Article:
Prestwich, A orcid.org/0000-0002-7489-6415, Lalljee, M and Laham, SM (2021) The Morality-Agency-Communion (MAC) model of respect and liking. European Journal of Social Psychology, 51 (6). pp. 1019-1034. ISSN 0046-2772

https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2804

The Morality-Agency-Communion (MAC) model of respect and liking

Andrew Prestwich

School of Psychology, University of Leeds, UK

Mansur Lalljee

Jesus College, University of Oxford, UK

and

Simon M. Laham

Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne

Word Count: 9701 words

This is the final submitted version of the manuscript accepted for publication in *European Journal of Social Psychology*. The final version, including the supplementary materials, will be available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ejsp.2804

Running Title: MAC Model of Respect & Liking

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Saniya Rabbani, James Anthony Wilkinson, Nicole Atkins, Lizzie Berry, Megan Doherty, Emily Francis and Charlotte James for their assistance with data collection and data entry for Study 4. Financial support for Studies 3 and 4 was provided by the University of Leeds.

Abstract

Traits can primarily facilitate one's own goals (agentic) or those of others (communal) with the former linked with respect and the latter with liking. However, communal traits vary in morality, which has been associated with respect. Four studies tested the impact of traits varying in morality, agency (competence or assertiveness) and communion (warmth) on ratings of respect and liking. Studies 1 and 2 used vignettes targeting integrity (communion-moral), competency (agency-competence) and friendliness (communion-warmth), while Studies 3 and 4 considered a broader range of pre-rated traits (Studies 3 and 4). Communal traits with a limited moral component were associated more with liking than with respect. Communal traits with a stronger moral component were associated at least as, and sometimes more, strongly with respect than liking. Moral traits were the most respected trait type and were similarly liked as warmth traits. Morality influences whether communal traits primarily influence liking and/or respect.

Keywords: respect; liking; morality; agency; communion.

People form impressions of others on the basis of their actions and inferred traits. Such actions or traits are typically categorised into one of two broad dimensions, variously labelled (Abele, Cuddy, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2008): competence versus warmth (e.g., Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002; Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt & Kashima, 2007), intellectual versus social (Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968), social utility versus social desirability (Dubois & Beauvois, 2005), self-profitability versus other-profitability (Peeters, 1992) or agency versus communion (e.g., Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Bakan, 1966). The group of traits labelled as (for example) agency (e.g., intelligent, assertive) typically facilitate the pursuit of one's own goals. The group of traits labelled as (for example) communion (e.g., caring, friendly) typically help people to get along with others.

Previous work by Wojciszke et al. (2009) suggests that agentic traits are more strongly related to respect than to liking. Conversely, communal traits are more strongly related to liking than to respect (see also Montoya & Horton, 2014; Wortman & Wood, 2011). According to Wojciszke et al. (2009) agentic traits such as being conscientious or assertive provide information about an individual's ability to reach a high social status (with previous evidence also supporting the reverse pathway: status influences perceptions of competence, e.g., Caprariello, Cuddy & Fiske, 2009; Russell & Fiske, 2008). In turn, this increased status potential leads to greater respect (an evaluative stance where particular others are deeply admired or held in high regard based on their traits or actions, as well as their achievements, status or being human; see, Lalljee, Tam, Hewstone, Laham & Lee, 2009). Wojciszke et al. (2009), in keeping with previous research (e.g., Park & Flink, 1989), also argue that communal-type traits such as being friendly or caring increases liking (an evaluative stance where individuals' have a preference or fondness for specific others due, in particular, to their traits or actions) because these traits indicate benevolence or potential benefits to other people, including the perceiver. Wojciszke et al. report a series of studies that support this model, and indeed a model of this sort

has support from a number of other studies (e.g., Hamilton & Fallot, 1974; Kiesler & Goldberg, 1968; Prestwich & Lalljee, 2009; Rosenberg et al., 1968).

While Wojciszke et al.'s (2009) model relating agentic traits to respect and communal traits to liking provides a parsimonious account of the factors influencing respect and liking, there are a number of issues. First, the studies they report involved grouping lists of characteristics, a practice criticised by Goodwin, Piazza and Rozin (2014) as the results could show general effects of a group of traits even if each trait did not work in the same way. Second, models such as these may offer an overly simplistic explanation of person perception. For example, Brambilla and Leach (2014) note that communion should be considered as comprising two sub-components- morality and sociability (see also Landy, Piazza, & Goodwin, 2016; Leach, Ellemers & Barreto, 2007), while Abele, Hauke, Peters, Louvet, Szymkow and Duan (2016) note similar sub-dimensions of morality and warmth. In essence, grouping a variety of traits into broad categories, such as communion versus agency or warmth versus competence, ignores important differences between the traits within each category.

Third, traits reflecting communion or warmth vary in their moral base (Goodwin et al., 2014; Goodwin, 2015) which is important because the moral relevance of traits has been shown to play a role in person perception (Wojciszke, Bazinska, & Jaworski, 1998). Indeed, it has been argued that morality has a more prominent role in guiding person perceptions over other types of communal and agentic traits (Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Brambilla & Riva, 2017).

Fourth, there is evidence contradicting the assumption that communal characteristics are invariably related to liking rather than to respect. Studies by Hendrick and Hendrick (2006), Lawrence-Lightfoot (2000) and Frei and Shaver (2002) find that characteristics such as being considerate, having integrity, honesty and attending to the views of others (which are seen by Wojciszke et al. as communal traits) are strongly related to respect. Indeed, these traits are typically seen as having moral content (e.g., Abele & Wojciszke, 2007) suggesting a possible

link between moral-communal traits and respect. Researchers have also used trait or action-related aspects of respect (e.g., respectful) as an exemplar of moral traits (Brambilla, Rusconi, Sacchi & Cherubini, 2011), further suggesting a link between respect and morality. However, these studies are primarily descriptive rather than experimental and do not adequately distinguish between respect and other forms of evaluation such as liking. There is need, therefore, to clarify the effect of specific traits on respect and liking in the context of a new model which accounts for different bases of respect and liking. Finally, as noted previously by Lalljee et al. (2009), respect for others can be based on achievements or status (which may be indicative of one's competence and/or assertiveness), as well as being human (a strong moral stance). As such, there is a conceptual argument that respect has moral and agentic (assertiveness and competence) bases.

Overview of the MAC model

The Morality-Agency-Communion (MAC) model of respect and liking is predicated on the following five main tenets. Agentic traits will influence respect more than liking (Tenet 1; e.g., Wojciszke et al., 2007). Despite previous evidence suggesting that communal traits guide liking more than respect (Wojciszke et al., 2009), this proposition is overly simplistic given that communal traits vary in their degree of morality (Tenet 2, e.g., Goodwin et al., 2014; Leach et al., 2007); indeed, consistent with others (e.g., Abele et al., 2016), communal traits can be differentiated into moral-based traits and warmth-based traits. When the moral component is low (i.e., warmth-based traits), communal traits will influence liking more than respect (Tenet 3). A highly moral, communal trait will be guided strongly by the moral component (e.g., Brambilla & Leach, 2014). As a consequence of this and the connection between morality and respect (e.g., Frei & Shaver, 2002), when the moral component is high (i.e., moral-based traits), the greater effect of communal traits on liking over respect will diminish to the point that they are at least as important, and potentially more important, for respect than liking (Tenet 4). Given

evidence that moral traits can also be important for liking (e.g., Hartley, Furr, Helzer, Jayawickreme, Velasquez, & Fleeson, 2016), communal traits high in morality (i.e., moral-related traits) should lead to high levels of respect *and* liking compared to communal traits low in morality which should lead to high levels of liking only (Tenet 5). Two further tenets are more tentatively proposed relating to the possibility that within categories (warmth and moral) traits may differ in meaningful ways. As these tenets are proposed more tentatively and tested only in Study 4, these tenets are presented in Online Supplementary Materials S5.

Overview of Current Studies

The first two studies utilised person descriptions and manipulated single moral, communal-warmth and agentic-competence traits. In the latter two studies, we tested the MAC model across a reasonably broad range of agentic and communal traits which vary in their degree of moral relevance. Data for all studies can be accessed via: https://osf.io/cqaws/?view_only=6f7c920a24614446b3ceddc423519c33 The manuscript adheres to ethical guidelines specified in the APA Code of Conduct as well as authors' national ethics guidelines.

Study 1: An initial test of the MAC model of respect and liking

In Study 1, vignettes were employed similar to those used by Wojciszke et al. (2009). However, rather than test the impact of a collection of traits on respect and liking, in the current study, participants were presented with three different vignettes attempting to manipulate a single agentic trait (competence) as well as communal traits with high (integrity) and low (friendliness) moral components (see Tenet 2). Previous work suggests friendliness is relatively low in morality compared to traits linked with integrity such as honesty (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007), while Brambilla and Leach (2014) note the distinction between sociable communal traits such as friendliness and moral communal traits such as honesty. After reading the vignettes, participants rated their respect and liking for the person described in the vignette. Consistent

with Wojciszke et al. (2009) it was predicted that differences in competence would impact more on respect than on liking (see Tenet 1). Inconsistent with Wojciszke et al. (2009), it was predicted that, despite being a communal trait, differences in integrity would impact at least as much on respect than on liking (see Tenet 4). Finally, being friendly has been consistently shown to be linked more strongly with liking than respect (e.g., Prestwich & Lalljee, 2009) and consistent with Wojciszke et al. (2009) it was predicted that differences in friendliness would impact more on liking than respect (see Tenet 3).

