<H1> **Supplement Material**

<H2> ***Table S-1***

***Descriptive Statistics***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Akers (2012) | 299 | US | 19.9 |  | 73.2 |  | 1 |
| Allen et al. (2017) | 542 | US | 39.3 |  | 47.0 | .68 | 0 |
| Almeida et al. (2015) | 375 | Portugal | 21.8 | 4.0 | 61.5 |  | 0 |
| Ashdown et al. (2018) | 322 | US | 26.1 | 1.7 | 71.7 | .43 | 0 |
| Baldner et al. (2018) 1 | 254 | US | 36.2 | 12.0 | 5.4 | .38 | 0 |
| Baldner et al. (2018) 2 | 328 | Italy | 38.5 | 15.5 | 52.4 | .42 | 0 |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 1 | 926 | US | 49.2 | 18.0 |  | .51 | 2 |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 2 | 920 | US | 48.9 | 18.1 |  | .51 | 2 |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 3 | 2,927 | US | 35.3 | 11.3 |  | .37 | 2 |
| Black & Barnes (2017) | 184 | US |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Black et al. (2018) 1 | 188 | US | 25.0 | 11.2 | 7.2 | .66 | 0 |
| Black et al. (2018) 2 | 104 | US | 19.6 | 2.5 | 56.2 | .42 | 0 |
| Black et al. (2018) 3 | 158 | US | 36.9 | 36.9 | 5.0 | .59 | 0 |
| Bobbio et al. (2011) | 535 | Italy | 25.5 | 7.6 | 71.2 |  | 0 |
| Bowman et al. (2012) 1 | 328 | Germany | 23.2 | 3.0 | 23.2 |  | 0 |
| Bowman et al (2012) 2 | 135 | Germany | 35.0 | 27.4 | 56.2 |  | 0 |
| Bowman et al. (2012) 3 | 145 | US | 32.6 | 26.1 | 56.1 |  | 0 |
| Brasini et al. (2018) | 125 | Italy | 27.3 | 5.2 | 49.6 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 1 | 180 | Mexico | 2.8 | 2.8 | 79.0 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 2 | 181 | Spain | 21.3 | 21.3 | 67.8 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 3 | 159 | Ireland | 2.9 | 4.1 | 55.4 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 4 | 180 | Estonia | 22.0 | 2.7 | 67.9 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 5 | 176 | Netherlands | 22.3 | 3.4 | 64.1 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 6 | 131 | Sweden | 25.0 | 4.6 | 57.4 |  | 0 |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 7 | 166 | Poland | 24.7 | 6.0 | 67.5 |  | 0 |
| Choi & Lewis (2017) 1 | 184 | US | 2.5 | 1.4 | 77.2 |  | 0 |
| Choi & Lewis (2017) 2 | 77 | South Korea | 22.2 | 3.1 | 47.4 |  | 0 |
| Chowdhury (2017) | 450 | US | 42.9 | 13.7 | 51.1 |  | 0 |
| Cohen et al. (2014) | 498 | US | 56.2 | 15.3 | 53.3 | .55 | 0 |
| Cornwell & Higgins (2014) | 77 | US | 23.7 | 4.3 | 66.0 | .31 | 0 |
| Crimston et al. (2016) 1 | 123 | US | 34.0 | 11.6 | 35.8 |  | 1 |
| Crimston et al. (2016) 2 | 316 | US | 34.2 | 12.4 | 58.2 |  | 1 |
| Curry et al. (2019) 1 | 1,042 | UK | 48.0 | 13.9 | 47.9 |  | 1 |
| Curry et al. (2019) 2 | 469 | UK | 46.9 | 16.8 | 49.0 |  | 1 |
| Da Silva Dias (2017) | 300 | US | 38.9 | 12.6 | .8 | .37 | 0 |
| Davies et al. (2014) | 3,978 | New Zealand | 5.2 | 15.5 | 62.9 |  | 0 |
| Dewulf (2013) | 97 | Netherlands | 22.9 | 7.7 | 79.2 |  | 0 |
| ***Citation*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Di Battista et al. (2018) | 242 | Italy | 25.3 | 9.5 | 66.9 | .52 | 1 |
| Diessner et al. (2013) | 4,550 | US | 39.7 | 15.5 | 49.7 | .30 | 0 |
| Djeriouat & Trémolière (2014) | 136 | US | 36.9 | 12.7 | 69.1 |  | 0 |
| Erceg et al. (2018) | 175 | Croatia | 31.6 | 9.2 | 42.9 | .23 | 1 |
| Federico et al. (2016) 1 | 198 | US | 2.6 | 4.0 | 64.3 |  | 0 |
| Federico et al. (2016) 2 | 309 | US | 19.6 | 4.5 | 64.7 |  | 0 |
| Federico et al. (2016) 3 | 297 | US | 19.8 | 2.5 | 54.2 |  | 0 |
| Feldman (2020) 1 | 1,519 | US | 5.2 | 16.7 | 5.5 |  | 3 |
| Feldman (2020) 2 | 3,342 |  | 25.2 | 1.6 | 56.0 |  | 0 |
| Feldman (2020) 3 | 3,184 |  | 24.5 | 8.4 | 57.0 |  | 0 |
| Feldman (2020) 4 | 8,883 |  | 22.3 | 5.6 | 39.9 |  | 1 |
| Findor (2015) | 378 | Slovakia | 25.2 | 12.8 | 58.4 | .55 | 0 |
| Findor et al. (2014) | 60 | Slovakia | 24.9 | 1.9 | 75.8 |  | 0 |
| Forscher & Kteily (2020) | 1,348 | US | 5.9 | 16.6 | 5.2 |  | 3 |
| Franks & Scherr (2015) | 144 | US | 19.8 | 2.7 | 64.0 |  | 0 |
| Franks & Scherr (2018) | 275 | US |  |  | 44.0 |  | 0 |
| Funk (2017) | 214 | US | 21.1 | .9 | 55.1 |  | 0 |
| Gay et al. (2018) | 464 | US | 38.7 | 13.7 | 61.4 | .54 | 0 |
| Giacomantonio et al. (2017) 1 | 214 | Italy | 36.4 | 14.7 | 66.6 | .54 | 0 |
| Giacomantonio et al (2017) 2 | 200 | US | 35.3 | 12.3 | 66.6 | .42 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 01 | 556 | US | 32.1 | 12.2 | 58.0 | .16 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 02 | 380 | UK | 33.3 | 1.5 | 39.2 | .16 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 03 | 318 |  | 31.5 | 9.7 | 39.1 | .02 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 04 | 5,652 | US | 37.4 | 14.5 | 4.8 | .32 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 05 | 141 | UK | 39.2 | 14.2 | 24.1 | .29 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 06 | 239 | Canada | 36.1 | 13.4 | 33.8 | .29 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 07 | 68 | Australia | 37.1 | 16.4 | 37.2 | .28 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 08 | 221 | Western Europe | 35.9 | 14.3 | 3.2 | .25 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 09 | 56 | Eastern Europe | 38.8 | 23.2 | 42.1 | .33 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 10 | 146 | Latin America | 33.4 | 13.3 | 44.3 | .32 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 11 | 24 | Africa | 39.3 | 24.2 | 35.5 | .23 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 12 | 45 | Middle East | 36.5 | 14.0 | 27.3 | .26 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 13 | 16 | Central Asia | 52.6 | 27.3 | 26.3 | .28 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 14 | 39 | South Asia | 35.9 | 12.4 | 34.6 | .22 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 15 | 21 | East Asia | 31.8 | 1.3 | 34.5 | .32 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 16 | 32 | Southeast Asia | 28.1 | 11.0 | 36.4 | .36 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 17 | 23 | Oceania | 41.7 | 15.7 | 37.0 | .36 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 18 | 1,151 | US | 32.2 | 12.8 | 63.7 | .38 | 1 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 01 | 194,145 | US | 33.7 | 16.2 | 46.9 | .35 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 02 | 11,274 | UK | 33.8 | 14.6 | 33.5 | .28 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 04 | 6,950 | Oceania | 32.3 | 14.0 | 39.5 | .30 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 05 | 11,141 | Western Europe | 31.1 | 13.5 | 31.4 | .28 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 06 | 3,726 | Eastern Europe | 29.1 | 15.4 | 4.9 | .32 | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Citation*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Graham et al. (2011) 07 | 3,387 | Latin America | 3.4 | 16.2 | 37.8 | .34 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 08 | 429 | Africa | 31.3 | 24.2 | 4.7 | .37 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 09 | 1,367 | Middle East | 28.4 | 17.2 | 38.5 | .31 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 10 | 74 | Central Asia | 29.3 | 23.0 | 51.1 | .37 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 11 | 2,147 | South Asia | 27.2 | 11.5 | 3.3 | .31 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 12 | 2,164 | East Asia | 26.2 | 12.7 | 49.2 | .36 | 0 |
| Graham et al. (2011) 13 | 2,030 | Southeast Asia | 25.1 | 12.6 | 49.0 | .37 | 0 |
| Greenway et al. (2018) | 313 | US | 38.7 | 17.1 | 67.7 |  | 0 |
| Hahnel & Brosch (2018) | 182 | Switzerland | 22.5 | 5.1 | 83.0 |  | 0 |
| Halevy et al. (2018) | 200 | US | 32.3 | 1.8 | 67.2 |  | 0 |
| Harnish et al. (2018) | 132 | US | 19.5 | 1.4 | 64.0 | .51 | 0 |
| Harper & Hogue (2018) | 506 | UK | 33.4 | 13.9 | 3.2 |  | 0 |
| Howell et al. (2011) | 250 | Canada | 2.4 | 3.9 | 75.3 |  | 0 |
| Jarmakowski–Kostrzanowski et al. (2016) | 108 | Poland | 23.8 | 3.7 | 59.3 |  | 0 |
| Ji & Janicke (2018) 1 | 234 | China | 21.7 | 3.5 | 63.0 |  | 0 |
| Ji & Janicke (2018) 2 | 204 | US | 22.4 | 3.4 | 77.0 |  | 0 |
| Jöckel & Früh (2016) | 448 | Germany | 39.0 | 16.8 | 51.2 | .43 | 1 |
| Johnson et al. (2016) | 450 | US | 38.0 | 12.7 | 63.1 |  | 0 |
| Jones (2015) | 128 | US | 31.1 | 9.9 | 37.0 |  | 0 |
| Kang et al. (2016) | 577 | US | 33.6 | 11.5 | 58.6 |  | 0 |
| Karandikar et al. (2018) | 355 |  | 24.9 | 1.2 | 63.9 |  | 0 |
| Katzarska-Miller & Reysen (2018) | 343 | US | 21.7 | 6.3 | 7.6 |  | 1 |
| Kawamoto et al. (2017) 1 | 500 | Japan | 45.4 | 8.5 | 5.0 |  | 0 |
| Kawamoto et al. (2017) 2 | 487 | Japan | 41.1 | 1.1 | 5.1 |  | 0 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 1 | 498 | US | 31.2 | 11.2 |  |  | 3 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 2 | 346 | US | 32.0 | 11.9 |  |  | 3 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 3 | 352 | US | 34.2 | 11.4 | 46.0 |  | 3 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 4 | 350 | US | 39.6 | 11.3 | 54.8 |  | 3 |
| Kertzer et al. (2014) | 1,152 | US | 41.0 | 16.4 | 27.9 | .42 | 0 |
| Kim et al. (2012) | 7,704 | US | 21.1 | 2.6 | 52.7 | .31 | 0 |
