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Abstract

Despite documents such as the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, people still tolerate human rights violations. My dissertation examined possible methods for reducing this toleration. Specifically, I used “hypocrisy induction” to try and reduce toleration of rights violations and encourage pro-human rights responses. Hypocrisy induction—a procedure based on cognitive dissonance—involves having people recognize that their responses in a given situation are at odds with a strongly held attitude. In Study 1, I examined whether people who support human rights would reduce their toleration of a rights violation when confronted with their previous hypocritical toleration. Although participants who were confronted with their hypocrisy were more willing to act to promote human rights, they did not reduce their toleration of a violation, contrary to expectations. One reason for the lack of change in toleration could be that personal toleration of a human rights violation is not directly related to the occurrence of violations. Thus, for Studies 2 and 3, I extended the hypocrisy induction procedure to a case where an ingroup member’s hypocrisy directly resulted in a human rights violation. Specifically, I examined whether Canadians would alter their own toleration of a violation in response to a Canadian official who permitted a human rights violation. Results from both studies indicated that the group-level procedure was effective at encouraging pro-human rights responses, but not at reducing toleration of a violation. Moreover, results from Study 3 indicated that the effect of the group-level procedure was
the result of directly-experienced, not vicarious, discomfort. I refer to the dissonance associated with the former type of discomfort as “group-level” dissonance. Although hypocrisy induction was not useful for reducing the toleration of human rights violations, my results suggest that both the group- and individual-level procedures can be used to encourage other pro-human rights responses.
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Cognitive Dissonance, Hypocrisy, and Reducing Toleration of Human Rights Violations

**Human Rights and the Toleration of Human Rights Violations**

The universal declaration of human rights (UDHR) outlines those rights that are fundamental, meaning those rights to which all people are inherently entitled (United Nations, 2014). These rights include the right to security, to adequate quality of life, to humane treatment, and so on. The motivation to create the universal declaration of human rights came from a desire to prevent the atrocities that occurred during the Holocaust from happening again. Toward this end, the human rights described in the UDHR were characterized as universal, meaning that they are granted to everyone without exception. Although the rights described in the declaration are not, themselves, enforceable laws, many countries (particularly those who are signatories) have laws that reflect the rights outlined in the declaration. Currently, at least 50 countries have signed the declaration of human rights, including Canada, indicating that many nations support the notion of universal human rights (United Nations, 2015).

Despite general support for human rights and that the UDHR characterizes human rights as universal, serious violations of universal human rights continue to occur (Human Rights Watch, 2018). Although the fault for such violations rests with the perpetrators, it is also important to recognize the role played by those outside of the situation in allowing such violations to continue. Tolerating or overlooking human rights violations undoubtedly contributes to continued occurrence of such violations, in that it
COGNITIVE DISSONANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

allows human rights abuses to continue unchecked. An initial step in ending these abuses is understanding how to reduce their toleration. For my PhD studies, I used an application of cognitive dissonance theory to try and reduce the toleration of human rights violations.

The idea for my PhD studies came from some of the research I conducted during my MA. In these studies, I explored a possible reason for the toleration of human rights violations. I found that some people who supported a human right in the abstract still tolerated a violation of that right (Drolet, Hafer, & Heuer, 2016). More specifically, some participants who supported the right to humane treatment also tolerated a specific individual’s torture. Consistent with previous theory (e.g., Finkel, 2001; Trope & Liberman, 2010) and research (e.g., Staerklé & Clémence, 2004), these participants tolerated a human rights violation because they found it difficult to ignore situation-specific information, even when that information conflicted with their abstract support for the right (i.e., the information suggested a reason for tolerating the violation). Given that even those who support human rights tolerate human rights violations, I concluded that an important starting point for reducing and discouraging the toleration of violations is to reduce this toleration among those who already support universal human rights. For example, perhaps if people confronted the inconsistency between their abstract attitudes and their toleration of certain cases of a human rights violation, they would reduce their toleration of similar violations, bringing their responses more in line with their abstract
attitude. A well-known social psychological theory that deals with people’s reactions to their own inconsistency is cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959). Thus, cognitive dissonance research might be applicable to this situation.

**Overview of Thesis Studies**

In the second part of my MA thesis, I conducted an initial test of whether cognitive dissonance could be used to reduce the toleration of a human rights violation by using hypocrisy induction, a procedure used to draw attention to the discrepancy between one’s important attitude (in this case, support for a given right) and their inconsistent responses (in this case, toleration of a violation of that right). Despite some methodological limitations (e.g., the study was conducted in a single session and was subject to carryover effects; I used a binary measure of pro-rights behaviour), there were promising results that led me to examine further the use of hypocrisy induction in my PhD studies. Namely, I found that reflecting on their own hypocrisy led individuals to be more willing to help the target of a human rights violation and marginally more interested in getting information on organizations that promote human rights.