Method

Participants. One hundred and ninety psychology students (15 men, 173 women, 2 not reported; 178 British, 1 dual British nationality, 11 non-British; mean age = 19.14 years, SD = 1.72 years) were recruited. The main analyses are presented based on British participants only due to possible cultural differences and relatively small numbers of non-British participants. Of the British participants, 93% were female and 94.3% described their ethnicity as White. For details regarding power, see Online Supplementary Materials S3.

Design and Procedure. The study comprised a single session conducted in two large rooms. Participants read the volunteer information sheet and consent form. Participants were informed that the study attempted to assess their views and opinions of fictitious individuals who display different characteristics through their actions. Participants were then told that they would be presented with a series of descriptions of fictitious individuals and they would need to rate these individuals and their actions on a series of scales. A within-subjects design was used in which participants read a series of 6 vignettes (3 traits: integrity/friendly/competence x 2 valence: positive/negative) before completing measures of respect and liking (see Online Supplementary Material S1 for all manipulations and measures used in Studies 1-3). Additional variables (agency/communion; overall evaluation) were also assessed as manipulation checks. The vignettes were matched in length (all comprised 62 or 63 words), did not refer to the

demographics of the person described such as their sex or age, and were presented in a counterbalanced order.

Measures. Single items were used to measure *respect* ('I respect Person X'), *liking* ('I like Person X'), *communion* ('Person X's actions are beneficial for other people'), *agency* (Person X's actions are beneficial for themselves') and *overall evaluation* (*favourableness*) ('I have an extremely positive evaluation of Person X') using 7-point scales (*1= strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree*).

Statistical Methods. A series of 2 x 2 within-subjects ANOVAs (trait: high/low; measure: agency/communion) were conducted as manipulation checks to ensure that integrity and friendliness were viewed more as communal than agentic traits and that competence was viewed as more agentic than communal (see Online Supplementary Materials S3). Additional 2 x 2 within-subjects ANOVAs (trait: high/low; measure: respect/liking) tested whether (a) integrity; (b) competence; (c) friendliness had a greater impact on respect or liking. For the ANOVA analyses, partial eta-squared (η_p^2) and 90% confidence intervals are reported; for t-tests, effect size *d* and 95% confidence intervals are reported. The results of these analyses after controlling for differences in favourability are reported in Online Supplementary Materials S3, along with 3 (trait: competence, friendliness, integrity) x 2 (trait level: high/low) x 2 (measure: respect/liking) ANOVAs which enable comparisons of respect or liking across traits.

Results

The descriptive statistics for all of the measures from this study are reported in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Competence. Consistent with Tenet 1 (agentic traits impact respect more than liking), there was a significant level of competence x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 178) = 92.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .34$, 90% CI [.25, .42]. The competent individual was respected significantly more than the incompetent individual, $t(178) = 13.69$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.02$, 95% CI [0.84, 1.20]; they

were also more liked but the effect was smaller**,** $t(178) = 6.94$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.52$, 95% CI [0.36, 0.68].

Friendliness. Consistent with Tenet 3 (communal traits with a low moral component impact liking more than respect), there was a significant level of friendliness x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 178) = 53.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$, 90% CI [.15, .31]. The friendly individual was liked significantly more than the unfriendly individual, $t(178) = 27.74$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.07$, 95% CI [1.81, 2.33]; they were also more respected but the effect was smaller, $t(178) = 19.36$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.45$, 95% CI [1.24, 1.66].

Integrity. Consistent with Tenet 4 (communal traits with a high moral component impact respect at least as much as liking), there was a significant level of integrity x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 178) = 168.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .49$, 90% CI [.40, .55]. Follow-up repeated measures *t*-tests showed that the individual displaying high integrity was respected significantly more than the individual displaying low integrity, $t(178) = 42.65$, $p < .001$, $d = 3.19$, 95% CI [2.83, 3.55]; they were also more liked but the effect was smaller, $t(178) = 25.74$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.92$, 95% CI [1.68, 2.17]. Manipulating integrity, therefore, had a stronger effect on respect than on liking (consistent with Tenet 4) but also a very large effect on liking (see Tenet 5).

Discussion

The results provide initial support for the MAC model of respect and liking. In particular, while one communal trait, friendliness, is related to liking more so than to respect, the other communal trait, integrity, is related more to respect than to liking. These traits can be differentiated in terms of their moral component (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). An agentic trait, competence, was related to respect more than liking.

An alternative explanation regarding why friendliness was more strongly related to liking than to respect and integrity was more strongly related to respect is that friendliness in general is more communal than integrity. However, on the basis of the larger change in communal ratings

between the high and low integrity vignettes than the high and low friendliness vignettes, integrity (at least based on the descriptions used in this study) is more communal than friendliness.

While the basic tenets were tested in Study 1, a more direct test of the role of morality is needed. Wojciszke et al. (2009) suggest that communal traits imply benevolence and this benevolence mediates the effect of communal traits on liking. In contrast, agentic traits provide information about an individual's ability to reach a high social status and thus status potential mediates the effect of the agentic traits on respect. In light of the findings from Study 1 demonstrating that certain communal traits can influence respect more than liking, the next study sought to examine the processes involved in these relationships.

Study 2: Examining Mechanisms

Wojciszke et al. (2009) suggest that agentic traits provide information about an individual's ability to reach high social status. Social status is generally valued, and agency, they point out, is seen as a prerequisite of success, particularly in individualistic societies. It is this 'status potential' which mediates the effect of agentic traits on respect. They also argue that communal attributes indicate benevolence or potential benefits to other people, including the perceiver, which in turn increases liking. While Wojciszke et al. (2009) take our understanding a vital step forward by considering the processes through which agency is related to respect (via status potential) and communion to liking (via benevolence), if traits like integrity and honesty are related to respect, it is unclear whether the relationship is mediated by status potential or in other ways.

It is possible that status potential is still involved. The common saying "Honesty is the best policy" might lead to the view that the long term benefits of integrity, of which honesty is a key facet, are likely to lead to higher social status. Indeed, evidence has accumulated illustrating the general role of various moral actions in enhancing social status (Bai, 2017). Another

possible mediator is effort. Previous research suggests a link between effort-related constructs and morality given individuals are thought to more likely try to do moral than immoral actions (Reeder, Henderson & Sullivan, 1982). Moreover, displaying integrity (as in the vignette used in Studies 1 and 2) may involve effort and determination to behave in the morally appropriate way. Being hardworking is an agentic trait (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007) and determination clusters with respect-related traits such as intelligence and imaginativeness (Rosenberg et al., 1968). Showing that one is willing and able to make an effort could be related to status potential. However, an alternative explanation could be that a moral act like having integrity or being honest is regarded as intrinsically worthy of respect.

The moral relevance of traits has been shown to play an important role in person perception (Wojciszke et al., 1998); and the intimate connection between respect and morality has been stressed by psychologists (Frei & Shaver, 2002) and by philosophers (Dillon, 2007). Indeed it is hard to envisage a society where moral acts are not regarded highly. So in Study 2, the same three traits (integrity, competence and friendliness) were used, and effort and morality were included as potential mediators of respect effects alongside status potential and benevolence. Moreover, directly assessing morality enabled a test of Tenet 2 (communal traits vary in the extent to which they have a moral component) with the integrity vignettes predicted to impact more on moral ratings than the friendliness and competence vignettes.

Method

Participants. One hundred and eighty-one psychology students (16 men, 165 women; 177 British, 4 non-British; mean age = 18.87 years, SD = 1.03 years) were recruited. Of the British participants, 91% were female and 84.2% described their ethnicity as White. For details regarding power, see Online Supplementary Materials S3.

Design and Procedure. The study was identical to Study 1 but included additional measures to assess the proposed mediators (morality; effort; benevolence; status potential). These were measured between the items assessing respect, liking, communion, agency and the item assessing the overall evaluation of the person.

Measures. The same single items used in Study 1 were used again to measure *respect*, *liking*, *communion*, *agency* and *overall evaluation* (*favourableness*). In addition, two items were used to assess each of the following: *morality* ('Person X acts in morally appropriate ways'; 'Person X behaves as they ought to'), *effort* ('Person X does difficult things'; 'Person X goes beyond what would normally be expected of people'), *benevolence* ('Person X is good for others'; 'Person X does much for others') and *status potential* ('Person X will achieve a lot in life'; 'Person X is suitable for promotion'). All items were measured on 7-point scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

Statistical Methods. The manipulation check analyses conducted in Study 1 were repeated for Study 2 but, to test Tenet 2, also included a check regarding the differential impact of the traits on morality (see Online Supplementary Materials S3). The potential mediating role of status potential, benevolence, morality and effort was tested using Montoya and Hayes's (2017) MEMORE macro for within-subjects mediation. Four sets of six mediation analyses were conducted to test the mediating role of status potential, benevolence, morality and effort in the relationship between traits (integrity, competence, friendliness) and respect or liking. In the first set, the role of each mediator was tested individually. These mediators were tested individually to ensure that their role was not affected by other mediators despite zero-order correlations (see Online Supplementary Tables S1-S3) and variance inflation factors (VIFs) suggesting an unlikely risk of multicollinearity between them (integrity: VIFs ranged between 1.30-2.09; competence: VIFs ranged between 1.20-1.50; friendliness: VIFs ranged between 1.15-2.17). As VIFs are not calculated by the MEMORE macro, VIFs were calculated via conceptually similar

regressions that used change scores for each mediator (e.g., benevolence rating in the friendly vignette minus the benevolence rating in the unfriendly vignette) as simultaneous predictors of the outcome variable (respect or liking). In the second set of mediation analyses, each mediator was entered simultaneously alongside all of the other mediators. The third and fourth sets of mediation analyses were identical to sets one and two aside from the third and fourth sets each included respect or liking as additional mediators given the interrelationships between respect and liking (see Wojciszke et al., 2009). In all four sets of mediation, favourableness was included as an additional mediator to account for the fact that showing competence (or being friendly or having integrity) is more positively evaluated than incompetence (or being unfriendly or lacking integrity). Mediation is suggested when the indirect effect is significant.