| Kivikangas et al. (2017) | 874 | Finland | 43.4 | 16.0 | 49.2 | .44 | 0 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 01 | 123 | Austria | 25.2 | 8.0 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 02 | 110 | Belgium | 19.4 | 5.0 |  | .02 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 03 | 103 | Brazil | 2.2 | 2.7 |  | .01 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 04 | 597 | Canada | 39.2 | 2.9 |  | .01 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 05 | 153 | Chile | 21.2 | 2.3 |  | .00 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 06 | 380 | China | 38.0 | 3.0 |  | .52 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 07 | 101 | Costa Rica | 22.5 | 5.7 |  | .02 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 09 | 43 | France | 2.2 | 2.4 |  | .03 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 10 | 92 | Germany | 23.6 | 4.7 |  | .05 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 11 | 170 | Hong Kong | 21.3 | 3.5 |  | .05 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 12 | 183 | Hungary | 21.5 | 3.1 |  | .08 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 13 | 359 | India | 31.5 | 9.6 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 14 | 110 | Japan | 19.3 | 1.2 |  | .03 | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Citation*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Klein et al. (2018) 15 | 144 | Mexico | 21.2 | 5.1 |  | .03 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 16 | 102 | New Zealand | 19.4 | 2.3 |  | .05 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 17 | 229 | Poland | 26.2 | 7.8 |  | .04 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 18 | 35 | Portugal | 27.0 | 7.1 |  | .04 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 19 | 105 | Serbia | 2.7 | 2.4 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 20 | 72 | South Africa | 25.7 | 8.6 |  | .04 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 21 | 54 | Spain | 19.9 | 1.1 |  | .02 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 22 | 111 | Sweden | 33.4 | 1.4 |  | .07 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 23 | 113 | Switzerland | 21.1 | 4.9 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 24 | 135 | Taiwan | 26.9 | 5.1 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 25 | 483 | Netherlands | 21.6 | 7.5 |  | .06 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 26 | 237 | Turkey | 26.9 | 8.9 |  | .32 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 27 | 142 | UK | 21.8 | 6.5 |  | .03 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 28 | 91 | United Arab Emirates | 19.8 | 1.3 |  | .09 | 1 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 30 | 2,358 | US | 21.6 | 7.4 |  | .08 | 1 |
| Koleva et al. (2012) | 10,222 | US | 38.0 | 14.3 | 38.0 | .30 | 0 |
| Konishi et al. (2017) | 237 | Japan | 19.4 | 1.5 | 55.7 |  | 0 |
| Laakasuo, Drosinou et al. (2018) 1 | 268 | US | 31.6 | 1.9 | 6.1 | .54 | 0 |
| Laakasuo, Drosinou, et al. (2018) 2 | 303 | Finland | 25.7 | 5.4 | 72.9 | .47 | 0 |
| Laakasuo, Köbis et al. (2018) | 189 | Finland | 26.0 | 6.5 | 74.5 |  | 0 |
| Lake & Lindsey (2013) | 1,561 | US | 33.7 | 14.4 | 54.1 | .38 | 0 |
| Landmann & Hess (2018) | 195 | Germany | 34.3 | 15.3 | 6.0 |  | 2 |
| Leone et al. (2019) 1 | 319 | Italy | 35.4 | 13.7 | 56.1 |  | 0 |
| Leone et al. (2019) 2 | 514 | Italy | 36.3 | 11.0 | 52.5 |  | 0 |
| Li et al. (2017) | 206 | China | 19.5 | .7 | 5.5 |  | 3 |
| Low & Wi (2016) | 185 | US | 38.0 | 15.5 | 4.0 |  | 0 |
| Macko (2012) | 65 | Poland | 21.5 | 3.1 | 3.9 | .35 | 0 |
| Malka et al. (2016) 1 | 1,379 | US | 26.5 | 11.1 | 65.2 | .43 | 1 |
| Malka et al. (2016) 2 | 3,429 | New Zealand | 5.1 | 15.6 | 62.4 | .43 | 0 |
| Marszalek et al. (2017) | 330 | US | 32.9 | 1.8 | 74.6 | .49 | 0 |
| McAdams et al. (2008) | 128 | US | 49.2 | 8.5 | 61.0 | .40 | 3 |
| Meagher (2019) | 578 | US | 58.4 | 16.9 | 57.0 |  |  |
| Međedović & Petrović (2016) | 402 | Serbia | 28.3 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 0 |
| Métayer (2014) | 627 | France | 27.1 | 1.0 | 57.5 | .28 | 0 |
| Milesi (2016) 1 | 82 | Italy | 34.9 | 14.2 | 51.5 |  | 0 |
| Milesi (2016) 2 | 102 | Italy | 22.0 | 3.3 | 72.6 |  | 0 |
| Milesi (2017) 1 | 312 | Italy | 21.2 | 3.7 |  |  | 0 |
| Milesi (2017) 2 | 301 | Italy | 39.1 | 14.2 |  |  | 0 |
| Milesi (2017) 3 | 291 | Italy | 39.7 | 16.1 |  |  | 1 |
| Milesi & Alberici (2018) 1 | 143 | Italy | 49.2 | 12.5 | 37.1 |  | 1 |
| Milesi & Alberici (2018) 2 | 170 | Italy | 41.9 | 16.4 | 57.0 |  | 1 |
| Minton et al. (2019) | 391 | US | 35.8 | 13.1 | 48.1 |  | 0 |
| Mitrić-Aćimović (2015) | 545 | Serbia | 38.3 | 9.4 | 46.8 |  | 0 |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 1 | 246 | Austria | 29.6 | 7.8 | 71.1 |  | 1 |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 2 | 155 | India | 23.1 | 2.1 | 7.3 |  | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Citation*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 3 | 227 | Nigeria | 23.9 | 3.9 | 38.8 |  | 1 |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 4 | 155 | China | 2.6 | .7 | 8.0 |  | 1 |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 5 | 91 | Cyprus | 24.4 | 5.3 | 78.0 |  | 1 |
| Nilsson & Erlandsson (2015) | 530 | Sweden | 24.0 | 4.5 | 63.2 |  | 0 |
| Nilsson et al. (2016) 1 | 1,049 | Sweden | 52.1 | 14.9 | 49.8 | .25 | 0 |
| Nilsson et al. (2016) 2 | 205 | Sweden | 24.7 | 5.6 | 69.8 | .48 | 0 |
| Nilsson et al. (2020) | 1,015 | Sweden | 48.9 | 15.5 | 49.9 | .51 | 0 |
| Ochoa et al. (2016) | 467 | Philippines | 19.0 | 1.3 | 51.0 | .37 | 0 |
| Palich et al. (2016) | 508 |  |  |  | 23.0 |  | 3 |
| Panczyk et al. (2019) | 1,274 | Poland | 43.0 | 7.8 | 98.3 |  | 0 |
| Peker et al. (2015) | 99 | Turkey | 21.5 | 2.7 | 10.0 |  | 2 |
| Pennycook et al (2014) | 495 | US | 31.0 | 11.4 | 47.8 | .29 | 3 |
| Pyszczynski et al. (2018) | 176 | US | 33.2 | 13.1 | 6.8 | .45 | 1 |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 1 | 492 | Belgium | 19.2 | 5.6 | 58.2 |  | 0 |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 2 | 283 | Netherlands | 21.5 | 4.1 | 65.6 |  | 0 |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 3 | 297 | Japan | 2.0 | 1.6 | 69.0 |  | 0 |
| Rathbun et al. (2019) | 1,381 | Germany | 43.4 | 14.1 | 49.6 |  | 0 |
| Rebega (2017) | 123 | Romania | 16.3 | .6 | 44.7 |  | 0 |
| Regts (2015) 1 | 223 | US | 41.9 | 16.1 | 6.5 |  | 0 |
| Regts (2015) 2 | 300 | US | 35.0 | 14.1 | 63.0 |  | 0 |
| Rempala et al. (2016) 1 | 406 | US | 18.6 | 1.5 | 5.0 |  | 3 |
| Rempala et al. (2016) 2 | 517 | US | 28.5 | 12.9 | 62.0 |  | 0 |
| Rutjens et al. (2018) | 167 |  | 35.8 | 1.7 | 43.7 |  | 1 |
| Rutjens et al. (2016) | 276 | US | 42.1 | 12.8 | 42.0 |  | 3 |
| Sağel (2015) | 941 | Turkey | 33.1 | 15.1 | 6.8 |  | 0 |
| Saldarriaga et al. (2017) | 350 | Colombia | 2.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 0 |
| Santos-Lang (2016) | 248 | US | 37.7 | 13.0 | 52.0 | .38 | 0 |
| Silver & Silver (2017) | 1,025 | US | 37.1 | 12.1 | 53.0 | .41 | 1 |
| Smith et al. (2017) 1 | 522 | US | 39.6 | 44.4 |  | .57 | 0 |
| Smith et al. (2017) 2 | 1,793 | Australia | 37.9 | 14.1 | 6.2 |  | 3 |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 1 | 300 | US | 33.6 | 1.4 | 42.0 | .50 | 0 |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 2 | 401 | US | 33.9 | 1.8 | 48.6 | .33 | 0 |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 4 | 262 | US | 33.6 | 9.9 | 48.5 | .32 | 0 |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 5 | 297 | US | 31.6 | 13.8 | 64.0 | .29 | 0 |
| Steiger & Reyna (2017) 1 | 423 | US | 36.2 | 13.8 | 68.7 | .41 | 0 |
| Steiger & Reyna (2017) 2 | 343 | US | 39.1 | 14.1 | 57.4 | .42 | 0 |
| Stevens (2013) 1 | 510 | US | 3.6 | 11.5 | 44.4 |  | 0 |
| Stevens (2013) 2 | 151 | US | 35.5 | 13.5 | 56.3 |  | 0 |
| Stolerman & Langado (2020) | 151 | US | 29.0 |  | 48.3 |  | 1 |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 1 | 65 | Germany | 25.3 | 8.0 | 4.0 |  | 0 |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 2 | 61 | Germany | 21.7 | 3.0 | 74.5 |  | 0 |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 3 | 58 | Germany | 24.3 | 7.4 | 68.3 |  | 0 |
| Sychev et al. (2016) 1 | 446 | Mongolia | 12.8 | .7 | 49.8 |  | 0 |
| Sychev et al. (2016) 2 | 450 | Russia | 12.7 | .7 | 48.7 |  | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Citation*** | ***N*** | ***Country*** | ***Age*** | ***SD*** | ***Gender*** | ***Id.*** | ***Instr.*** |
| Sychev et al. (2018) | 303 | Russia | 24.3 | 7.7 | 66.4 |  | 0 |
| Sychev & Tromifova (2018) | 169 | Russia | 18,3 | 1,7 | 69,3 |  | 0 |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 1 | 698 | Italy | 41.0 | 16.4 | 65.6 |  | 0 |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 2 | 265 | Italy | 42.6 | 5.0 | 52.3 |  | 0 |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 3 | 698 | Italy | 35.6 | 15.3 | 68.1 |  | 0 |
| Teo & Chan-Serafin (2013) | 502 | US | 34.5 | 1.3 | 45.0 |  | 0 |
| Trups-Kalne (2014) 1 | 348 | Latvia | 31.2 | 9.9 | 68.1 | .09 | 0 |
| Trups-Kalne (2014) 2 | 361 | Latvia | 33.8 | 11.2 | 72.9 | .07 | 0 |
| van Leeuwen & Park (2013) | 273 |  | 20.5 | 4.0 | 57.9 |  | 0 |
| Voelkel & Brandt (2019) | 139 | US | 35.3 | 11.4 | 63.6 | .53 | 0 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018a) | 800 |  | 35.1 | 11.1 | 48.0 | .11 | 3 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 1 | 80 | Netherlands | 19.6 | 1.5 | 72.5 |  | 3 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 2 | 221 | Netherlands | 31.5 | 13.9 | 77.4 |  | 3 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 3 | 148 | Netherlands | 2.0 | 2.3 | 8.4 | .39 | 3 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 4 | 450 | Netherlands | 35.3 | 1.7 | 46.2 |  | 2 |
| Waytz et al. (2013) | 74 | US | 35.7 | 13.9 | 65.0 |  | 3 |
| Wheeler & Laham (2016) | 165 | Australia | 19.7 | 3.0 | 71.5 |  | 3 |
| Xiong et al. (2018) | 175 | US | 34.7 |  | 45.7 |  | 0 |
| Yalçın (2017) | 512 |  | 21.5 | 2.1 | 64.5 |  | 0 |
| Yalçındağ et al. (2019) | 493 | Turkey | 31.4 | 12.1 | 56.0 | .48 | 0 |
| Zhang (2017) | 300 | US | 35.0 |  | 47.7 |  | 0 |
| Zhang & Li (2015) | 274 | China | 25.4 | 8.5 | 86.0 |  | 0 |

