Appendix: Instructions, Manipulations, and Measures

Introduction to the Study

At the beginning of the questionnaire we informed participants about the topic of the survey and asked for their informed consent. The instructions read as follows: "Welcome. We are doing a survey on people's beliefs, thoughts, and feelings about everyday life situations. We are very grateful for your time and cooperation. This survey is anonymous and there are no correct or wrong answers. What matters is your opinion. Do you give your voluntary and informed consent for participating in this study?" [Forced choice between: Yes (please go on with the survey) / No (please quit the survey)]

Demographics

We then asked demographic questions with the following overarching instructions: "We would first like to ask you a few questions about yourself." Participants reported their age (open-ended question "Age"); gender (forced choice between: Female / Male); education level (forced choice among: no education, primary education, secondary education, and tertiary education); country of residence (open-ended question "What country are you currently living in?"); length of residence in their country (open-ended question "How many years have you lived in this country?"); identification country (open-ended question "Some people may live in one country but feel most related to another country, for example, when they are immigrants. What country do you relate to most?"); religiosity (Likert-type question "How important is God to you?" ranging from 1=*not at all* to 7=*very much*); and socioeconomic status (Likert-type questions "What was the neighborhood you grew up in like? " ranging from 1=*very poor* to 7=*very wealthy* and "Do you have enough money to buy things you want? " ranging from 1=*not at all* to 7=*very much*); We also recorded whether the study was administered online or with pen and paper, as

well as the type of compensation participants received for participating in the study (forced choice among: research credits, money, participation in a lottery, voluntary participation, and other reason).

We computed the ratio of participants' age to the length of residence in their country to estimate the proportional length of residence. Age, gender, education level, SES, religiosity, administration means, type of compensation, and proportional length of residence were used as control variables in the analyses reported in the main text. We did not control for identification country because the respective question was variously interpreted as asking for participants' preferred country, birth country, or nationality country. We also did not exclude participants who reported a residence country that was different than the country of data collection (1.76% of the total sample) because it was not clear whether these participants were sojourners and thereby non-nationals or nationals who were temporarily living in another country.

Actor's Behavior Manipulation

Next we manipulated actor's behavior by means of a vignette. In a first step, participants read: "We now ask you to carefully read the following story. Please pay close attention, because you will then be asked a few questions about this story". In a second step, one of the two experimental conditions was introduced.

The vignette in the norm violation condition reads as follows: "K works for a medium-sized consultancy company that employs 20 people. Today is the Annual General Meeting of the company and everyone is expected to be present. At 12:00 sharp the meeting organizer starts the discussion by introducing issues that concern the company. K arrives late to the meeting (12:10), walks in without knocking, and causes some commotion while getting seated. Halfway through the meeting, K really wants some coffee. But to get coffee, he would have to stand up and walk

to the other side of the room where the coffee pot is. Although it's not appropriate, K stands up and crosses through the center of the room to get to the coffee pot. He gets a cup of coffee, grabs the last few cookies, leaving none left, and walks back to his seat. Toward the end of the meeting, the issue of cell phone use comes up. The company has certain rules about using cell phones during working hours, but employees have occasionally expressed divergent opinions on this issue. One of the employees starts explaining why he finds rules necessary and continues to do so for a few minutes. K disagrees with his colleague and interrupts him to express his opinion: *'I don't see your point at all about the importance of rules, rules are there to be broken.'* Other employees also give their opinions and in the end the organizer rounds off the discussion. The meeting has now finished and everybody leaves the room."

The vignette in the norm adherence condition reads as follows: "K works for a medium-sized consultancy company that employs 20 people. Today is the Annual General Meeting of the company and everyone is expected to be present. K arrives well on time (11:50), takes a seat, and gets prepared for the meeting. At 12:00 sharp the meeting organizer starts the discussion by introducing issues that concern the company. Halfway through the meeting, K really wants some coffee. But to get coffee, he would have to stand up and walk to the other side of the room where the coffee pot is. Because this would not be appropriate, K decides to wait until the end of the meeting. Toward the end of the meeting, the issue of cell phone use comes up. The company has certain rules about using cell phones during working hours, but employees have occasionally expressed divergent opinions on this issue. One of the employees starts explaining why he finds rules unnecessary and continues to do so for a few minutes. K disagrees with his colleague and waits for him to finish to express his opinion: *'Thank you for pointing out the problems of some rules, but rules are there for a reason.'* Other employees also give their opinions and in the end

the organizer rounds off the discussion. The meeting has now finished and everybody leaves the room while K crosses through the center of the room to get to the coffee pot. He gets a cup of coffee and a cookie, and heads back to his office."