Results

The descriptive statistics for all of the measures from this study are reported in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Competence. Consistent with the results from Study 1 and Tenet 1, there was a significant level of competence x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 175) = 43.26$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$, 90% CI [.12, .28]. The competent individual was respected significantly more than the incompetent individual, $t(176) = 13.97$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.05$, 95% CI [0.87, 1.23]; they were also more liked but the effect was smaller**,** $t(175) = 9.33$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.70$, 95% CI [0.54, 0.87].

Friendliness. Consistent with the results from Study 1 and Tenet 3, there was a significant level of friendliness x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 176) = 74.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$, 90% CI [.21, .38]. The friendly individual was liked significantly more than the unfriendly individual, $t(176) = 32.43$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.44$, 95% CI [2.14, 2.73]; they were also more respected but the effect was smaller, $t(176) = 21.41$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.61$, 95% CI [1.39, 1.83].

Integrity. Consistent with the results from Study 1 and Tenet 4, there was a significant level of integrity x respect/liking interaction, $F(1, 174) = 144.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .45$, 90% CI

[.36, .53]. The individual displaying high integrity was respected significantly more than the individual displaying low integrity, $t(175) = 55.74$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.20$, 95% CI [3.74, 4.67]; they were also more liked but the effect was smaller, $t(174) = 31.39$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.37$, 95% CI [2.08, 2.66]. The large effect of this high moral, communal trait on liking is also consistent with Tenet 5.

Reliability of measures of mediators. On average, the two items assessing morality (median $\alpha = .72$), benevolence (median $\alpha = .81$) and status potential (median $\alpha = .72$) were reliable. However, the items assessing effort were not, on average, reliable (median $\alpha = .60$ and below .60 for three pairs of items) and thus these items were subsequently examined individually.

Indirect effects. The results of the within-subjects mediation analyses are summarized in Table 3. Of the proposed mediators, morals were a significant mediator of the relationship between all types of traits (integrity, competence and friendliness) with respect. Morals also played a role in mediating the effect of all three traits on liking but these effects became non-significant after controlling for respect alongside other potential mediators.

Focusing on the hypothesized pairings of traits and outcomes (i.e., integrity-respect; competence-respect; friendliness-liking): 1) only morals mediated the effect of the integrity information on respect (benevolence was only significant in model 1 prior to controlling for other mediators and/or liking); 2) morals, effort-1 (Person X does difficult things) and, in 2 out of 4 models, status potential and effort-2 (Person X goes beyond what would normally be expected of people) mediated the effect of competence on respect; 3) no variable consistently mediated the effect of friendliness information on liking across all four models (morals were significant in three models; benevolence and effort-2 (Person X goes beyond what would normally be expected of people) were only significant before controlling for respect and/or the other mediators).

Focusing on the non-hypothesized pairs of traits and outcomes (i.e., integrity-liking; competence-liking; friendliness-respect): 1) no variable consistently mediated the effect of the integrity information on liking across 4 models (morals and benevolence were significant in three models; status potential was significant in two models); 2) benevolence and, in 2 out of 4 models, status potential and morals mediated the effect of competence on liking; 3) morals and effort-2 (Person X goes beyond what would normally be expected of people), and to some extent status potential and benevolence (significant in the 2 models that did not control for the other proposed mediators), mediated the effect of friendliness information on respect.

Insert Table 3 about here

Discussion

This study replicated and extended the key findings from Study 1. Consistent with research highlighting the importance of morality for both liking and respect (e.g., Hartley et al., 2016), morality was found to mediate the effect of all three traits on respect (across all 4 models) and, prior to controlling for the other proposed mediators, liking.

Consistent with the findings from Study 1, a highly moral, communal trait (integrity) increased respect more than liking. Furthermore, morals were found to be a robust mediator of the effect of this type of trait on respect. Wojciszke et al. (2009) identified benevolence as a mediator of the effect of communal traits (which broadly construed would include integrity) on liking. We found that benevolence mediated the effect of integrity on liking in three out of four models but also morals (significant in three models) and status potential (significant in two models) also played a role. Moreover, the role of benevolence in mediating the effect of a low moral, communal trait (friendliness) on liking was less robust (significant only in model 1); indeed, no measured variable consistently mediated this effect across all 4 models.

Consistent with Wojciszke et al. (2009), an agentic trait (competence) influenced respect more than liking. While Wojciszke et al. (2009) found this effect to be mediated by status

potential, we found this mediating effect in only 2 out of 4 models, while two alternative mediators (morals and effort-1: Person X does difficult things) were significant across all 4 models ('effort-2: Person X goes beyond what would normally be expected of people' was significant in two models).

The MAC model proposes that high moral, communal traits such as integrity, as well as agentic traits such as competence, influence respect more than liking, while low moral, communal traits such as friendliness influence liking more than respect. However, it is clear that showing integrity (versus not) or being competent (versus not) will also increase liking, while being friendly (versus not) will also increase respect. Indeed, Wojciske et al. reported that communal information also influenced respect and agentic information influenced liking although these effects were reduced (or rendered non-significant, in some analyses) after controlling for respect or liking. They suggested that, for instance, agentic information influenced liking as a result of the impact of agentic information on respect. As such, it is also not surprising that a number of significant indirect effects of these relationships were found. For example, being friendly increased respect and this was consistently mediated by morals and effort-2, as well as benevolence (in models 1 and 3) and status potential (in model 1). These findings may be partly driven by the context (workplace) and/or other aspects of the vignette. For example, somebody who is friendly and able to communicate well with others during a break (participants would know nothing about their behaviour outside of this break) may be characteristics of a good leader or manager- somebody with status potential (friendliness → status potential → respect). This may not be the case if the person was chatting freely outside of their break time. Similarly, not responding to or saying hello to others during work would likely appear rude, contravening social rules and, in some way, immoral thus less worthy of respect (friendliness → morals → respect). In short, it appears that the role of particular mediators in the relationships between traits and respect or liking is potentially more complex than Wojciszke et

al. suggest based on the identification of additional mediators not tested by Wojciszke et al. (effort and morals) but also due to some inconsistencies in the findings. At this stage, we do not know the moderating factors that influence when a specific mediator variable does or does not mediate the effect of specific traits on either respect or liking. Further research should examine why the role of mediators such as status potential may change depending on the context or other factors such as status or the extent to which the rated individuals are similar to the participant (for example, in the related test of mediators by Wojciszke et al., students rated descriptions of other students rather than employees in a workplace).

We also acknowledge that in the tests of the indirect effects, changes in status potential, benevolence, morals and effort were tested as mediators and changes in respect or liking as outcomes. By not establishing a clear time order of the indirect effect and not testing the reverse causal effects, it is possible that the manipulations of specific traits directly influenced respect or liking and the proposed mediators could be consequences of changes in respect and liking.

Both Studies 1 and 2 focused on only three traits and thus the results could be restricted to these specific traits rather than the broader categories of communion (high and low moral) and agency. In addition, using vignettes, while enhancing ecological validity, are at risk of confounds. Study 3 addressed these issues.

Study 3

In Study 3, we investigated whether moral traits are generally more related to respect than to liking. Consistent with the MAC model of respect and liking, we anticipated that agentic traits would generally be related to respect (Tenet 1), and that while some communal traits (those unrelated to morality) would be more strongly related to liking than to respect (Tenet 3), other communal traits (those related to morality) would be at least as strongly, and potentially more strongly, related to respect than liking (Tenet 4).

Method

Participants. The study aimed to recruit 50 participants to have at least 80% power to detect a significant effect at $p < .05$ (one-tailed due to the directional nature of the hypotheses) based on a ratio of 1.64 : 1 for the distribution of responses across two categories (respect/liking). Ratios were used as the basis of the effect size as participants were required to decide whether a specific trait is related more strongly to either respect or liking. The ratio 1.64:1 was selected as it represented a meaningful effect close to 2 out of 3 choices being made for respect (or liking) for each specific trait. Fifty British adults (18 men, 32 women; mean age = 26.84 years, SD = 10.31 years; 33 students, 17 university employees; 82% described their ethnicity as White) were recruited. Upon completion, participants received either course credits or £2.

Design and Procedure. Participants were presented with a list of 22 traits that had been pre-rated for agency, communion and morality in a previous study (see Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). The exceptions to this were the traits 'law-abiding' and 'integrity' both used as exemplars of moral traits. Law-abiding was used instead of the term 'upright' (which scored high on morality in Abele and Wojciszke's, 2007, study) because we anticipated the former would be better understood by our participants. Integrity was included because this trait was used in Studies 1 and 2 and is linked to several traits that scored high on morality in Abele and Wojciszke's (2007) study such as honest, moral and fair.

A 2 (within-subjects: trait type: agentic; communal) x 2 (within-subjects: moral component: high; low) within-subjects design was used. As far as possible, trait selection was selected based on a 2 x 2 design (agentic vs. communal) x (moral component: high/low) though, in line with Tenet 2, there was much less variation in morality for agentic traits than for communal traits (see Table 4). Participants were then asked to decide whether the trait was more important for respect or for liking. Participants had to choose only one response (respect or liking) for each trait.