*Note*. *Age* = mean age of the samples; *SD* = *Age’s* standard deviation; *Gender* = percentage of women in the sample; *Id.* = political ideology, (coded quantitatively from 0 = extreme liberal to 1 = extreme conservative); *Instr.* refers to the moral instrument used, coded as 0 = mfq30, 1 = other mfq, 2 = other moral scales; 3 = other ad-hoc moral measurements

<H2> ***Table S-2***

***Correlations between Age and Moral Foundations by Sample***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Akers (2012) | .02 | .05 |  | –.11 | –.12 | –.03 |  |  |
| Allen et al. (2017) | .20 | .14 |  | .10 | .11 | .09 |  |  |
| Almeida et al. (2015) | .07 | .01 |  | –.01 | .08 | –.01 |  |  |
| Ashdown et al. (2018) | .02 | .08 |  | –.14 | –.10 | –.06 |  |  |
| Baldner et al. (2018) 1 | .16 | .14 |  | .04 | .09 | .02 |  |  |
| Baldner et al. (2018) 2 | .40 | .24 |  | .37 | .17 | .37 |  |  |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 1 | .14 | .11 |  | .21 | .12 | .12 |  |  |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 2 | .06 | –.06 |  | .17 | .07 | .03 |  |  |
| Bentley et al. (2018) 3 | .08 | .08 |  | –.05 | .15 | .12 |  |  |
| Black & Barnes (2017) | –.11 | –.09 |  | –.18 | –.15 | –.14 |  |  |
| Black et al. (2018) 1 |  |  |  | .04 | –.02 | –.04 | –.05 |  |
| Black et al. (2018) 2 |  |  |  |  |  | .08 |  |  |
| Black et al. (2018) 3 |  |  |  |  |  | .18 |  |  |
| Bobbio et al. (2011) | .11 | .04 |  | .11 | –.01 | .06 |  |  |
| Bowman et al. (2012) 1 | –.04 | .00 |  | –.12 | –.14 | –.11 |  |  |
| Bowman et al. (2012) 2 | .39 | .34 |  | –.10 | .11 | .11 |  |  |
| Bowman et al. (2012) 3 | .23 | .23 |  | .13 | .03 | .09 |  |  |
| Brasini et al. (2018) | .24 | .10 |  | .02 | –.09 | –.03 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 1 | .14 | .11 |  | .12 | .03 | –.04 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 2 | .10 | .07 |  | .02 | –.06 | –.08 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 3 | .09 | .04 |  | .00 | .09 | .14 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 4 | –.06 | .03 |  | –.11 | –.14 | .05 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 5 | .06 | .02 |  | –.04 | .02 | –.06 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 6 | .08 | .08 |  | –.10 | –.11 | –.10 |  |  |
| Cantarero et al. (2021) 7 | .12 | –.06 |  | .01 | –.13 | –.07 |  |  |
| Choi & Lewis (2017) 1 | .02 | .09 |  | .01 | .05 | .08 |  |  |
| Choi & Lewis (2017) 2 | –.02 | –.07 |  | –.03 | .02 | –.10 |  |  |
| Chowdhury (2017) | .04 | .08 |  | .11 | .05 | –.02 |  |  |
| Cohen et al. (2014) | .88 | .06 |  | .11 | .10 | .10 |  |  |
| Cornwell & Higgins (2014) | .04 | –.08 |  | –.19 | –.12 | –.15 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Crimston et al. (2016) 1 | .12 | .19 |  | .11 | .09 | –.01 |  |  |
| Crimston et al. (2016) 2 | .10 | .15 |  | .15 | .11 | .04 |  |  |
| Curry et al. (2019) 1 | .02 | –.02 |  | .08 | .08 | .05 |  |  |
| Curry et al. (2019) 2 | .12 | .03 |  | .07 | .04 | .11 |  |  |
| Da Silva Dias (2017) | .13 | .06 |  | .07 | .08 | .09 |  |  |
| Davies et al. (2014) | .05 | .14 |  | .26 | .28 | .29 |  |  |
| Dewulf (2013) | .12 |  |  |  | .05 | .00 |  |  |
| Di Battista et al. (2018) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .08 | .26 |
| Diessner et al. (2013) | .12 | .06 |  | .10 | .16 | .14 |  |  |
| Djeriouat & Trémolière (2014) | .05 | .03 |  | .13 | .21 | .22 |  |  |
| Erceg et al. (2018) | –.07 | –.04 |  | .03 | –.04 | –.01 |  |  |
| Federico et al. (2016) 1 | –.02 | .05 |  | .02 | .03 | .01 |  |  |
| Federico et al. (2016) 2 | –.02 | –.06 |  | .00 | –.03 | –.04 |  |  |
| Federico et al. (2016) 3 | .02 | .00 |  | .05 | .02 | –.10 |  |  |
| Feldman (2020) 1 | .20 | .25 |  | .26 | .23 | .11 |  |  |
| Feldman (2020) 2 | .04 | .01 |  | .03 | .06 | .05 |  |  |
| Feldman (2020) 3 | .14 | .09 |  | .07 | .08 | .06 |  |  |
| Feldman (2020) 4 | –.04 | –.01 |  | –.02 | .03 | –.01 |  |  |
| Findor (2015) | .10 | .13 |  | .21 | .27 | .42 |  |  |
| Findor et al. (2014) | .29 | .10 |  | –.14 | –.02 | .01 |  |  |
| Forscher & Kteily (2020) |  |  |  |  |  | –.01 |  |  |
| Franks & Scherr (2015) | .04 | –.03 |  | –.23 | –.15 | –.08 |  |  |
| Franks & Scherr (2018) | .16 | .16 |  | –.14 | –.12 | –.20 |  |  |
| Funk (2017) | .01 | .01 |  | –.03 | –.04 | –.05 |  |  |
| Gay et al. (2018) | .13 | .14 |  | .05 | .12 | .14 |  |  |
| Giacomantonio et al. (2017) 1 | .43 | .23 |  | .35 | .15 | .36 |  |  |
| Giacomantonio et al. (2017) 2 | .21 | .15 |  | .04 | .10 | .09 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 01 | .05 | –.01 |  | –.12 | .06 | .05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 02 | .08 | .08 |  | –.19 | –.12 | –.11 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 03 | .04 | .06 |  | –.12 | .01 | –.05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 04 | .12 | .99 |  | .06 | .12 | .11 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 05 | .28 | .12 |  | .15 | .17 | .19 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 06 | .15 | .16 |  | .10 | .11 | .15 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 07 | .09 | .09 |  | –.04 | .09 | –.06 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Graham et al. (2009) 08 | .08 | .02 |  | .04 | .08 | .12 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 09 | .10 | –.14 |  | .34 | .29 | .44 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 10 | .20 | .21 |  | –.17 | –.06 | –.03 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 11 | .13 | –.05 |  | –.22 | –.13 | .04 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 12 | .02 | .07 |  | .18 | .15 | .11 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 13 | –.41 | –.27 |  | –.20 | .45 | .06 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 14 | .22 | .22 |  | –.07 | .11 | .26 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 15 | .28 | .51 |  | –.01 | .08 | .11 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 16 | .38 | .35 |  | .07 | .23 | .08 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 17 | .23 | .02 |  | .05 | .40 | .18 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2009) 18 | .05 | .13 |  | –.15 | .08 | –.01 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 01 | .07 | .05 |  | –.05 | .00 | –.01 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 02 | .11 | .11 |  | .02 | .07 | .06 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 03 | .13 | .08 |  | –.03 | .02 | .03 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 04 | .12 | .09 |  | .05 | .07 | .08 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 05 | .11 | .08 |  | .03 | .02 | .05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 06 | .10 | .09 |  | .02 | .05 | .05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 07 | .09 | .08 |  | –.03 | .03 | .01 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 08 | .00 | .00 |  | –.01 | –.06 | –.12 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 09 | .06 | .00 |  | –.08 | –.05 | –.05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 10 | –.19 | .00 |  | –.14 | –.29 | –.31 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 11 | .11 | .04 |  | –.03 | .03 | .05 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 12 | .06 | .07 |  | –.10 | –.04 | –.07 |  |  |
| Graham et al. (2011) 13 | .06 | .09 |  | –.13 | –.04 | –.08 |  |  |
| Greenway et al. (2018) | .05 | .01 |  | .11 | .12 | .09 |  |  |
| Hahnel & Brosch (2018) | .18 | .04 |  | –.27 | –.24 | –.21 |  |  |
| Halevy et al. (2018) | .05 | .02 |  | .23 | .28 | .19 |  |  |
| Harnish et al. (2018) | .17 | .21 |  | .08 | .06 | –.03 |  |  |
| Harper & Hogue (2018) | .13 | –.03 | .38 | .17 | .23 | .29 |  |  |
| Howell et al. (2011) | .07 | –.14 |  | –.08 | .05 | .08 |  |  |
| Jarmakowski-Kostrzanowski  & Jarmakowska-Kostrzanowski (2016) | .11 | .20 |  | .06 | .12 | –.07 |  |  |
| Ji & Janicke (2018) 1 | –.09 | –.21 |  | .08 | .08 | –.06 |  |  |
| Ji & Janicke (2018) 2 | .00 | –.04 |  | –.11 | .03 | –.08 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Jöckel & Früh (2016) | .17 | .13 |  | .21 | .27 | .42 |  |  |
| Johnson et al. (2016) | .09 | –.01 |  | .00 | .08 | .11 |  |  |
| Jones (2015) | .05 | .08 |  | –.03 | .07 | –.01 |  |  |
| Kang et al. (2016) | .17 | .15 |  | .09 | .18 | .18 |  |  |
| Karandikar et al. (2018) | –.01 | –.05 |  | –.15 | –.07 | –.03 |  |  |
| Katzarska-Miller & Reysen (2018) | .09 | .03 |  | –.03 | .06 | .13 |  |  |
| Kawamoto et al. (2017) 1 | .02 | .00 |  | .06 | –.02 | –.02 |  |  |
| Kawamoto et al. (2017) 2 | .04 | .07 |  | .04 | –.04 | .02 |  |  |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .09 | .06 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .08 | .10 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .27 | .39 |
| Kerry & Murray (2018) 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .13 | –.24 |
| Kertzer et al. (2014) | .05 | .04 |  | .10 | .19 | .16 |  |  |
| Kim et al. (2012) | .00 | .00 |  | –.04 | .00 | –.06 |  |  |
| Kivikangas et al. (2017) | .23 | .18 |  | .23 | .09 | .30 |  |  |