Individual-level Measures

Following the actor's behavior manipulation, we measured power perception, moral outrage, leader support, and norm-violation perception as individual-level constructs. These measures were introduced with the text "Research shows that people form impressions of others very quickly even if they have limited information. Based on the story you just read, we would like to know what is your impression of K. There are no right or wrong answers."

The power perception scale was introduced with the general question "What do you think of K's relationships with others?" The scale items were "I think that … K gets to make the decisions in his relationships with others; … K can get others to do what he wants; … K has a great deal of power; and … K's ideas and opinions are often ignored". All items were answered on Likert-type scales ranging from 1=*strongly disagree* to 7=*strongly agree*.

Moral outrage was measured with the questions "To what extent does K's behavior make you feel … anger; … contempt; … disgust?". These questions were answered on Likert-type scales ranging from 1=*not at all* to 7=*very much*.

The leader support scale was introduced with the scenario "Imagine that you are working in the same team with K. Suppose that the leadership position in your team has yet to be determined and K is a candidate for that position. What do you think of K as a leader?" The scale items were "I would trust K as a leader"; "I think K is a good candidate for the leadership position"; "I would be a strong supporter of K"; "I think K would represent the interests of the team very well"; "I think K would be an effective leader"; "I would vote for K"; and "I would

not support K as a leader". All items were answered on Likert-type scales ranging from 1=*strongly disagree* to 7=*strongly agree.*

We measured norm violation perception to check the manipulation of actor's behavior. This measure was introduced with the question "To what extent do the following items describe K as a person?". The items were "K follows the rules"; "K behaves properly"; "K breaks the rules"; and "K behaves improperly"**.** All items were answered on Likert-type scales ranging from 1=*does not describe K at all* to 7=*describes K very well.*

Culture-level Measures

We then introduced the culture-level measures of tightness, collectivism, and power distance with the instructions "The following statements refer to [participant's country] as a whole. Please try to give us an accurate impression of how things are in your country."

The tightness scale was introduced with the statement "Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements using the following scale (1 to 6). Note that the statements sometimes refer to 'social norms', which are standards for behavior that are generally unwritten. " The scale items were "In [participant's country] … there are many social norms that people are supposed to follow; … there are clear expectations for how people should behave; … people agree upon what behaviors are appropriate; … people will disapprove of someone who acts in an inappropriate way; … people comply with social norms; and … people are free to do what they want". These items were answered on Likert-type scales ranging from 1=*strongly disagree* to 6=*strongly agree.*

The collectivism scale was introduced with the text "Finally, we want to know how important groups are to the people in your country. Which behaviors or values are more typical for the majority of people in your country?" The scale items were answered on Likert-type

scales, the anchors of which were item-specific. The scale items were "If there is a conflict between personal values and the values of a group, most people follow: 1=*their personal values* to 7=*the values of their group*"; "Most people: 1=*do what is enjoyable to them personally* to 7=*carry out their group obligations*"; "Most people obey: 1=*their personal contracts rather than their group norms and duties* to 7=*their group norms and duties rather than personal contracts*"; "Most people act in line with: 1=*their rights* to 7=*their group norms and duties*"; and "Most people follow: 1=*their personal attitudes* to 7=*their group norms and rules*".

The power distance scale was introduced with the text "The following statements ask about the relations between followers and leaders in your country. You can think of a student – teacher or an employee – manager relationship." The scale items were "In this country followers: *1 = obey their leader without question* to *7 = question their leader when in disagreement*" (reverse-coded); "How often are followers afraid to express disagreement with their leaders? *1 = very seldom* to *7 = very frequently*"; and "In this country power is: *1 = concentrated at the top* to *7 = shared throughout the society*" (reverse-coded).