Statistical Methods. To test the model as a whole, a 2 (agentic vs. communal) x 2 (moral component: high/low) within-subjects ANOVA was conducted. Selecting respect was coded as 1 and selecting liking was coded as 0. For each of the four categories, the responses were summed and then divided by the number of relevant traits such that the dependent variable reflected the proportion of traits selected as being more important for respect. Binominal sign-tests were also conducted to test whether each specific trait was rated as more important for respect or for liking. Although Bonferroni corrections were not utilized, if we did adjust the *p*-values by the number of tests conducted within each type of trait (e.g., multiplying the moral-communal *p*-values by 7), the conclusions regarding any trait did not change: all traits significant at $p < .05$ (2-tailed) remained significant after adjusting for multiple tests.

Results

Consistent with Tenet 1 of the MAC model, there was a main effect of agency/communion with agentic traits rated as more important for respect compared to communal traits, $F(1, 48) = 62.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .56$, 90% CI [.40, .67]; a main effect of the moral component, with higher moral traits rated as more important for respect than lower moral traits, $F(1, 48) = 132.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .73$, 90% CI [.61, .80]. Crucially, there was a significant agency/communion x moral interaction, $F(1, 48) = 69.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .59$, 90% CI [.43, .69]. While communal traits were rated as less important for respect (more important for liking) than agentic traits when the moral component was low, $t(48) = -9.78$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.40$, 95% CI [-1.79, -1.00] (consistent with Tenet 3), communal and agentic traits were rated as equally important for respect when the moral component was high, $t(49) = -0.37$, $p = .71$, $d = -0.05$, 95% CI [-0.33, 0.23] (consistent with Tenet 4).

When looking at each trait individually (see Table 4), each trait significantly differed in the likelihood that it would be rated as more important for respect or for liking. Specifically, all of the moral traits were rated as more important for respect than for liking; the low moral agentic

traits were also rated as more important for respect than for liking; the low moral communal traits were rated as more important for liking than for respect. The exceptions to this (caring; individualistic) were marginally significant, or significant, with one-tailed p-values, respectively.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

The results of Study 3 provide support for several of the tenets of the MAC model of respect and liking across a reasonably broad range of traits. Regarding caring, some participants may have interpreted the item as caring for somebody in need of care which, in itself, would be a moral act. This may have partly contributed to a slightly weaker effect than the other traits, albeit the effect was in the predicted direction.

One further issue worthy of discussion is that for the category high agentic + high moral, the traits were much lower in terms of their moral value than the equivalent traits in the high communal + high moral condition. This is in keeping with evidence that morality is a component of communal traits rather than agentic traits (e.g., Abele et al., 2016; Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Landy et al., 2016; Leach et al., 2007). Moreover, this issue is not problematic in order to test the key defining feature of the proposed model which differentiates it from the work of Wojciszke et al. (2009): that communal traits with a low moral component will be associated more strongly with liking (Tenet 3), while communal traits with a high moral component will blur the distinction between respect and liking (Tenet 4). Overall, there is striking confirmation of the hypotheses. Agentic traits, and communal traits that have a high moral component, are related more to respect, while communal traits unrelated to morality are related more to liking. However, it has been argued that morality is a component of communal traits rather than agentic traits and that assertiveness and competence reflect different aspects of agency (e.g., Abele et al., 2016; Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Landy et al., 2016; Leach et al., 2007). Consequently a fourth

study was conducted which selected traits on the basis of whether they belonged to one of two types of communion (warmth or morality) or agency (assertiveness or competence).

Study 4

To address the issue that morality is a component of communal traits rather than agentic traits, in Study 4 participants responded to sets of traits which fell into the following four categories: agentic-assertiveness; agentic-competence; communal-moral; communal-warmth. Furthermore, rather than force participants into a binary choice regarding whether a specific trait is more important for respect or liking, which could accentuate differences between respect and liking, rating scales were employed. This approach also enabled the possibility of more directly testing whether moral traits are important for *both* respect and liking whereas communal traits relatively low in morality (i.e., warmth-related traits) are likely to be important only for liking (Tenet 5).

Study 4 also extended Study 3 as this later study was pre-registered on the Open Science Framework and included manipulation checks of assertiveness, competence, morality, warmth, agency and communion. The following directional hypotheses were made: Participants will rate individuals with agentic traits (regardless of whether they are competence-related [hypothesis 1a] or assertiveness-related [hypothesis 1b] higher for respect than for liking (Tenet 1); Participants will rate individuals with communal-warmth traits higher for liking than for respect [hypothesis 2, Tenet 3]; Participants will rate individuals with communal-moral traits higher for respect than for liking [hypothesis 3, Tenet 4].

Method

All aspects of the methodology and analysis plan were registered prior to the start of the study as part of the Open Science Framework's Preregistration Challenge. Full methodological details and statistical analyses plans are available at https://osf.io/kc4jf/?view_only=6822c738ca63481a869ba1544c576805

Participants. The target sample size for this study was 110 participants with 55 participants completing one of two sets of traits. The sample size was calculated a-priori to ensure 90% power to detect a significant effect at $p < .05$ (one-tailed) using repeated measures t-tests based on an effect size of $dz = 0.40$ for each set of traits. This effect size was used as it reflects a meaningful effect which was smaller than what we had achieved in Study 3. A smaller effect size was anticipated in this study due to the use of rating scales over binary choices forcing participants to choose whether a specific trait was more important for respect or liking, the latter of which may accentuate differences in respect and liking across traits. One hundred and ten British adults (44 men, 66 women; mean age = 21.76 years, SD = 4.71 years; 102 students, 8 non-students; 80% described their ethnicity as White) were recruited. However, due to errors in implementing the allocation sequence, one participant completed respect/liking measures for one set of traits and the remaining measures for the other traits while another participant initially randomized to complete measures in relation to one set of traits, did so for the other set of traits. Both of these participants are included in the analyses based on the measures that they completed. Upon completion, participants received either course credits or £3 Love to Shop vouchers.

Design and Procedure. Participants completed a questionnaire comprising measures relating to one of two sets of traits. A 2 (between-subjects: set of traits: A or B) x 2 (within-subjects: measure: respect vs. liking) x 4 (within-subjects: trait type: agency-competence; agency-assertiveness; communion-warmth; communion-morality) mixed design was used. Two sets of participants were used (one to complete each set of traits) to minimize participant burden, to test a broader range of traits and to test whether the effects replicate across different sets of traits.

Each set of traits (A or B) included 5 exemplar traits for each of the 4 trait types (agency-competence; agency-assertiveness; communion-warmth; communion-morality; see Table 6 for the complete list of traits). These traits were selected directly or indirectly through a

combination of the results of a factor analysis reported by Abele et al. (2016) in which specific traits were separated into relevant categories, as well as ratings of specific traits reported by Abele and Wojciszke (2007). Each of the traits used were rated either in the study by Abele et al. (2016) and/or the study by Abele and Wojciszke (2007) with the exception of 'law-abiding' and 'integrity' (see Study 3 for the rationale).

The order participants completed the sets of measures (manipulation checks; respect/liking; evaluation) and whether participants rated the traits for respect then liking or vice-versa, was determined via randomization using the random number generator in Excel. The order the 20 individual traits were presented to participant was fixed for all participants. The manipulation check measures were also fixed in the following order: warmth, morality, assertiveness, competence, communion, agency. All of the measures used in this study can be accessed in the Online Supplementary Material S2 file.

Measures. Single item measures for a set of 20 specific traits (5 from each of the 4 type of traits categories), were employed for all constructs to minimize participant burden.

Manipulation check items

All measures were presented along 5-point (1-5) bipolar scales in the same form ('Please rate the extent to which somebody who possesses a trait from below is…:'): 'warm' with 1 being 'not warm' to 5 being 'very warm' (*warmth*), 'moral' with 1 being 'not moral' to 5 being 'very moral' (*morality*), 'assertive' with 1 being 'not assertive' to 5 being 'very assertive' (*assertiveness)*, 'competent' with 1 being 'not competent' to 5 being 'very competent' (*competence*), 'somebody who is able to get along with others' with 1 being 'not able to get along with others' to 5 being 'very able to get along with others' (*communion*), 'somebody who is able to achieve their goals' with 1 being 'not able to achieve their goals' to 5 being 'very able to achieve their goals' (*agency*). In addition, an *overall evaluation* (*favourableness*) of an individual who possesses each specific trait was requested as follows: 'Please rate the extent to

which somebody who possesses a trait from below is somebody you would evaluate positively with 1 being 'somebody I would not evaluate positively' to 5 being 'somebody I would evaluate very positively''.

Dependent variables

Equivalent 5-point bipolar scales were used with the only difference being the word 'respect' or 'like'. *Respect* was assessed with the item 'Please rate the extent to which somebody who possesses a trait from below is somebody you would respect with 1 being 'somebody I would not respect' to 5 being 'somebody I would very much respect'' while *liking* was assessed with the item 'Please rate the extent to which somebody who possesses a trait from below is somebody you would like with 1 being "somebody I would not like" to 5 being "somebody I would very much like''.

Statistical Methods. To minimize the risk of data entry errors, data was independently and separately entered for all participants twice by different researchers using the same data template. These two sets of data entry were compared to maximize the likelihood that data entry errors were detected and the discrepancies were resolved.