| Klein et al. (2018) 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.26 | –.53 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .07 | .06 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 03 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.02 | –.09 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 04 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.04 | –.08 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 05 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.02 | –.10 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .03 | –.01 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 07 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .01 | .17 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 08 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.11 | –.02 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 09 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.13 | –.16 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.15 | –.10 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .00 | –.01 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.03 | –.19 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .09 | .02 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.04 | –.01 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .23 | .16 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.17 | –.23 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .07 | –.05 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .14 | .19 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .08 | .00 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .02 | –.04 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.12 | –.13 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.02 | –.17 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .08 | –.01 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .00 | .05 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.02 | .02 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.11 | –.18 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .08 | .02 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.22 | –.10 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.03 | .12 |
| Klein et al. (2018) 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | .05 | –.25 |
| Koleva et al. (2012) | .11 | .05 |  | .06 | .12 | .13 |  |  |
| Konishi et al. (2017) | .10 | .07 |  | .02 | .11 | .07 |  |  |
| Laakasuo, Drosinou, et al. (2018) 1 | .09 | .07 |  | .20 | .17 | .16 |  |  |
| Laakasuo, Drosinou, et al. (2018) 2 | .11 | .07 |  | –.03 | –.11 | –.03 |  |  |
| Laakasuo, Köbis, et al. (2018) | .12 | .08 |  | –.01 | –.10 | .05 |  |  |
| Lake & Lindsey (2013) | .11 | .08 |  | .04 | .11 | .10 |  |  |
| Landmann & Hess (2018) | .18 | .10 |  | –.03 | .19 | .12 |  |  |
| Leone et al. (2019) 1 | –.01 | .08 |  | .15 | .23 | .31 |  |  |
| Leone et al. (2019) 2 | .11 | .03 |  | .18 | .16 | .18 |  |  |
| Li et al. (2017) | .02 | .02 |  | –.04 | –.05 | .01 |  |  |
| Low & Wi (2016) | .07 | .06 |  | .08 | .11 | .08 |  |  |
| Macko (2012) | .26 | –.09 |  | –.03 | –.11 | .16 |  |  |
| Malka et al. (2016) 1 | .13 | .08 |  | –.01 | .04 | .08 |  |  |
| Malka et al. (2016) 2 | .06 | .15 |  | .27 | .29 | .29 |  |  |
| Marszalek et al. (2017) | .07 | –.01 |  | –.16 | –.06 | –.14 |  |  |
| McAdams et al. (2008) | .00 | .00 |  | .00 | .00 | .00 |  |  |
| Meagher (2019) | .22 | .23 |  | .34 | .32 | .21 |  |  |
| Međedović & Petrović (2016) | .01 | –.08 |  | .03 | –.06 | –.10 |  |  |
| Métayer (2014) | .04 | .04 |  | .04 | .01 | .04 |  |  |
| Milesi (2016) 1 | .15 | .19 |  | .32 | .34 | .22 |  |  |
| Milesi (2016) 2 | .05 | –.04 |  | .01 | .04 | .06 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Milesi (2017) 1 | .07 | .01 |  | –.04 | .00 | .08 |  |  |
| Milesi (2017) 2 | .15 | .14 |  | .23 | .25 | .32 |  |  |
| Milesi (2017) 3 | .27 | .22 |  | .21 | .12 | .18 |  |  |
| Milesi & Alberici (2018) 1 | .14 | .21 |  | .07 | –.13 | –.03 |  |  |
| Milesi & Alberici (2018) 2 | .02 | .04 |  | .03 | –.11 | .24 |  |  |
| Minton et al. (2019) | .10 | .12 |  | –.07 | .02 | .01 |  |  |
| Mitrić-Aćimović (2015) | .18 | .17 |  | .15 | .13 | .22 |  |  |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 1 | .10 | .10 |  | .07 | .05 | .15 |  |  |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 2 | –.17 | –.14 |  | –.04 | –.20 | –.04 |  |  |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 3 | .17 | .04 |  | –.07 | .13 | .16 |  |  |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 4 | –.09 | .06 |  | –.03 | .01 | .00 |  |  |
| Nechtelberger et al. (2017) 5 | .04 | .05 |  | –.04 | .06 | .01 |  |  |
| Nilsson & Erlandsson (2015) | –.01 | .00 |  | –.03 | –.08 | –.05 |  |  |
| Nilsson et al. (2016) 1 | .06 | .08 |  | .20 | .23 | .20 |  |  |
| Nilsson et al. (2016) 2 | –.02 | .03 |  | .03 | .03 | .01 |  |  |
| Nilsson et al. (2020) | –.07 | .05 |  | .18 | .11 | .07 |  |  |
| Ochoa et al. (2016) | –.10 | –.07 |  | –.05 | .01 | –.09 |  |  |
| Palich et al. (2016) | .02 | .10 |  | –.05 | .00 |  |  |  |
| Panczyk et al. (2019) |  | .13 |  | .14 | .14 | .16 |  |  |
| Peker et al. (2015) | .07 | .14 |  | .01 | –.05 | –.19 |  |  |
| Pennycook et al. (2014) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .02 | .11 |
| Pyszczynski et al. (2018) | .04 | –.03 |  | .09 | .22 | .21 |  |  |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 1 | .09 | .05 |  | .04 | .06 | .07 |  |  |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 2 | –.08 | –.08 |  | –.16 | –.18 | –.28 |  |  |
| Quintelier et al. (2013) 3 | .07 | .05 |  | .09 | .09 | .00 |  |  |
| Rathbun et al. (2019) | .10 | .14 |  |  | –.01 |  |  |  |
| Rebega (2017) | .15 | .67 |  | .19 | .07 | .17 |  |  |
| Regts (2015) 1 | –.03 | –.04 |  | .12 | .28 | .27 |  |  |
| Regts (2015) 2 | .12 | .01 |  | .04 | .11 | .12 |  |  |
| Rempala et al. (2016) 1 | –.06 | .05 | .05 | –.01 | –.02 | .18 |  |  |
| Rempala et al. (2016) 2 | –.14 | –.09 |  | –.23 | –.11 | –.14 |  |  |
| Rutjens et al. (2018) | .11 | .08 |  | .01 | .09 | .06 |  |  |
| Rutjens et al. (2016) | .06 | .03 |  | –.11 | –.03 | .08 |  |  |
| Sağel (2015) | .18 | .05 |  | .13 | .18 | .26 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Saldarriaga et al. (2017) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .32 | .33 |
| Santos-Lang (2016) | .19 | .08 |  | .04 | .05 | .03 |  |  |
| Silver & Silver (2017) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .05 | .05 |
| Smith et al. (2017) 1 | .06 | .00 |  | .03 | .05 | .04 |  |  |
| Smith et al. (2017) 2 | .02 | –.02 |  | –.12 | –.01 | .02 |  |  |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 1 | .13 | .12 | .06 | .06 | .10 | .07 |  |  |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 2 | .17 | –.02 | .03 | –.04 | .05 | .04 |  |  |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 3 | .18 | .10 | .02 | .03 | .12 | .10 |  |  |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 4 | –.01 | –.06 | .08 | .01 | .04 | –.07 |  |  |
| Ståhl et al. (2016) 5 | .12 | .07 |  | –.06 | .12 | .04 |  |  |
| Steiger & Reyna (2017) 1 | .08 | –.02 |  | .16 | .22 | .25 |  |  |
| Steiger & Reyna (2017) 2 | .06 | .09 |  | .07 | .11 | .13 |  |  |
| Stevens (2013) 1 | .09 | .09 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .19 |  |  |
| Stevens (2013) 2 | .14 | –.06 | –.13 | .01 | .07 | .12 |  |  |
| Stolerman & Lagnado (2020) | .00 | –.01 |  | .15 | .07 | .05 |  |  |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 1 | –.07 | –.17 |  | –.22 | –.04 | –.26 |  |  |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 2 | –.04 | –.20 |  | .18 | .10 | .11 |  |  |
| Süssenbach et al. (2019) 3 | .12 | .04 |  | .01 | .09 | .20 |  |  |
| Sychev et al. (2016) 1 | .05 | .07 |  | .06 | .07 | .08 |  |  |
| Sychev et al. (2016) 2 | –.07 | –.02 |  | –.03 | –.11 | –.07 |  |  |
| Sychev et al. (2018) | .02 | –.13 |  | .09 | .24 | .26 |  |  |
| Sychev & Trofimova (2018) | .34 | .24 |  | .01 | .10 | .41 |  |  |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 1 | .14 | .08 |  | .40 | .29 | .32 |  |  |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 2 | .04 | .09 |  | .00 | .03 | .05 |  |  |
| Tagar et al. (2017) 3 | .15 | .06 |  | .43 | .37 | .39 |  |  |
| Teo & Chan-Serafin (2013) |  |  |  |  |  |  | .11 | .13 |
| Trups-Kalne et al. (2014) 1 | .19 | .15 |  | .13 | .17 | .31 |  |  |
| Trups-Kalne et al. (2014) 2 | .21 | .09 |  | .03 | .02 | .18 |  |  |
| van Leeuwen & Park (2013) | .04 | .08 |  | –.11 | –.08 | –.22 |  |  |
| Voelkel & Brandt (2019) | .22 | .06 |  | .21 | .28 | .23 |  |  |
| Wagemans et al. (2018a) | –.07 |  |  |  |  | .02 |  |  |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 1 | –.09 | –.05 |  |  | –.03 | –.04 |  |  |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 2 | .06 | .20 |  |  | .33 | –.02 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Sample*** |  | *r*𝒇𝒄 | *r* 𝒍𝒐 | *r* 𝒍𝒃 | *r* 𝒂𝒔 | *r* 𝒑𝒅 | *r* 𝒊𝒇 | *r* 𝒃𝒇 |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 3 | –.05 | .07 |  |  |  | .08 |  |  |
| Wagemans et al. (2018b) 4 | –.05 | .07 | –.15 | –.12 | –.16 | –.02 |  |  |
| Waytz et al. (2013) | .12 | .03 |  | –.13 | .04 | .05 |  |  |
| Wheeler & Laham (2016) | .02 | .20 |  | .19 | –.03 | .17 |  |  |
| Xiong et al. (2018) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yalçın (2017) | .23 | .18 |  | –.02 | .30 | .23 |  |  |
| Yalçındağ et al. (2019) | .08 | –.03 |  | .24 | .23 | .27 |  |  |
| Zhang (2017) | .23 |  |  |  |  | .16 |  |  |
| Zhang & Li (2015) | .02 | –.02 |  | .06 | .06 | .01 |  |  |

