* = .1188388, *MSlow* = 4.068259, *SE* = .1380542).

Stata script:

keep if wave==0

bootstrap, reps(10000) seed(1): anova soc\_des\_total condition

**Total Sample Results**

1586 participants completed the target study and correctly answered the pre-registered attention check item.

This design was a 2-cell design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions in which they were told to answer each question either in less than 11 seconds or in more than 11 seconds. Participants then completed a 10-item subset of the social desirability scale. We coded socially desirable responses as 1 and non-socially desirable responses as 0. We calculated the dependent variable by summing participants’ responses to the social desirability scale. We then conducted a one-way ANOVA with 10,000 bootstrap resamples and found a significant effect of condition, *z* = 5.71, *p* < .001. An investigation of the marginal means reveals an effect consistent with what was predicted, as participants in the *fast* condition responded in a more socially desirable manner (*MFast* = 4.905307, *SE* = .0788987, *MSlow* = 4.1856, *SE* = .0979825).

Stata script:

bootstrap, reps(10000) seed(1): anova soc\_des\_total condition