To test the model as a whole, a 2 (set: A or B (between-subjects) x 2 (type of measure: respect vs. liking (within-subjects)) x 4 (type of trait: warmth; morality; assertiveness; competence (within-subjects)) mixed ANOVA was conducted before follow-up ANOVAs (one for set A and one for set B). To assess the extent to which the predictions hold across each trait, 40 repeated measures *t*-tests were conducted to compare ratings of respect and liking (i.e., one for each of the 40 traits across sets A and B). Manipulation and robustness checks are presented in Online Supplementary Materials S4.

Results

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics for each group of traits. The associated manipulation and robustness checks are reported in Online Supplementary Materials S4. The

three-way ANOVA revealed the critical type of measure (respect/liking) x trait type (warmth, morality, assertiveness, competence) interaction, $F(2.44, 261.41) = 102.57$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.49$, 90% CI [0.42, 0.54]. This interaction was further moderated by set-type, $F(2.44, 261.41) = 4.45$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$, 90% CI [0.01, 0.08]; the ANOVAs were subsequently repeated separately for the set A and set B traits. Significant interactions between the type of measure and trait type indicated that the differences in respect and liking varied across the 4 trait types (set A: $F(1.76, 94.83) = 51.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.49$, 90% CI [0.37, 0.58]; set B: $F(3, 159) = 57.26$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.52$, 90% CI [0.42, 0.58]). Consistent with Tenet 1, both types of agentic traits were rated as more likely to lead to respect than liking. Specifically, assertiveness traits were rated as more likely to lead to respect than liking (set A: $t(54) = 8.78$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.18$, 95% CI [0.84, 1.53]; set B: $t(54) = 6.57$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.89$, 95% CI [0.57, 1.20]), as were competence traits (set A: $t(54) = 4.61$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.62$, 95% CI [0.33, 0.91]; set B: $t(54) = 4.64$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.63$, 95% CI [0.34, 0.92]). Consistent with Tenet 3, warmth traits were more likely to lead to liking rather than respect (set A: $t(54) = -5.38$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.73$, 95% CI [-1.02, -0.43]; set B: $t(54) = -7.21$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.97$, 95% CI [-1.29, -0.65]). Consistent with Tenet 4, morality-based traits were rated either as equally likely to lead to respect and liking (set A: $t(54) = -0.77$, $p = .44$, $d = -0.10$, 95% CI [-0.37, 0.16]) or more likely to lead to respect than liking (set B: $t(53) = 3.56$, $p = .001$, $d = 0.48$, 95% CI [0.20, 0.77]).

Insert Table 5 about here

Specific traits

The results for each specific trait are reported in Table 6. Across the traits categorised as moral, being just, law-abiding or having integrity were each rated as more important for respect than for liking. For the remaining traits in the moral category, there was no difference in their importance for respect and liking. The one exception was the trait of being considerate which was rated as more important for liking than for respect. However, it should be noted that none of

the warmth traits from set A were rated as significantly higher in warmth than being considerate and being considerate was rated significantly higher on the warmth than the moral scale, $t(55) = 4.54$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.61$, 95% CI [0.32, 0.89], suggesting it better represents warmth than morality. All of the assertiveness traits were rated significantly more important for respect than liking. With the exception of being intelligent or insightful (both of which failed the competence manipulation check), all of the competence traits were rated as more important for respect than liking. All of the warmth traits were rated significantly more important for liking than for respect, although for being empathetic this was the case only under a 1-tailed *p*-value. As these analyses were focused on specific traits (e.g., friendly) rather than trait types (e.g., warmth), we did not adjust the *p*-values to take into account the number of traits within each trait type in set A or the number of traits within each trait type in set B (i.e., 5). If we did, by multiplying the obtained *p*-values by 5, conclusions regarding 4 traits identified as differing in respect and liking would change from significant to non-significant: dominant: $p = .10$; sympathetic: $p = .05$; empathetic: $p = .14$; agreeable: $p = .06$.

Insert Table 6 about here

Additional Analyses: Tenet 5- Communal traits high in morality (moral) lead to high levels of respect and liking; communal traits low in morality (warmth) lead to high levels of liking only

To test Tenet 5, one-way within-subject ANOVAs (not pre-registered) were conducted for ratings of a) respect and b) liking across the 4 trait types (morality, warmth, assertiveness and competence) (see also Online Supplementary Materials S5).

Comparison of respect scores across trait types

Ratings of respect varied across the four trait types (set A: $F(2.17, 117.11) = 14.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.21$, 90% CI [0.10, 0.30]; set B: $F(2.79, 147.61) = 25.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.32$, 90% CI [0.22, 0.40]). Consistent with Tenet 5, moral traits scored higher on respect than warmth traits (set A: $p < .001$, $d = 1.15$, 95% CI [0.81, 1.49]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 0.80$, 95% CI [0.49,

1.10]). Furthermore, moral traits were rated higher on respect than assertiveness (set A: $p = .01$, $d = 0.35$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.62]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 1.14$, 95% CI [0.80, 1.49]) and competence (set A: $p < .001$, $d = 0.63$, 95% CI [0.35, 0.92]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 0.54$, 95% CI [0.26, 0.83]) traits.

The remaining comparisons indicated that competence traits scored higher on respect than warmth in both sets of traits (set A: $p = .02$, $d = 0.34$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.61]; set B: $p = .001$, $d = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.16, 0.72]) and assertiveness for one set of traits (set A: $p = .25$, $d = -0.16$, 95% CI [-0.42, 0.11]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 0.60$, 95% CI [0.32, 0.89]). Assertiveness traits were also rated higher on respect than warmth traits in one set of traits (set A: $p = .004$, $d = 0.41$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.69]; set B: $p = .18$, $d = -0.18$, 95% CI [-0.45, 0.09]).

Comparison of liking scores across trait types

Consistent with Tenet 5, ratings of liking also varied across trait types (set A: $F(2.14, 115.63) = 79.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.59$, 90% CI [0.49, 0.66]; set B: $F(3, 162) = 71.16$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.57$, 90% CI [0.48, 0.63]) with moral traits scoring highly for liking. Specifically, for set A, moral traits scored higher on liking than each of the other three types of traits (all $p < .001$; warmth: $d = 0.56$, 95% CI [0.27, 0.84]; assertiveness: $d = 1.54$, 95% CI [1.15, 1.93]; competence: $d = 1.35$, 95% CI [0.98, 1.71]); for set B traits, moral traits scored higher on liking than assertiveness ($p < .001$; $d = 1.48$, 95% CI [1.10, 1.87]) and competence ($p < .001$; $d = 0.69$, 95% CI [0.39, 0.98]) traits but lower than warmth traits ($p < .001$; $d = -0.52$, 95% CI [-0.80, -0.24]).

The remaining comparisons indicated that warmth traits scored higher on liking than assertiveness (set A: $p < .001$, $d = 1.22$, 95% CI [0.87, 1.56]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 1.69$, 95% CI [1.28, 2.10]) and competence (set A: $p < .001$, $d = 1.11$, 95% CI [0.77, 1.44]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 1.05$, 95% CI [0.72, 1.38]) traits. Competence traits were also rated higher on liking than

assertiveness traits (set A: $p = .002$, $d = 0.43$, 95% CI [0.15, 0.71]; set B: $p < .001$, $d = 0.67$, 95% CI [0.38, 0.96]).

In sum, as well as respect and liking differing *within* trait-type categories (as demonstrated in the pre-registered analyses), respect scores differ *across* trait-type categories, as do liking scores.

General Discussion

Across four studies, the MAC model clarifies the bases of respect and liking. The results indicate that agentic traits influence respect more than liking (Tenet 1; Studies 1-4); communal traits vary in their degree of morality (Tenet 2, see Study 2); when the moral component is low, communal traits influence liking more than respect (Tenet 3; see Studies 1-4); when the moral component is high, communal traits are at least as important, and potentially more important, for respect than liking (Tenet 4; see Studies 1-4). Communal traits high in morality lead to high levels of respect *and* liking compared to communal traits low in morality, which score high on liking only (Tenet 5; see Studies 1, 2 and 4). On average, moral traits lead to higher levels of respect than assertiveness, competence and warmth-related traits and higher levels of liking than assertiveness and competence-related traits. Two further tenets are introduced, tested (in Study 4) and discussed in Online Supplementary Materials S5.

While Wojciszke et al. (2009) reported agency was related to respect through status potential and communion was related to liking through benevolence, the studies reported here demonstrate that moral-communal traits are related *at least* as strongly to respect than liking. Moreover, these findings open up the possibility that agentic traits influence respect via status potential (and potentially other mechanisms, see Study 2) but moral-communal traits influence respect in a different way. Given moral traits are guided strongly by the moral component (e.g., Brambilla & Leach, 2014) and the connection between morality and respect (e.g., Frei & Shaver, 2002), moral-communal traits such as integrity and being fair may influence respect via morality.

Some initial supportive evidence for this was provided in Study 2 but further research is needed to examine these potentially different mechanisms across a range of traits. Furthermore, Wojciszke et al.'s (2009) work did not attempt to identify which traits (or groups of traits) were important for both respect and liking. High moral, communal traits appear to be relatively important for both.

Four high moral, communal traits rated as more important for respect than liking in Study 3, did not differ in Study 4. This could be attributable to methodological changes which accentuated differences in ratings of respect and liking in Study 3 (see also Online Supplementary Materials S5).