*Note*. refers to Care/Harm. *r*𝒇𝒄 refers to Fairness/Cheating. *r* 𝒍𝒐 refers to Liberty/Oppression. *r* 𝒍𝒃 refers to Loyalty/Betrayal. *r* 𝒂𝒔 refers to Authority/Subversion. *r* 𝒑𝒅 refers to Purity/Degradation. *r* 𝒊𝒇 refers to Individualizing Foundations. *r* 𝒃𝒇 refers to Binding Foundations.

<H2> ***Table S-3.***

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and HC, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver. Other int. Adhoc int. | 110  72  155  26  72  71  38  75  3  63  3  30  7  131  39  6  13 | 100,967  352,564  429,118  23,800  352,564  73,704  26,950  370,104  6,291  33,431 952  24,861  17,579  433,976  22,894  5,356  3,963 | .081  .087  .089  .061  .087  .093  .056  .088  .125  .092  .070  .054  .066  .082  .082  .081  .032 | [.064, .098]  [.067, .106]  [.075, .102]  [.026, .095]  [.067, .106]  [.073, .114]  [.027, .086]  [.069, .107]  [.030, .218]  [.069, .114]  [–.042, .180]  [.021, .087]  [.004, .128]  [.068, .097]  [.052, .113]  [.015, .147]  [–.017, .081] | *F*(1, 180) = 0.186, *p =* .667. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(180) = 631.397, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 179) = 2.255, *p =* .135. *R2* = .0121  *QW*(179) = 656.842, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 178) = 2.142, *p =* .120. *R2* = .0228  *QW*(178) = 612.270, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 175) = 1.002, *p =* .418. *R2* = .0001  *QW*(175) = 650.184, *p* < .001  *F*(3, 185) = 1.283, *p =* .281. *R2* = .0076  *QW*(185) = 780.889, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Table S–4.*

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and FC, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver.  Other int. Adhoc int. | 111  71  154  27  71  71  39  74  3  64  3  30  7  133  37  6  12 | 102,372  346,890  424,635  24,014  346,890  73,826  28,233  364,430  6,291  34,836 952  24,861  17,579  436,099  16,502  5,356  3,963 | .065  .057  .065  .046  .057  .072  .051  .056  .119  .072  .010  .039  .104  .056  .064  .066  .085 | [.046, .084]  [.035, .079]  [.050, .081]  [.007, .085]  [.035, .079]  [.049, .095]  [.019, .084]  [.035, .078]  [.012, .223]  [.048, .097]  [–.114, .133]  [.002, .076]  [.033, .174]  [.040, .072]  [.029, .099]  [–.007, .138]  [.029, .140] | *F*(1, 180) = 0.281, *p =* .597. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(180) = 608.567, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 179) = 0.827, *p =* .364. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(179) = 666.810, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 178) = 0.652, *p =* .522. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(178) = 591.136, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 175) = 1.136, *p =* .343. *R2* = .0069  *QW*(175) = 585.745, *p* < .001  *F*(3, 184) = 0.355, *p =* .786. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(184) = 674.945, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Table S–5.*

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and LB, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver. Other int.  Adhoc int. | 105  69  145  27  69  66  38  72  3  58  3  30  7  128  37  6  8 | 101,905  350,786  427,897  24,014  350,786  73,482  28,110  368,326  6,291  34,369  952  24,861  17,579  434,737  21,398  5,356  3,691 | .048  .029  .044  .029  .029  .065  .021  .027  –.025  .070  –.057  .017  .116  .041  .020  .040  .001 | [.023, .073]  [–.001, .058]  [.023, .065]  [–.022, .080]  [–.000, .058]  [.035, .096]  [–.022, .063]  [–.001, .056]  [–.162, .114]  [.037, .102]  [–.211, .100]  [–.030, .064]  [.023, .208]  [.019, .062]  [–.024, .064]  [–.058, .136]  [–.084, .086] | *F*(1, 172) = 0.977, *p =* .324. *R2* = .0042  *QW*(172) = 2,199.971, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 170) = 0 .279, *p =* .598. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(170) = 2,523.955, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 170) = 1.989, *p =* .140. *R2* = .0147  *QW*(170) = 2,096.131, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 167) = 1.984, *p =* .084. *R2* = .0361  *QW*(167) = 1,755.609, *p* < .001  *F*(3, 175) = 0.461, *p =* .710. *R2* = .000  *QW*(175) = 2,429.727, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Table S–6.*

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and the Authority/Subversion Dimension, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver.  Other int. Adhoc int. | 104  72  150  25  72  66  37  75  3  61  3  28  5  126  39  6  10 | 94,018  353,059  422,791  23,673  353,059  65,813  27,892  370,599  6,291  34,230  952  24,520  10,172  425,663  22,894  5,356  3,963 | .057  .079  .069  .056  .079  .055  .063  .079  .007  .070  .003  .040  .052  .064  .059  .062  .054 | [.034, .080]  [.052, .105]  [.050, .088]  [.007, .105]  [.052, .105]  [.026, .083]  [.023, .103]  [.052, .104]  [–.124,.138]  [.040, .100]  [–.145, .152]  [–.006, .086]  [–.061, .164]  [.044, .084]  [.019, .098]  [–.029, .151]  [–.018, .125] | *F*(1, 174) = 1.494, *p =* .223. *R2* = .0040  *QW*(174) = 1,390.309, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 173) = 0.235, *p =* .628. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(173) = 1,443.018, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 172) = 0.755, *p =* .471. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(172) = 1,373.096, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 169) = 0.724, *p =* .606. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(169) = 1,299.397, *p* < .001  *F*(3, 177) = 0.035, *p =* .991. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(177) = 1,312.534, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Table S–7.*

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and PD, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver.  Other int. Adhoc int. | 104  74  152  25  74  68  35  77  3  59  3  28  7  127  37  6  13 | 100,733  352,537  428,814  23,843  352,537  72,854  27,566  370,077  6,291  33,368  952  24,690  17,579  431,030  22,409  5,356  3,455 | .079  .065  .078  .055  .065  .100  .039  .066  –.016  .099  .011  .039  .156  .074  .063  .048  .052 | [.054, .103]  [.037, .093]  [.058, .097]  [.004, .106]  [.038, .093]  [.070, .129]  [–.004, .082]  [.039, .093]  [–.151, .120]  [.067, .130]  [–.142, .165]  [–.009, .086]  [.065, .244]  [.053, .095]  [.019, .106]  [–.048, .144]  [–.016, .119] | *F*(1, 176) = 0.550, *p =* .459. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(176) = 2,087.459, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 175) = 0.659, *p =* .418. *R2* = .0015  *QW*(175) = 2,403.118, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 174) = 2.979, *p =* .054. *R2* = .0286  *QW*(174) = 1,962.751, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 171) = 2.066, *p =* .072. *R2* = .0382  *QW*(171) = 1,725.033, *p* < .001  *F*(3, 179) = 0.253, *p =* .860. *R2* = .0382  *QW*(179) = 2,336.053, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Table S–8.*

