

Supplementary Materials

Saying Good and Bad Things Behind Someone's Back or to Their Face. Perceived
Source Selflessness and Trust in Information Matter when the Information is Positive

Pilot Study

Participants and Design

Forty-four Polish students of various universities participated in the pilot study. Forty-three participants, 29 women (67%) and 14 men (33%) completed the full survey and were therefore retained. Age of participants varied from 18 to 41 ($M = 21.49$, $SD = 4.17$).

Procedure and Materials

Students received a link with a request to participate in a voluntary study via Internet. After giving informed consent participants read and evaluated 16 stories representing behavior, of either positive or negative valence, and of agentic or communal character (e.g., *Magda has borrowed a book from the library more than a month before. There are several people waiting for this book. This exemplar is the only one that can be taken home. The library has already reclaimed the book, reminding Magda that there are people waiting for it, but Magda didn't really feel bothered. She doesn't really care that someone may need the book*). Eight stories of positive valence described either high agency or high communion and eight of negative valence described either low agency or low communion.

In half of the stories the primary character was a woman in the rest it was a men. Previous literature established that men list more agentic attributes than women and women more communal than men when describing themselves (Diehl, Owen, & Youngblade, 2004). Accordingly, in our pilot study stories describing communal behaviors were describing women. Men were the protagonists of the descriptions involving agency. We decided for such a prototypical (though stereotypical) division to reduce the number of possible combinations. After reading all the stories, participants evaluated how competent and how moral each of the protagonists was and how plausible each of the story was. Responses were given on a seven point scale (1 = *definitely not* to 7 = *definitely yes*) to the following questions: "Please rate the

extent, to which the protagonist of the story is competent?”, “Please rate the extent, to which the protagonist of the story is moral?” and “Could a story like this happen in real life?”.

Participants then reported demographics.

Results and discussion. The goal of the analysis was to select four out of the 16 stories that best described low and high agency, or low and high communion of the target individual. The stories highlighted in bold had highest mean scores on each of the dimensions of all the stories (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of the agency, morality and plausibility scores of the target individuals of each of the stories.

STORIES	Competence		Communion		Plausibility	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.(agentic / positive)	5.28	0.93	4.93	1.10	5.88	1.14
2.(agentic / negative)	3.49	1.56	4.79	1.13	5.67	1.30
3.(communal / negative)	2.70	1.25	1.86	1.23	6.33	1.11
4.(agentic / positive)	6.05	1.05	5.26	1.22	6.30	1.10
5.(communal / positive)	5.49	1.28	6.19	1.05	6.02	1.21
6.(agentic / negative)	3.67	1.29	4.37	1.02	4.72	1.45
7.(agentic / positive)	5.33	1.30	4.84	1.19	5.63	1.35
8.(communal / positive)	6.12	1.10	6.44	0.83	6.37	0.85
9.(communal / positive)	5.51	1.56	6.42	0.91	5.88	1.03
10.(agentic / negative)	3.12	1.53	4.49	1.22	5.70	1.08
11.(communal / positive)	6.09	1.13	6.42	0.91	6.19	0.93
12.(communal / negative)	3.21	1.42	2.40	1.31	5.86	0.92
13.(agentic / negative)	3.26	1.26	4.19	0.88	5.70	1.12
14.(communal / negative)	2.72	1.50	2.02	1.58	5.40	1.18
15.(agentic / positive)	5.77	1.00	5.14	1.13	6.16	0.90
16.(communal / negative)	2.95	1.50	2.02	1.35	5.91	1.32

The evaluations of agency and communion were positively correlated $r(43) = .68, p < .001$. We chose stories that differed significantly in the way they were evaluated on two dimension (agency and communion). Namely, we chose stories, in which the dimension of our interest (e.g., agency) was evaluated significantly higher than the other (here communion).

The story #3 describes a situation in which a protagonist withholds a book from the library. It was evaluated low on both agency and communion. The dominant dimension is low communion ($M = 1.86, SD = 1.23$) of the target individual, which is significantly lower than the evaluation of the target individual's agency ($M = 2.70, SD = 1.25$), $t(42) = 3.67, p = .001, d = 0.56$. The target individual of the story #4 was evaluated as significantly more agentic ($M = 6.05, SD = 1.05$) than communal ($M = 5.26, SD = 1.22$), $t(42) = 5.00, p < .001, d = 0.77$. The main character of story #8 was perceived as more moral ($M = 6.12, SD = 1.10$) than competent ($M = 6.44, SD = 0.88$), $t(42) = 2.45, p = .018, d = 0.38$. Finally, the target individual of the story #10 was seen as less agentic ($M = 3.12, SD = 1.53$) than moral ($M = 4.49, SD = 1.22$), $t(42) = 5.46, p < .001, d = 0.84$. These results assured us that our material adequately and most typically represented characters of high and low communion and agency.

References

- Diehl, M., Owen, S. K., & Youngblade, L. M. (2004). Agency and communion attributes in adults' spontaneous self-representations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 1-15.