The current work considered the impact of specific traits and, explicitly in Studies 1-2 and implicitly in Studies 3-4, related actions on engendering respect and liking. By identifying the traits and/or actions that can influence respect (and liking), we can identify targets for interventions designed to increase the likelihood of being respected (and/or liked). This can be important, for instance, for individuals who are keen to increase the likelihood that they are respected such as leaders or politicians. It has further consequence because people who are respected and/or liked are treated differently from those who are not. For example, those who are respected can be expected to be more likely to have their feelings, wishes and rights taken into account than those who are not respected. As such, the findings of the current research are important not only in identifying the broad processes or bases underlying respect and liking, but also has consequences, down the line, for how individuals are perceived or treated.

Limits of the MAC model of respect and liking

Tenet 2 (that communal traits vary in their moral component) was testable in only Study 2. However, it is firmly supported by Abele and Wojciszke's (2007) dataset (used to select the traits for Studies 3 and 4) which clearly shows variance in morality ratings for communal traits. Thus, Tenet 2 is not contentious.

Given the conflicting findings regarding the relative importance of certain moral traits on respect and liking across both studies, further work is needed to clarify the factors which influence whether moral traits are rated as more important for respect than liking or equally important (but see Online Supplementary Materials S5, Tenet 7, for a potential, partial explanation). Furthermore, given the mechanisms underpinning the effect of trait types on respect and liking was a peripheral focus here (see Study 2), further work is needed to expand on and clarify the identified processes.

The studies presented to test the MAC model were based on manipulations of single traits. While this approach enables conclusions about specific individual traits or trait types, individuals possess and portray different trait profiles (comprising multiple traits); how different trait profiles influence respect and liking need to be tested in further research. Similarly, further tests of the MAC model should consider real people rather than fictitious individuals. While Wojciszke et al. (2009) used multiple items of their assessed constructs (including for respect and liking), we utilized single item measures throughout (aside from the assessment of mediators in Study 2). While this precludes assessment of the internal consistency of the measures and threatens to not fully capture the complexity of the constructs, for the primary measures (respect and liking) a clear, face valid item was used for each.

The analysed samples were British and comprised of university staff and students; the results may not be replicated in other populations. Indeed, Wojciszke et al. argue agency is crucial for acquiring status in an individualistic society. But even in individualistic societies, the primacy of an individual's goals is not normative, and may even be counter-normative (Dubois & Beauvois, 2005). In societies where status is more embedded in social relationships (such as family or kinship groups), agency may be less relevant. Respect may be accorded to a person because of their particular relationship or role (e.g., being a teacher, or Queen). Such respect is not a function of their traits, but of their position. In addition, Li (2003) stresses the importance

of contextualising respect in terms of cultural beliefs and values. Whether a particular trait is respected and why may depend on the values held by that particular society.

Conclusion

The present studies suggest while agentic traits garner respect more than liking, the effect of communal traits on liking and respect is more complex. Communal traits with low morality influence liking more strongly than respect; the effect of communal traits with high morality at least weakens this effect. Whether high moral traits are respected more than liked appears to be dependent on methodological approach and the level of warmth of moral traits (see Online Supplementary Materials S5); nevertheless, moral traits appear important for both respect and liking. Thus, previous attempts to specify the bases of respect and liking only in terms of agency and communion are insufficient. Morality plays a central role in person perception and should be included in a model of respect and liking. The Morality-Agency-Communion (MAC) model shows the important role that these constructs play in differentially affecting respect and liking.

References

Abele, A. E., Cuddy, A. J. C., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2008). Fundamental dimensions of social judgment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 1063-1065.

Abele, A. E., Hauke, N., Peters, K., Louvet, E., Szymkow, A., & Duan, Y. (2016). Facets of the Fundamental Content Dimensions: Agency with Competence and Assertiveness—Communion with Warmth and Morality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self versus others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93,* 751–763.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence. An essay on psychology and religion*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Brambilla, M., & Leach, C. (2014). On the importance of being moral: the distinctive role of morality in social judgment. *Social Cognition*, *32*, 397-408.

Brambilla, M., & Riva, P. (2017). Predicting pleasure at others' misfortune: Morality trumps sociability and competence in driving deservingness and schadenfreude. *Motivation and Emotion*, *41*, 243-253.

Caprariello, P.A., Cuddy, A.J.C., & Fiske, S.T. (2009). Social structure shapes cultural stereotypes and emotions: A causal test of the stereotype content model. *Group Processes and Intergroup Behavior*, *12*, 147-155.

Dubois, N. & Beauvois, J. L. (2005). Normativeness and individualism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 123-146.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from the perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 878-902.

Frei, J.R. & Shaver, P.R. (2002). Respect in close relationships: Prototype definition, self-report assessment, and initial correlates. *Personal Relationships, 9,* 121 - 139.

Goodwin, G.P. (2015). Moral character in person perception. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24,* 38-44.

Goodwin, G.P., Piazza, J. & Rozin, P. (2014). Moral character predominates in person perception and evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106,* 148-168.

Hamilton, D. L. & Fallot, R. D. (1974). Information salience as a weighting factor in impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30,* 444-448.

Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2006). Measuring respect in close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*, 881-899.

Judd, C.M., James-Hawkins, L., Yzerbyt,V., & Kashima,Y. (2005). Fundamental dimensions of social judgment: Understanding the relations between judgements of competence and warmth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 899-913.

Kiesler, C.A. & Goldberg, G.N. (1968). Multi-dimensional approach to the experimental study of interpersonal attraction: Effect of a blunder on the attractiveness of a competent other. *Psychological Reports, 22*, 693-705.

Lalljee, M., Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Laham, S., & Lee, J. (2009). Unconditional respect for persons and the prediction of intergroup action tendencies. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 666-683.

Landy, J. F., Piazza, J., & Goodwin, G. P. (2016). When it's bad to be friendly and smart. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *42*, 1272-1290.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2000). *Respect: An exploration*. Cambridge, Mass: Perseus Books.

Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of ingroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 234-249.

Montoya, R. M., & Horton, R. S. (2014). A two-dimensional model for the study of interpersonal attraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 59-86.

Park, B. & Flink, C. (1989). A social relations analysis of agreement in liking judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*, 506-518.

Peeters, G. (1992). Evaluative meanings of adjectives in vitro and in context: Some theoretical implications and practical consequences of positive-negative asymmetry and behavioral-adaptive concepts of evaluation. *Psychologica Belgica*, 32, 211-231.

Prestwich, A. & Lalljee, M. (2009). The determinants and consequences of intragroup respect: An examination within a sporting context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*, 1229-1253.

Reeder, G.D., Henderson, D.J., & Sullivan, J.J. (1982). From dispositions to behaviors: The flip side of attribution. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *16*, 355-375.

Rosenberg, S., Nelson, C., & Vivekananthan, P. (1968). A multidimensional approach to the structure of personality impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9*, 283-294.

Russell, A.M. & Fiske, S.T. (2008). It's all relative: Competition and status drive interpersonal perception. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 1193-1201.

Wojciszke, B., Abele, A. E., & Baryla, W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39,* 973–990.

Wojciszke, B., Bazinska, R., & Jaworski, M. (1998). On the dominance of moral categories in impression formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 1251–1263.

Wortman, J. & Wood, D. (2011). The personality traits of liked people. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*, 519-528.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics (N = 179) (Study 1)

Measure	Competence		Friendliness		Integrity	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Respect	5.53 (1.01)	4.12 (1.02)	5.51 (1.01)	2.98 (1.16)	6.51 (0.77)	1.94 (1.00)
Liking	4.80 (0.96)	4.20 (0.84)	5.94 (0.83)	2.70 (1.06)	5.75 (0.99)	2.49 (1.07)
Agency	6.31 (0.85)	2.38 (1.04)	5.82 (1.06)	3.06 (1.53)	3.56 (1.63)	5.47 (1.80)
Communion	4.68 (1.49)	3.11 (1.22)	5.87 (0.88)	2.23 (0.98)	6.46 (0.75)	1.37 (0.64)
Evaluation	5.26 (0.93)	3.53 (1.01)	5.83 (0.77)	2.51 (1.04)	5.91 (0.90)	2.04 (0.89)

Table 2: Descriptive statistics (N = 177) (Study 2)

Measure	Competence		Friendliness		Integrity	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Respect	5.48 (0.85)	4.24 (0.90)	5.66 (0.95)	2.94 (1.07)	6.55 (0.65)	1.78 (0.76)
Liking	4.89 (0.89)	4.15 (0.76)	6.05 (0.80)	2.61 (0.95)	6.01 (0.89)	2.29 (1.01)
Agency	6.31 (0.81)	2.50 (1.11)	5.89 (0.84)	3.26 (1.69)	3.90 (1.72)	5.42 (1.93)
Communion	4.79 (1.21)	3.18 (1.14)	5.86 (0.84)	2.20 (0.94)	6.34 (0.77)	1.38 (0.57)
Evaluation	5.38 (0.83)	3.48 (0.92)	5.73 (0.84)	2.42 (1.03)	5.69 (0.94)	1.79 (0.85)
Morals	5.10 (0.85)	3.79 (0.85)	5.75 (0.85)	2.77 (0.96)	6.49 (0.64)	1.69 (0.76)
Status Potential	5.97 (0.78)	2.77 (0.89)	5.12 (0.86)	2.97 (1.01)	4.81 (1.01)	2.43 (1.05)
Benevolence	4.62 (0.87)	3.37 (0.98)	5.43 (0.84)	2.13 (0.93)	5.80 (0.95)	1.63 (0.79)
Effort-1	5.06 (1.30)	4.12 (1.32)	3.64 (1.34)	3.37 (1.44)	5.35 (1.42)	2.88 (1.50)
Effort-2	5.84 (1.05)	2.64 (1.14)	4.49 (1.29)	2.13 (1.08)	4.80 (1.39)	1.85 (1.00)