***Results of the Weighted Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) Applied on Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for the Relationship between Age and BF, Taking Qualitative Moderator Variables as Independent Variables***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | ***k*** | ***N*** | 𝒃𝒋 | **95% CI** | **ANOVA results** |
| USA sample No  Yes  Asian sample No  Yes Weirdness USA  West Rest  Continent  North Am. South Am. Europe Africa Asia Oceania  Instrument  mfq30 Other ver. Other int. Adhoc int. | 29  7  29  7  7  21  4  8  5  14  1  7  1  1  31  0  4 | 10,032  5,549  14,206  1,375  5,549  8,588  1,444  11,426  574  2,038  69  1,375  99  502  13,386  0  1,693 | –.021  –.010  –.014  –.032  –.010  –.016  –.033  –.019  .048  –.016  –.037  –.032  –.226  .130  –.030  -  .010 | [–.073, .031]  [–.097, .077]  [–.064, .035]  [–.132, .068]  [–.098, .079]  [–.078, .047]  [–.130, .065]  [–.101, .063]  [–.083, .177]  [–.094, .062]  [–.354, .288]  [–.134, .070]  [–.487, .072]  [–.096, .344]  [–.078, .019]  -  [–.105, .125] | *F*(1, 34) = 0.049, *p =* .827. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(34) = 225.748, *p* < .001  *F*(1, 34) = 0.106, *p =* .747. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(34) = 227.257, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 33) = 0.068, *p =* .934. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(33) = 224.803, *p* < .001  *F*(5, 30) = 0.641, *p =* .670. *R2* = .0000  *QW*(30) = 207.749, *p* < .001  *F*(2, 33) = 1.125, *p =* .337. *R2* = .0100  *QW*(33) = 195.272, *p* < .001 |

*Note. k* = number of independent samples with respect to the 43 samples for which alpha coefficients were available; *N* = total sample size; 𝛼+= pooled Cronbach’s alpha estimate; *F* = Knapp-Hartung’s statistic for testing the significance of the moderator variable; *QW* = statistic for testing the model misspecification; *R2* = proportion of variance accounted for by the moderator.

# <H2> *Figures S–1 to S–8*. Scatter Diagrams of the Relationship between Mean age (X-axis) and Age Correlations with the Different Moral Dimensions

<H3> *1.Harm/Care*



<H3> *2. Fairness/Cheating*

![Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated]()

<H3> *3. Loyalty/Betrayal*



<H3> *4. Authority/Subversion*

![Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated]()

<H3> *5. Purity/Degradation*

![Chart, scatter chart

Description automatically generated]()

<H3> *6. Individualizing Foundations*

![Chart

Description automatically generated]()

<H3> *7. Binding Foundations*

![Chart

Description automatically generated]()

<H2> ***References Included in the Meta-Analysis***

<REFJ> Akers, L. (2012). *Patterns in individual endorsement of societal metanarratives* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon]. DSpace.

<REFJ> Allen, S., McCright, A. M., & Dietz, T. (2017). A social movement identity instrument for integrating survey methods into social movements research. *SAGE Open, 7*(2), [https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017708819](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244017708819)

<REFJ> Almeida, P. R., Seixas, M. J., Ferreira-Santos, F., Vieira, J. B., Paiva, T. O., Moreira, P. S., & Costa, P. (2015). Empathic, moral and antisocial outcomes associated with distinct components of psychopathy in healthy individuals: A Triarchic model approach. *Personality and Individual Differences, 85*, 205–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.012" \o "Persistent link using digital object identifier" \t "_blank)

<REFJ> Ashdown, B. K., Hackathorn, J. M., & Daniels, J. (2018). Scandalous: Christian identification, sex guilt, and the mediated demonization of the participants in the AshleyMadison scandal. *The Journal of social psychology, 159*(3), 244–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1461603>

<REFJ> Baldner, C., Pierro, A., Chernikova, M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2018). When and why do liberals and conservatives think alike? *Social Psychology, 49,* 360–368 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000354>

<REFJ> Bentley, J. W., Bloomfield, M. J., Bloomfield, R. J., & Lambert, T. A. (2018). *Measure management and the masses: How acceptability of operating and reporting distortion varies with justification, demography, and moral consequences.* SSRN.

<REFJ> Black, J. E., & Barnes, J. L. (2017). Measuring the unimaginable: Imaginative resistance to fiction and related constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 111*, 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.055>

<REFJ> Black, J. E., Helmy, Y., Robson, O., & Barnes, J. L. (2018). Who can resist a villain? Morality, Machiavellianism, imaginative resistance and liking for dark fictional characters. *Poetics, 74*, Article101344.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.12.005>

<REFJ> Bobbio, A., Nencini, A., & Sarrica, M. (2011). Il Moral Foundation Questionnaire: Analisi della struttura fattoriale della versione italiana [The Moral Foundation Questionnaire: Analysis of the factorial structure of the Italian version] *Giornale di Psicologia, 5*(1), 7–18. [www.psicotecnica.net/gdp/GiornaleDiPsicologia.2011.5.1-2.pdf#page=9](http://www.psicotecnica.net/gdp/GiornaleDiPsicologia.2011.5.1-2.pdf#page=9)

<REFJ> Bowman, N. D., Jöckel, S., & Dogruel, L. (2012). A question of morality? The influence of moral salience and nationality on media preferences. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research, 3*7(4), 345–369. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2012-0020>

<REFJ> Brasini, M., Del Vecchio, S., Gregni, E., Casali, C., Mira, F., Capuano, N., Questa, V., Giacomantonio, M., & Mancini, F. (2018). Fairness is a more effective interpersonal motive than care for sustaining prosocial behaviour. *Psychology, 9*(06), 1426–1443. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.96087>

<REFJ> Cantarero, K., Szarota, P., Stamkou, E., Navas, M., & Domínguez Espinosa, A. d. C. (2021). The effects of culture and moral foundations on moral judgments: The ethics of authority mediates the relationship between power distance and attitude towards lying to one’s supervisor. *Current Psychology*, *40*, 675–683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9945-0>

<REFJ> Choi, J.-A., & Lewis, R. (2017). Culture and the star-power strategy: Comparing American and Korean response to celebrity-endorsed advertising. *Journal of Global Marketing, 30*(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2016.1242681>

<REFJ> Chowdhury, R. M. M. I. (2017). The moral foundations of consumer ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 158*(3), 585–601 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3676-2>

<REFJ> Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., Turan, N., Morse, L., & Kim, Y. (2014). Moral character in the workplace. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*(5), 943–963 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037245>

<REFJ> Cornwell, J. F. M., & Higgins, E. T. (2014). Locomotion concerns with moral usefulness: When liberals endorse conservative binding moral foundations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.09.007>

<REFJ> Crimston, D., Bain, P. G., Hornsey, M. J., & Bastian, B. (2016). Moral expansiveness: Examining variability in the extension of the moral world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 111*(4), 636–653. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000086>

<REFJ> Curry, O. S., Chesters, M. J., & van Lissa, C. J. (2019). Mapping morality with a compass: Testing the theory of ‘morality-as-cooperation’with a new questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *78*, 106–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.10.008>

<REFJ> Da Silva Dias, R. (2017). *Political views, morality, and attitudes toward marijuana legalization* [Doctoral dissertation, Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas]. Repositório Digital FGV. <https://bibliotecadigital.fgv.br/dspace/handle/10438/24098>

<REFJ> Davies, C. L., Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2014). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire. Independent scale validation in a New Zealand sample. *Social Psychology, 45,* 431–436. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000201>

<REFJ> Dewulf, I. (2013). *Burgers melden misdaad wel of niet: welke factoren beïnvloeden dit?* [Citizens report crime or not: Which factors influence this? [Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente]. University of Twente Student Theses. <https://essay.utwente.nl/64018/>

<REFJ> Di Battista, S., Pivetti, M., & Berti, C. (2018). Moral foundations, political orientation and religiosity in Italy. *The Open Psychology Journal, 11*(1). 46–58. https://doi.org/[10.2174/1874350101811010046](http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1874350101811010046)

<REFJ> Diessner, R., Iyer, R., Smith, M. M., & Haidt, J. (2013). Who engages with moral beauty? *Journal of Moral Education, 42*(2), 139–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2013.785941>

<REFJ> Djeriouat, H., & Trémolière, B. (2014). The Dark Triad of personality and utilitarian moral judgment: The mediating role of Honesty/Humility and Harm/Care. *Personality and Individual Differences, 67,* 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.12.026>

<REFJ> Erceg, N., Galić, Z., & Bubić, A. (2018). The psychology of economic attitudes–Moral foundations predict economic attitudes beyond socio-demographic variables. *Croatian Economic Survey, 20*(1), 37–70. <https://doi.org/10.15179/ces.20.1.2>

<REFJ> Federico, C. M., Ekstrom, P., Tagar, M. R., & Williams, A. L. (2016). Epistemic motivation and the structure of moral intuition: Dispositional need for closure as a predictor of individualizing and binding morality. *European Journal of Personality, 30*(3), 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2055>

<REFJ> Feldman, G. (2020) *Personal values and moral foundations: Towards an integrated perspective by examining meaning, structure, and relations.* Researchgate.<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32570.49600/5>

<REFJ> Findor, A. (2015). Moral foundations of welfare attitudes: The role of moral intuition and reasoning in pursuing social justice. *Central European Journal of Public Policy, 9*(2), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cejpp-2016-0013>

<REFJ> Findor, A., Maďarová, Z., & Ostertágová, A. (2014). Dotazník morálnych základov: Adaptácia a využitie v kontexte Slovenskej republiky. Fenomén moci a sociálne nerovnosti [Moral Foundations Questionnaire: Adaptation and use in the context of the Slovak Republic. The phenomenon of power and social inequality]. In L. Bomba, E. Kövérová, & M. Smrek (Eds.), Fenomén moci a sociálne nerovnosti. Zborník príspevkov z nultého ročníka konferencie doktorandov a mladých vedeckých pracovníkov [The phenomenon of power and social inequality. Proceedings of the year zero conference of doctoral students and young researchers] (pp. 55–80). Univerzita Komenského.