Table 3: Summary of within-subjects mediation analyses (Study 2)

IV-outcome	Mediator	Indirect effect (1)			Indirect effect (2)			Indirect effect (3)			Indirect effect (4)		
		Effect	SE	*p*	Effect	SE	*p*	Effect	SE	*p*	Effect	SE	*p*
Integrity-Respect	Status Potential	0.09	0.11	.43	-.0.02	0.11	.84	-0.07	0.10	.53	-0.08	0.10	.43
	Benevolence	0.54	0.24	.03	-.011	0.26	.66	0.05	0.23	.85	-0.27	0.25	.28
	Morals	2.30	0.31	<.0001	2.35	0.34	<.0001	1.80	0.32	<.0001	2.00	0.34	<.0001
	Effort-1	0.01	0.07	.92	-0.12	0.07	.08	-0.03	0.07	.73	-0.11	0.07	.10
	Effort-2	0.11	0.12	.38	0.10	0.12	.42	0.02	0.11	.87	0.06	0.11	.58
	Favourableness				1.15	0.24	<.0001				0.87	0.24	.0002
	Liking										0.81	0.20	<.0001
Integrity-Liking	Status Potential	0.47	0.15	.001	0.28	0.15	.07	.42	0.14	.002	0.28	0.15	.05
	Benevolence	1.54	0.32	<.0001	0.68	0.36	.06	1.27	0.30	<.0001	0.73	0.35	.03
	Morals	2.32	0.47	<.0001	1.57	0.48	.001	1.40	0.52	.007	0.61	0.53	.25
	Effort-1	0.10	0.10	.30	-.05	0.10	.63	0.12	0.09	.20	0.02	0.09	.84
	Effort-2	0.32	0.17	.052	0.18	0.17	.30	0.26	0.15	.09	0.12	0.16	.44
	Favourableness				1.25	0.34	.0002				0.72	0.34	.04
	Respect										2.05	0.52	.0001
Competence-Respect	Status Potential	0.50	0.21	.02	0.23	0.23	.32	0.58	0.19	.002	0.40	0.21	.06
	Benevolence	0.07	0.08	.40	-0.03	0.08	.67	-0.04	0.07	.58	-0.11	0.07	.13
	Morals	0.40	0.10	<.0001	0.32	0.10	.001	0.29	0.09	.002	0.21	0.09	.03
	Effort-1	0.15	0.05	.001	0.10	0.05	.03	0.15	0.04	.001	0.10	0.04	.02
	Effort-2	0.38	0.15	.01	0.03	0.18	.86	0.34	0.14	.02	0.03	0.17	.87
	Favourableness				0.39	0.15	.008				0.08	0.14	.55
	Liking										0.38	0.07	<.0001

Competence-Liking	Status Potential	-0.17	0.18	.35	-0.35	0.20	.09	-0.37	0.17	.02	-0.45	0.18	.02
	Benevolence	0.20	0.07	.003	0.15	0.07	.03	0.18	0.06	.004	0.16	0.06	.01
	Morals	0.28	0.08	.001	0.26	0.09	.003	0.15	0.08	.06	0.15	0.08	.07
	Effort-1	0.01	0.04	.83	0.00	0.04	1.00	-0.05	0.04	.13	-0.04	0.04	.27
	Effort-2	0.07	0.14	.58	0.00	0.16	.99	-0.07	0.13	.58	0.00	0.15	.99
	Favourableness				0.62	0.13	<.0001				0.46	0.12	.0002
	Respect												<.0001
Friendliness-Respect	Status Potential	0.57	0.17	.001	0.19	0.16	.23	0.43	0.14	.003	0.26	0.14	.07
	Benevolence	1.23	0.28	<.0001	0.26	0.30	.38	0.76	0.25	.002	0.10	0.27	.70
	Morals	1.62	0.22	<.0001	1.35	0.24	<.0001	1.09	0.21	<.0001	0.94	0.22	<.0001
	Effort-1	0.02	0.02	.23	-0.01	0.01	.49	0.01	0.01	.57	-0.01	0.01	.31
	Effort-2	0.59	0.14	<.0001	0.36	0.14	.01	0.36	0.12	.004	0.26	0.13	.04
	Favourableness				0.74	0.28	.008				-0.09	0.28	.75
	Liking										1.97	0.31	<.0001
Friendliness-Liking	Status Potential	0.21	0.13	.09	-0.04	0.13	.74	-0.02	0.11	.87	-0.10	0.11	.36
	Benevolence	0.65	0.21	.002	0.21	0.24	.37	0.17	0.19	.37	0.12	0.21	.58
	Morals	0.93	0.16	<.0001	0.72	0.18	.0001	0.39	0.17	.02	0.27	0.18	.14
	Effort-1	0.02	0.02	.18	0.01	0.01	.46	0.01	0.01	.24	0.01	0.01	.32
	Effort-2	0.31	0.10	.003	0.16	0.11	.16	0.09	0.09	.34	0.03	0.10	.75
	Favourableness				1.49	0.22	<.0001				1.23	0.20	<.0001
	Respect										0.93	0.16	<.0001

Note. Indirect effect (1) model comprises 2 mediators (the stated mediator and favourableness); Indirect effect (2) model comprises 6 mediators (status potential, benevolence, morals, effort-1, effort-2, favourableness); Indirect effect (3) model comprises 3 mediators (the stated mediator, favourableness, respect or liking); Indirect effect (4) model comprises 7 mediators (status potential, benevolence, morals, effort-1, effort-2, favourableness, respect or liking).

Table 4: Percentage of participants rating a specific trait as being more important for respect vs. liking (Study 3)

Trait	Category	Moral[1]	Agentic[1]	Communal[1]	% participants rating trait for		*p*-value
					Respect	Liking	(2-tailed)
Integrity	Moral-Communal	not rated	not rated	not rated	84	16	<.001
Moral		4.70	0.55	2.85	86	14	<.001
Law-abiding[2]		4.40	0.90	3.05	84	16	<.001
Honest		4.65	1.10	3.80	78	22	<.001
Truthful		4.35	0.60	2.85	78	22	<.001
Fair		4.20	1.10	3.55	84	16	<.001
Altruistic		4.15	0.90	3.55	70	30	.007
Conscientious	Moral-Agentic	2.45	3.90	1.55	72	28	.003
Hard-working		2.15	4.45	1.90	84	16	<.001
Responsible		2.20	3.40	2.90	90	10	<.001
Smart/intelligent[3]	Low Moral-Agentic	1.00/0.65/-0.15	4.30/4.00/3.75	1.40/1.55/1.15	71	29	.004
Individualistic		0.40	3.10	-1.30	64	36	.07
Self-reliant		0.35	4.05	-0.45	76	24	<.001
Caring[3]	Low Moral-Communal	1.70/2.20	0.30/0.20	3.55/3.85	38	62	.12
Warm		2.00	0.45	3.30	8	92	<.001
Friendly		2.00	1.40	4.00	6	94	<.001
Agreeable[3]		1.10/2.45	-0.05/1.00	3.45/3.45	4	96	<.001
Sociable		0.75	1.75	4.15	12	88	<.001
Welcoming		0.70	-0.60	3.45	14	86	<.001
Pleasant		1.70	1.30	3.10	6	94	<.001
Sympathetic		1.25	1.85	3.60	22	78	<.001
Talkative		1.00	1.65	3.60	8	92	<.001

Note: [1]ratings provided by Bogdan Wojciszke (direct communication) from Abele & Wojciszke (2007); [2]based on the ratings for the trait 'upright'; [3]based on multiple related terms

Table 5: Trait-Type Level Descriptive Statistics (Study 4)

Set	Trait Type	Warmth	Morality	Assertiveness	Competence	Communion	Agency	Respect	Liking
A	Warmth	4.64 (0.38)	3.84 (0.55)	2.82 (0.54)	3.28 (0.57)	4.73 (0.34)	3.34 (0.62)	4.01 (0.70)	4.40 (0.37)
	Morality	4.28 (0.46)	4.52 (0.38)	3.35 (0.58)	3.78 (0.52)	4.58 (0.38)	3.73 (0.54)	4.53 (0.43)	4.57 (0.34)
	Assertiveness	3.03 (0.65)	3.37 (0.55)	4.63 (0.38)	4.21 (0.41)	3.24 (0.45)	4.63 (0.36)	4.33 (0.48)	3.67 (0.65)
	Competence	3.09 (0.70)	3.25 (0.52)	3.95 (0.50)	4.58 (0.30)	3.46 (0.49)	4.64 (0.33)	4.24 (0.62)	3.87 (0.62)
B	Warmth	4.66 (0.29)	3.58 (0.48)	2.95 (0.77)	3.35 (0.56)	4.78 (0.29)	3.48 (0.65)	4.01 (0.57)	4.51 (0.41)
	Morality	3.89 (0.48)	4.56 (0.36)	3.37 (0.68)	3.69 (0.55)	3.84 (0.48)	3.70 (0.59)	4.47 (0.39)	4.27 (0.40)
	Assertiveness	2.65 (0.59)	3.19 (0.48)	4.23 (0.48)	3.93 (0.47)	2.86 (0.52)	4.25 (0.47)	3.90 (0.47)	3.44 (0.58)
	Competence	3.36 (0.56)	3.77 (0.44)	3.57 (0.53)	4.29 (0.42)	3.55 (0.46)	4.35 (0.41)	4.23 (0.45)	3.87 (0.54)