<REFJ> Forscher, P. S., & Kteily, N. S. (2020). A psychological profile of the alt-right. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(1), 90–116. [https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619868208](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1745691619868208)

<REFJ> Franks, A. S., & Scherr, K. C. (2015). Using moral foundations to predict voting behavior: Regression models from the 2012 U.S. presidential election. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 15(*1), 213–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12074>

<REFJ> Franks, A. S., & Scherr, K. C. (2018). Economic issues are moral issues: The moral underpinnings of the desire to reduce wealth inequality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(4), 553–562. [https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550618772821](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1948550618772821)

<REFJ> Funk, C. (2017). *Elements of moral functioning in sport and school.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-St. Louis]. University of Missouri-St. Louis Institutional Repository Library <https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation/709>

<REFJ> Gay, J. G., Vitacco, M. J., Hackney, A., Beussink, C., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2018). Relations among psychopathy, moral competence, and moral intuitions in student and community samples. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *23*(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lcrp.12128>

<REFJ> Giacomantonio, M., Pierro, A., Baldner, C., & Kruglanski, A. (2017). Need for closure, torture, and punishment motivations. *Social Psychology, 48,* 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000321>

<REFJ> Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029–1046. [https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0015141)

<REFJ> Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 366–385, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>

<REFJ> Greenway, T. S., Schnitker, S. A., & Shepherd, A. M. (2018). Can prayer increase charitable giving? Examining the effects of intercessory prayer, moral intuitions, and theological orientation on generous behavior. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 28*(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2017.1406790>

<REFJ> Hahnel, U. J., & Brosch, T. (2018). Environmental trait affect. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *59*, 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.08.015>

<REFJ> Halevy, N., Jun, S., & Chou, E. Y. (2018). Intergroup conflict is our business: CEOs’ ethical intergroup leadership fuels stakeholder support for corporate intergroup responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics,* *162*, 229–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4013-0>

<REFJ> Harnish, R. J., Bridges, K. R., & Gump, J. T. (2018). Predicting economic, social, and foreign policy conservatism: The role of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, moral foundations orientation, and religious fundamentalism. *Current Psychology, 37*(3), 668–679. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9552-x>

<REFJ> Harper, C. A., & Hogue, T. E. (2018). The role of intuitive moral foundations in Britain's vote on EU membership. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 29*(2), 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2386>

<REFJ> Howell, A. J., Dopko, R. L., Turowski, J. B., & Buro, K. (2011). The disposition to apologize. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(4), 509–514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.009>

<REFJ> Jarmakowski-Kostrzanowski, T., & Jarmakowska-Kostrzanowski, L. (2016). Polska adaptacja Kwestionariusza kodów moralnych (MFQ-PL) [The Polish adaptation of the Moral Foundation Questionnaire (MFQ-PL)] *Psychologia Społeczna, XI*(39), 489–508. <https://doi.org/10.7366/1896180020163908>

<REFJ> Ji, Q., & Janicke, S. H. (2018). Culture, political orientation, and moral foundations: A comparison between China and the US. *China Media Research, 14*(1), 62-75.

<REFJ> Jöckel, S., & Früh, H. (2016). ‘The world ain’t all sunshine’: Investigating the relationship between mean world beliefs, conservatism and crime TV. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research, 41*(2), 195–217. <http://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2016-0001>

<REFJ> Johnson, K. A., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., van Tongeren, D. R., Sandage, S. J., & Crabtree, S. A. (2016). Moral foundation priorities reflect U.S. Christians' individual differences in religiosity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 100,* 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.037>

<REFJ> Jones, D. N. (2015). The framing of moral foundations alters perceptions of ethical business practices. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, 20*(2). <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-201804202309>

<REFJ> Kang, L. L., Rowatt, W. C., & Fergus, T. A. (2016). Moral foundations and obsessive-compulsive symptoms: A preliminary examination. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders, 11*, 22–30. [http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2016.06.004](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2016.06.004)

<REFJ> Karandikar, S., Kapoor, H., Fernandes, S., & Jonason, P. K. (2018). Predicting moral decision-making with dark personalities and moral values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 140*, 70–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.048>

<REFJ> Katzarska-Miller, I., & Reysen, S. (2018). Inclusive global citizenship education: Measuring types of global citizens. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education, 6*, Article 1. <http://journals.sfu.ca/jgcee/index.php/jgcee/article/view/159>

<REFJ> Kawamoto, T., van der Linden, D., & Dunkel, C. S. (2017). The General Factor of Personality (GFP) and moral foundations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119,* 78–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.06.043>

<REFJ> Kerry, N., & Murray, D. R. (2018). Conservative parenting: Investigating the relationships between parenthood, moral judgment, and social conservatism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 134,* 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.05.045>

<REFJ> Kertzer, J. D., Powers, K. E., Rathbun, B. C., & Iyer, R. (2014). Moral support: How moral values shape foreign policy attitudes. *The Journal of Politics, 76*(3), 825–840. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022381614000073>

<REFJ> Kim, K. R., Kang, J.-S., & Yun, S. (2012). Moral intuitions and political orientation: Similarities and differences between South Korea and the United States. *Psychological Reports, 111*(1), 173–185. [https://doi.org/10.2466/17.09.21.PR0.111.4.173-185](https://doi.org/10.2466%2F17.09.21.PR0.111.4.173-185)

<REFJ> Kivikangas, J. M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., & Ravaja, N. (2017). Relationship of moral foundations to political liberalism-conservatism and left-right orientation in a Finnish representative sample. *Social Psychology, 48,* 246–251. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000297>

<REFJ> Klein, R. A., Vianello, M., Hasselman, F., Adams, B. G., Adams, R. B., Jr., Alper, S., Aveyard, M., Axt, J. R., Babalola, M. T., Bahník, Š., Batra, R., Berkics, M., Bernstein, M. J., Berry, D. R., Bialobrzeska, O., Binan, E. D., Bocian, K., Brandt, M. J., Busching, R., … Nosek, B. A. (2018). Many Labs 2: Investigating variation in replicability across samples and settings. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *1*(4), 443–490. [https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918810225](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2515245918810225)

<REFJ> Koleva, S. P., Graham, J., Iyer, R., Ditto, P. H., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially Purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(2), 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.01.006>

<REFJ> Konishi, N., Oe, T., Shimizu, H., Tanaka, K., & Ohtsubo, Y. (2017). Perceived shared condemnation intensifies punitive moral emotions. *Scientific Reports, 7*, Article 7289. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07916-z>

<REFJ> Laakasuo, M., Drosinou, M., Koverola, M., Kunnari, A., Halonen, J., Lehtonen, N., & Palomäki, J. (2018). What makes people approve or condemn mind upload technology? Untangling the effects of sexual disgust, purity and science fiction familiarity. *Palgrave Communications, 4*(1), Article 84. <http://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0124-6>

<REFJ> Laakasuo, M., Köbis, N., Palomäki, J., & Jokela, M. (2018). Money for microbes—Pathogen avoidance and out‐group helping behaviour. *International Journal of Psychology*, *53*, 1–10. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12416>

<REFJ> Lake, D. A., & Lindsey, D. (2013, August 29-September 1). *Moral foundations and individual-level foreign policy preferences* [Paper presentation]. American Political Science Association 2013 Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, United States. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2299839>

<REFJ> Landmann, H., & Hess, U. (2018). Testing moral foundation theory: Are specific moral emotions elicited by specific moral transgressions? *Journal of Moral Education*, *47*(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2017.1350569>

<REFJ> Leone, L., Giacomantonio, M., & Lauriola, M. (2019). Moral foundations, worldviews, moral absolutism and belief in conspiracy theories. *International Journal of Psychology*, *54*(2), 197–204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12459>

<REFJ> Li, Z., Wu, X., Zhang, L., & Zhang, Z. (2017). Habitual cognitive reappraisal was negatively related to perceived immorality in the harm and fairness domains. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8,* Article 1805. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01805>

<REFJ> Low, M., & Wui, M. G. L. (2016). Moral foundations and attitudes towards the poor. *Current Psychology, 35*(4), 650–656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-015-9333-y>

<REFJ> Macko, A. (2012). Intuicje moralne młodych polskich liberałów i konserwatystów [Moral intuitions of young Polish liberals and conservatives]. *Psychologia Społeczna, 7*(22), 245–260. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=90989>

<REFJ> Malka, A., Osborne, D., Soto, C. J., Greaves, L. M., Sibley, C. G., & Lelkes, Y. (2016). Binding moral foundations and the narrowing of ideological conflict to the traditional morality domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*(9), 1243–1257. [https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216653936](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167216653936)

<REFJ> Marszalek, J. M., Barber, C., & Nilsson, J. E. (2017). Development of the Social Issues Advocacy Scale–2 (SIAS–2). *Social Justice Research, 30*(2), 117–144. [https://doi.org/[10.1007/s11211-017-0284-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11211-017-0284-3)](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167216653936)

<REFJ> McAdams, D. P., Albaugh, M., Farber, E., Daniels, J., Logan, R. L., & Olson, B. (2008). Family metaphors and moral intuitions: How conservatives and liberals narrate their lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(4), 978–990. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0012650>

<REFJ> Meagher, B. R. (2019). Moral representativeness and satisfaction with one’s religious community. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 29*(1), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2018.1544447>

<REFJ> Međedović, J., & Petrović, B. (2016). Can there be an immoral morality? Dark personality traits as predictors of moral foundations. *Psihologija, 49*(2), 185–197. <https://doi.org/10.2298/PSI1602185M>

<REFJ> Métayer, S. (2014). *Sanctionner l'auteur d'une transgression: Étude d'une composante motivationnelle des valeurs morales* [Sanctify the author of a transgression: Study of a motivational component of moral values] [Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris Descartes]. Theses.fr.

<REFJ> Milesi, P. (2016). Moral foundations and political attitudes: The moderating role of political sophistication. *International Journal of Psychology*, *51*(4), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12158>

<REFJ> Milesi, P. (2017). Moral foundations and voting intention in Italy. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *13*(4), 667–687. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v13i4.1391>

<REFJ> Milesi, P., & Alberici, A. I. (2018). Pluralistic morality and collective action: The role of moral foundations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(2), 235–256. [https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216675707](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1368430216675707)

<REFJ> Minton, E. A., Johnson, K. A., & Liu, R. L. (2019). Religiosity and special food consumption: The explanatory effects of moral priorities. *Journal of Business Research*, *95*, 442–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.041>

<REFJ> Mitrić-Aćimović, D. (2015). *Uloga moralnosti i organizacijska kontekst u formiranju spremnosti za korupciju* [The role of morality and organizational context in the formation of readiness for corruption] [Doctoral dissertation, University of Novi Sad]*.* Current Research Information System University of Novi Sad. <http://www.cris.uns.ac.rs/DownloadFileServlet/Disertacija143618499484652.pdf?controlNumber=(BISIS)95363&fileName=143618499484652.pdf&id=3908&source=NaRDuS&language=sr>

<REFJ> Nechtelberger, A., Renner, W., Nechtelberger, M., Supeková, S. C., Hadjimarkou, M., Offurum, C., Ramalingam, P., Senft, B., & Redfern, K. (2017). Adopting basic principles of the United Nations Academic Impact Initiative (UNAI): Can cultural differences be predicted from value orientations and globalization? *Frontiers in Psychology, 8,* Article 1977. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01977>

<REFJ> Nilsson, A., & Erlandsson, A. (2015). The Moral Foundations taxonomy: Structural validity and relation to political ideology in Sweden. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*, 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.049>

<REFJ> Nilsson, A., Erlandsson, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2016). The congruency between moral foundations and intentions to donate, self-reported donations, and actual donations to charity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 65,* 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.07.001>

<REFJ> Nilsson, A., Erlandsson, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2020). Moral foundations theory and the psychology of charitable giving. *European Journal of Personality*, *34*(3), 431–447. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2256>

<REFJ> Ochoa, D. P., Sio, C. P., Quiñones, D. M., & Manalastas, E. J. (2016). A bond between man and woman: Religiosity, moral foundations, and same-sex marriage attitudes in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 49*(2), 157–171. <http://www.tinyurl.com/ybgrcv3j>

<REFJ> Palich, L. E., Neubert, M. J., & McKinney, J. A. (2016). Ethical attitudes of business professionals in China and the United States: Same or different? *The Journal of Business Inquiry, 15*(2), 55–84.