Table 6: Individual Trait-Level Descriptive Statistics (Study 4)

Trait/Set	Warmth	Morality	Assertiveness	Competence	Communion	Agency	Respect	Liking
WARMTH								
Empathetic/A	4.78 (0.57)	4.37 (0.62)	2.81 (0.78)	3.35 (0.83)	4.80 (0.52)	3.42 (0.79)	4.31 (0.84)	4.51 (0.54)†
Friendly/A	4.75 (0.48)	3.91 (0.72)	3.13 (0.72)	3.27 (0.77)	4.91 (0.29)	3.66 (0.79)	4.24 (0.88)	4.84 (0.42)***
Affectionate/A	4.80 (0.52)	3.59 (0.93)	2.77 (0.89)	3.11 (0.78)	4.62 (0.53)	3.05 (0.78)	3.76 (0.92)	4.35 (0.64)***
Agreeable/A	4.05 (0.80)	3.18 (0.96)	2.55 (1.07)	3.27 (0.84)	4.47 (0.72)	3.35 (0.93)	3.38 (1.05)	3.64 (0.87)*
Caring/A	4.84 (0.46)	4.18 (0.74)	2.84 (0.74)	3.40 (0.68)	4.87 (0.34)	3.23 (0.85)	4.35 (0.75)	4.69 (0.50)**
Sociable/B	4.63 (0.56)	3.17 (0.64)	3.56 (0.92)	3.52 (0.82)	5.00 (0.00)	3.81 (0.77)	3.95 (0.70)	4.49 (0.66)***
Welcoming/B	4.91 (0.29)	3.85 (0.86)	2.77 (0.93)	3.34 (0.73)	4.81 (0.52)	3.31 (0.80)	4.31 (0.75)	4.70 (0.46)***
Pleasant/B	4.63 (0.60)	3.70 (0.77)	2.53 (0.97)	3.28 (0.71)	4.80 (0.41)	3.52 (0.79)	4.11 (0.79)	4.59 (0.57)***
Sympathetic/B	4.87 (0.34)	4.19 (0.70)	2.43 (0.90)	3.32 (0.73)	4.72 (0.50)	3.27 (0.84)	4.27 (0.77)	4.55 (0.54)*
Talkative/B	4.23 (0.72)	2.96 (0.55)	3.44 (0.95)	3.21 (0.75)	4.56 (0.69)	3.51 (0.78)	3.45 (0.81)	4.20 (0.80)***
MORALITY								
Just/A	3.64 (0.87)	4.63 (0.75)	3.54 (0.87)	3.66 (0.86)	4.14 (0.67)	3.59 (0.78)	4.47 (0.66)***	4.07 (0.77)
Fair/A	4.15 (0.80)	4.78 (0.50)	3.48 (0.89)	3.66 (0.75)	4.45 (0.66)	3.56 (0.83)	4.53 (0.69)	4.51 (0.60)
Considerate/A	4.86 (0.35)	4.41 (0.68)	2.82 (0.83)	3.34 (0.77)	4.91 (0.45)	3.40 (0.87)	4.33 (0.82)	4.75 (0.44)***
Trustworthy/A	4.57 (0.60)	4.57 (0.71)	3.25 (0.88)	3.91 (0.88)	4.78 (0.57)	3.85 (0.78)	4.85 (0.36)	4.91 (0.29)
Reliable/A	4.18 (0.82)	4.23 (0.79)	3.64 (0.80)	4.33 (0.67)	4.64 (0.48)	4.29 (0.65)	4.49 (0.69)	4.62 (0.49)
Integrity/B	3.85 (0.83)	4.54 (0.64)	3.74 (0.85)	4.11 (0.85)	4.04 (0.82)	4.06 (0.95)	4.54 (0.54)**	4.26 (0.78)
Law-Abiding/B	3.00 (0.95)	4.50 (0.75)	3.40 (1.01)	3.65 (0.83)	3.06 (0.66)	3.55 (0.89)	4.02 (0.89)***	3.60 (0.83)
Honest/B	4.24 (0.85)	4.72 (0.53)	3.43 (0.89)	3.70 (0.75)	4.10 (0.75)	3.64 (0.79)	4.72 (0.53)	4.65 (0.64)
Truthful/B	4.04 (0.82)	4.87 (0.39)	3.24 (0.89)	3.63 (0.77)	3.93 (0.67)	3.65 (0.76)	4.63 (0.56)	4.58 (0.57)
Altruistic/B	4.34 (0.81)	4.17 (0.82)	3.06 (1.00)	3.40 (0.72)	4.04 (0.91)	3.58 (0.89)	4.43 (0.69)	4.30 (0.72)
ASSERTIVENESS								
Self-confident/A	2.95 (0.95)	3.05 (0.62)	4.63 (0.65)	3.95 (0.84)	3.50 (1.04)	4.55 (0.54)	4.11 (0.85)**	3.64 (1.01)
Stands up/A	3.11 (0.89)	3.59 (0.99)	4.71 (0.56)	4.61 (0.56)	3.54 (0.79)	4.77 (0.57)	4.58 (0.79)***	3.91 (0.97)
Never gives up/A	3.07 (0.87)	3.45 (0.95)	4.57 (0.60)	4.15 (0.70)	2.95 (0.88)	4.95 (0.23)	4.73 (0.53)***	3.93 (0.86)
Leader/A	2.96 (0.76)	3.46 (0.91)	4.79 (0.46)	4.61 (0.53)	3.32 (0.77)	4.66 (0.51)	4.43 (0.72)***	3.57 (0.86)

Unwavering/A	3.09 (0.97)	3.27 (0.97)	4.40 (0.84)	3.75 (0.82)	2.89 (1.04)	4.24 (0.90)	3.78 (1.05)***	3.27 (0.95)
Self-reliant/B	2.91 (0.74)	3.31 (0.58)	3.73 (1.04)	4.24 (0.73)	3.15 (0.81)	4.19 (0.80)	4.20 (0.87)**	3.85 (0.80)
Resolute/B	2.78 (0.74)	3.62 (0.74)	4.15 (0.71)	3.72 (0.76)	3.04 (0.82)	4.35 (0.73)	3.91 (0.73)***	3.36 (0.87)
Independent/B	2.68 (0.94)	3.24 (0.67)	3.96 (0.99)	4.34 (0.73)	2.71 (0.87)	4.13 (0.82)	4.04 (0.74)*	3.70 (0.74)
Determined/B	2.92 (0.86)	3.26 (0.81)	4.54 (0.66)	4.11 (0.70)	3.15 (0.72)	4.88 (0.38)	4.64 (0.59)***	3.87 (0.83)
Dominant/B	1.94 (0.89)	2.53 (0.80)	4.74 (0.71)	3.25 (0.87)	2.17 (0.83)	3.79 (0.88)	2.69 (0.91)*	2.35 (0.99)
COMPETENCE								
Efficient/A	2.80 (1.00)	3.18 (0.81)	4.38 (0.68)	4.70 (0.54)	3.20 (0.70)	4.87 (0.34)	4.20 (0.86)**	3.82 (0.88)
Capable/A	3.45 (0.88)	3.39 (0.78)	4.07 (0.74)	4.84 (0.37)	3.83 (0.84)	4.71 (0.49)	4.38 (0.76)***	4.04 (0.88)
Intelligent/A	3.07 (0.81)	3.38 (0.78)	3.61 (0.68)	4.32 (0.66)	3.46 (0.71)	4.42 (0.57)	4.31 (0.80)	4.13 (0.79)
Clever/A	3.02 (0.76)	3.16 (0.87)	3.61 (0.73)	4.50 (0.60)	3.34 (0.58)	4.50 (0.54)	4.24 (0.79)***	3.75 (0.75)
Effective/A	3.13 (0.83)	3.16 (0.91)	4.09 (0.75)	4.52 (0.60)	3.48 (0.79)	4.74 (0.45)	4.05 (0.87)***	3.64 (0.78)
Knowledgeable/B	3.19 (0.75)	3.48 (0.64)	3.76 (0.75)	4.70 (0.46)	3.42 (0.60)	4.65 (0.55)	4.56 (0.57)***	4.00 (0.67)
Wise/B	3.77 (0.78)	3.89 (0.77)	3.28 (0.81)	4.33 (0.82)	3.87 (0.79)	4.28 (0.72)	4.59 (0.60)***	4.04 (0.74)
Insightful/B	3.83 (0.73)	3.75 (0.71)	3.17 (0.75)	3.92 (0.73)	3.96 (0.73)	4.17 (0.76)	4.15 (0.70)	4.09 (0.83)
Systematic/B	2.38 (0.99)	3.30 (0.80)	3.81 (0.81)	4.11 (0.72)	2.78 (0.72)	4.28 (0.71)	3.52 (0.82)***	3.18 (0.77)
Responsible/B	3.65 (0.80)	4.42 (0.66)	3.85 (0.86)	4.40 (0.69)	3.72 (0.72)	4.34 (0.65)	4.37 (0.62)**	4.04 (0.77)

Note: † $p < .05$ (one-tailed); *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for differences between ratings of respect vs. liking. *N*'s range from 51 to 56. Underlined values represent instances where the trait failed to meet the pre-specified manipulation check threshold of achieving significantly higher scores than at least 80% of traits allocated to other categories.