<REFJ> Panczyk, M., Jaworski, M., Iwanow, L., Cieślak, I., & Gotlib, J. (2019). Psychometric properties of Authentic Leadership Self‐Assessment Questionnaire in a population‐based sample of Polish nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *75*(3), 692–703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13922>

<REFJ> Peker, M., Gündoğdu, N., & Booth, R. W. (2015). Perceived self‐society moral discrepancies predict depression but not anxiety. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1*8(4), 337–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12100>

<REFJ> Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Barr, N., Koehler, D. J., & Fugelsang, J. A. (2014). The role of analytic thinking in moral judgements and values. *Thinking & Reasoning, 20*(2), 188–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2013.865000>

<REFJ> Pyszczynski, T., Kesebir, P., Motyl, M., Yetzer, A., & Anson, J. M. (2018). *Ideological consistency, political orientation, and variability across moral foundations.* PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/qgmsc>

<REFJ> Quintelier, K. J. P., Ishii, K., Weeden, J., Kurzban, R., & Braeckman, J. (2013). Individual differences in reproductive strategy are related to views about recreational drug use in Belgium, the Netherlands, and Japan. *Human Nature, 24*(2), 196–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-013-9165-0>

<REFJ> Rathbun, B. C., Powers, K. E., & Anders, T. (2019). Moral hazard: German public opinion on the Greek debt crisis. *Political Psychology*, *40*(3), 523–541. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12522>

<REFJ> Rebega, O. L. (2017). Gender differences in moral concerns, guilt and shame proness, and empathy. *Romanian Journal of Experimental Applied Psychology, 8.* 130–135 [https://doi.org/10.15303/rjeap.2017.si1.a20](https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12522)

<REFJ> Regts, G. J. (2015). *Elections have consequences: Moral value foundations ensure gridlock through the ballot box* (No. 349)[Doctoral dissertation, Loma Linda University]. TheScholarsRepository@LLU. <https://scholarsrepository.llu.edu/etd/349/>

<REFJ> Rempala, D. M., Okdie, B. M., & Garvey, K. J. (2016). Articulating ideology: How liberals and conservatives justify political affiliations using morality-based explanations. *Motivation and Emotion, 40*(5), 703–719. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9563-9>

<REFJ> Rutjens, B. T., Sutton, R. M., & van der Lee, R. (2018). Not all skepticism is equal: Exploring the ideological antecedents of science acceptance and rejection. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 44*(3), 384–405. [https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217741314](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167217741314)

<REFJ> Rutjens, B. T., van Harreveld, F., van Der Pligt, J., van Elk, M., & Pyszczynski, T. (2016). A march to a better world? Religiosity and the existential function of belief in social-moral progress. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 26*(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2014.990345>

<REFJ> Sağel, E. (2015). Age differences in moral foundations across adolescence and adulthood [Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University]. METU Theses. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12619122/index.pdf>

<REFJ> Saldarriaga, L., Vallejo, K., Olivera-La Rosa, A., & Bohner, G. (2017, March 26-29) *Moral foundations: Validation of a Spanish-language questionnaire in Colombia* [Poster presentation]. TeaP 2017 – 59th Conference of Experimental Psychologists, Dresden, Germany. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315474710_Moral_Foundations_Validation_of_a_Spanish-language_questionnaire_in_Colombia>

<REFJ> Santos-Lang, C. (2016). *Measuring evaluative computational differences in humans.* CiteSeer. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.695.1885&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

<REFJ> Silver, J. R., & Silver, E. (2017). Why are conservatives more punitive than liberals? A moral foundation approach. *Law and Human Behavior, 41*(3), 258–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000232>

<REFJ> Smith, K. B., Alford, J. R., Hibbing, J. R., Martin, N. G., & Hatemi, P. K. (2017). Intuitive ethics and political orientations: Testing moral foundations as a theory of political ideology. *American Journal of Political Science, 61*(2), 424–437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12255>

<REFJ> Ståhl, T., Zaal, M. P., & Skitka, L. J. (2016). Moralized rationality: Relying on logic and evidence in the formation and evaluation of belief can be seen as a moral issue. *PLOS ONE, 11*(11), Article e0166332. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166332>

<REFJ> Steiger, R. L., & Reyna, C. (2017). Trait contempt, anger, disgust, and moral foundation values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 113,* 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.071>

<REFJ> Stevens, S. T. (2013). *Political ideology as moral vigilance* [Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University]. RUcore: Rutgers University Community Repository. <https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/41925/PDF/1/>

<REFJ> Stolerman, D., & Lagnado, D. (2020) The moral foundations of human rights attitudes. *Political Psychology, 41*(3), 439–459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12539>

<REFJ> Süssenbach, P., Rees, J., & Gollwitzer, M. (2019). When the going gets tough, individualizers get going: On the relationship between moral foundations and prosociality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *136*, 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.01.019>

<REFJ> Sychev, O. A., Bespalov, A. M., Prudnikova, M. M., & Vlasov, M. S. (2016). Osobennosti moral'nykh osnovaniy u mongol'skikh, nemetskikh i rossiyskikh podrostkov [Features of the moral foundations of Mongolian, German and Russian teenagers]. *Cultural-Historical Psychology, 12*(1), 85–96.

<REFJ> Sychev, O. A., Protasova, I. N., & Belousov, K. I. (2018). Diagnostika moral'nykh osnovaniy: aprobatsiya russkoyazychnoy versii oprosnika MFQ [Diagnostics of moral grounds: Testing of the Russian version of the MFQ questionnaire]. *Materialy, 15*(3), 88–115. <http://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2018.3.5>

<REFJ> Sychev, O. A., & Trofimova, E. M. (2018). Values and moral foundations as a basis for attitude toward mentally retarded people in students. *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics, 15*(1), 53–66. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2313-1683-2018-15-1-53-66>

<REFJ> Tagar, M. R., Hetherington, C., Shulman, D., & Koenig, M. (2017). On the path to social dominance? Individual differences in sensitivity to intergroup fairness violations in early childhood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 113,* 246–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.03.020>

<REFJ> Teo, L., & Chan-Serafin, S. (2013, December 4-6). *Moral foundations in organizations: Exploring the role of moral concerns and organizational identification on unethical pro-organizational behaviours* [Paper presentation]. 27th Australian And New Zealand Academy of Management Conference, Hobart, Australia. <http://www.anzam.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf-manager/48_ANZAM-2013-085.PDF>

<REFJ> Trups-Kalne, I. (2014).Sociālā konservatīvisma skalas latviešu valodā izveide un validitātes pārbaude [Construction and validation of social conservativism scale in Latvian]. *Psiholoģija, 801,* 7–34.

<REFJ> van Leeuwen, F., & Park, J. H. (2013). *Moral concerns about purity may be driven by sexual disgust rather than pathogen disgust* [Poster presentation]. 8th European Human Behaviour and Evolution Association Conference, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands. <https://www.ehbea2013.com/ehbea_details/upload/files/1448.pdf>

<REFJ> Voelkel, J. G., & Brandt, M. J. (2019). The effect of ideological identification on the endorsement of moral values depends on the target group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 45*(6), 851–863. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218798822>

<REFJ> Wagemans, F. M. A., Brandt, M. J., & Zeelenberg, M. (2018a). Disgust sensitivity is primarily associated with purity-based moral judgments. *Emotion, 18*(2), 277–289. [https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000359](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/emo0000359)

<REFJ> Wagemans, F. M. A., Brandt, M. J., & Zeelenberg, M. (2018b). Weirdness of disgust sensitivity items predicts their relationship to purity moral judgments. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *146*, 182–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.042>

<REFJ> Waytz, A., Dungan, J., & Young, L. (2013). The whistleblower's dilemma and the fairness–loyalty tradeoff. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*(6), 1027–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.07.002>

<REFJ> Wheeler, M. A., & Laham, S. M. (2016). What we talk about when we talk about morality: Deontological, consequentialist, and emotive language use in justifications across foundation-specific moral violations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*(9), 1206–1216. [https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216653374](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167216653374)

<REFJ> Xiong, X., Guo, S., Gu, L., Huang, R., & Zhou, X. (2018). Reciprocity anxiety: Individual differences in feeling discomfort in reciprocity situations. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *67*, 149–161. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.05.007>

<REFJ> Yalçın, Ö. (2017). Sosyal baskınlık yönelimi ahlaki standartları farklı ahlaki temeller boyunca perdeliyor: ahlaki geri çekilmede bireysel farklılıklar [Social dominance orientation veils moral standards across different moral foundations: Individual differences in moral disengagement]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 3*2(80), 44–62.

<REFJ> Yalçındağ, B., Özkan, T., Cesur, S., Yilmaz, O., Tepe, B., Piyale, Z. E., Biten, A .F, & Sunar, D. (2019). An investigation of moral foundations theory in Turkey using different measures*. Current Psychology, 38,* 440–457*.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9618-4>

<REFJ> Zhang, J. (2017). Is support of censoring controversial media content for the good of others? Sexual strategies and support of censoring pro-alcohol advertising. *Evolutionary Psychology, 15*(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704917742808>

<REFJ> Zhang, Y., & Li, S. (2015). Two measures for cross-cultural research on morality: Comparison and revision. *Psychological Reports, 117*(1), 144–166. [https://doi.org/10.2466/08.07.PR0.117c15z5](https://doi.org/10.2466%2F08.07.PR0.117c15z5)