Building on these findings, I conducted three studies for my PhD. These studies all dealt with the question, can the application of cognitive dissonance theory help reduce the toleration of human rights violations? For Study 1, I examined whether hypocrisy induction—in this case, getting people to confront their tendency to support a human right in the abstract yet tolerate specific violations of that right—could lead people to
reduce their toleration of human rights violations. Drawing on social identity approaches in social psychology, for Studies 2 and 3, I argued that people will also reduce their toleration of human rights violations when they are confronted with an ingroup member’s hypocrisy regarding human rights, rather than their own hypocrisy. My argument introduces a heretofore unstudied form of cognitive dissonance, which I call “group-level dissonance” (for similar ideas, see Focella, Stone, Fernandez, Cooper, & Hogg, 2015; Gaffney, Hogg, Cooper, & Stone, 2012). Relevant background will be reviewed in the introductory sections to each study.
Study 1

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

According to cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959), people’s cognitive elements (i.e., knowledge of one’s own thoughts, attitudes, behaviours) can conflict with one another. When individuals hold conflicting cognitive elements, they will experience arousal and an unpleasant feeling of discomfort called “dissonance” (for a review, see Cooper, 2007). The discomfort motivates people to do something to reduce the discomfort, often through changing one of the cognitive elements to be more in line with the other. For example, in Festinger and Carlsmith’s (1959) original study on cognitive dissonance, participants were asked to complete a very boring task and then tell a confederate that it was quite enjoyable. Because the task was not enjoyable, telling the confederate that it was would have been at odds with how participants actually felt. Participants were paid $20, $1, or nothing (control condition) for talking to the confederate. The researchers expected that those in the $1 condition would be the most motivated to reduce the dissonance aroused between what they told the confederate and how they actually felt, because the amount they were paid was not sufficient to justify expressing the counterattitudinal sentiment. In support of this reasoning, participants in the $1 condition were more likely to say that they would like to participate in a similar study in the future compared to participants in the other two conditions. These results suggest that, without sufficient reason (e.g., getting paid enough money), holding two
cognitive elements that are at odds with one another will arouse dissonance, motivating the individual to change one of the relevant cognitive elements to be more in line with the other in order to resolve the dissonance.

One explanation for why holding conflicting cognitive elements arouses dissonance comes from research on self-consistency. Aronson, Blanton, and Cooper (1995) explain that people use their personally important attitudes to inform personal standards for their behaviour. These standards then contribute to the individual’s positive sense of self or self-concept. Dissonance can be aroused when individuals recognize that they have responded in a way that is inconsistent with their personal standards. When people recognize that they have responded in a way that is inconsistent with their personal standards, the inconsistency poses a threat to their self-concept. People are then motivated to reduce the dissonance by correcting their subsequent responses to be more in line with their personal standards, thereby protecting their self-concept.

For the first study of my PhD, I examined how participants responded to the inconsistency between their abstract support for a particular human right and their toleration of a violation of that right. Specifically, I examined whether dissonance was aroused when individuals both supported the right to humane treatment in the abstract yet tolerated the use of torture in a specific situation, and whether people then reduced their toleration of torture in specific situations in an attempt to decrease the discomfort associated with dissonance. The cognitive dissonance phenomenon that best matches this
situation is hypocrisy-induced dissonance, in which people change their relevant responses to better match their abstract attitude.

**Hypocrisy Induction**

In hypocrisy induction, dissonance is aroused by having people recognize that their responses in certain situations are at odds with an abstract attitude or standard that they have publicly advocated. Typically, participants first publicly endorse an abstract attitude or standard, then they are made to privately recognize situations in which they did not live up to that standard, which presumably leads to dissonance. Participants are then given the opportunity to reduce the dissonance by responding in a way that is consistent with the abstract standard that they endorsed.

For example, in a study by Stone, Aronson, Crain, Winslow, and Fried (1994), half of the participants were asked to publicly advocate for using condoms by being filmed while making a speech about the importance of using condoms; the other half of the participants advocated but were not filmed (i.e., private advocacy). Then, half of the participants who had publicly or privately advocated for the importance of using condoms were told to reflect on times when they had failed to use condoms. Finally, all participants were given the opportunity to buy condoms with the $4 they were given for their participation, which should have allowed participants who felt hypocritical to reduce the dissonance. The researchers found that participants who were expected to feel hypocritical (i.e., had both publicly advocated for the importance of using condoms and
who had been asked to reflect on times when they had failed to use condoms) purchased more condoms at the end of the experiment than participants in any of the other conditions.

According to the self-concept explanation of dissonance, hypocrisy induction encourages people to change their relevant responses because recognizing that one has acted in a way that violates one’s important attitudes or standards threatens one’s positive self-concept, thereby arousing dissonance (see Stone & Fernandez, 2008). Thus, bringing one’s responses in-line with the advocated standard reduces dissonance because it restores one’s positive sense of self.

Hypocrisy induction studies differ from many other studies on cognitive dissonance. In Carlsmith and Festinger’s (1959) original cognitive dissonance study, as well as in many of the dissonance studies that followed, participants reduced dissonance by changing their previously expressed attitude to be more in line with the discrepant response that they were made to perform in the experimental situation. However, in hypocrisy induction studies, participants are expected to change their responses (e.g., thoughts, behaviours) in specific situations to be more in line with their previously expressed, abstract attitude. There are two reasons for this difference. First, in both the original cognitive dissonance study and in many of those that followed, participants were not given the opportunity to change their discrepant response following the arousal of dissonance as they are in hypocrisy induction studies; thus, the only option to reduce their
discomfort was to change their previously expressed attitude. Second, one crucial aspect of the hypocrisy induction procedure is that the abstract attitude is personally important to the participant (Stone & Fernandez, 2008); that is, the attitude is strongly held. An attitude that is personally important should be resistant to change, meaning that people will be less likely to reduce dissonance by changing their attitude and more likely to reduce dissonance by changing their discrepant response.

Researchers have mainly used hypocrisy induction to promote healthy behaviour and environmentally friendly practices (e.g., Focella & Stone, 2013; Kantola, Syme, & Campbell, 1984; Stone et al., 1994; Stone, Wiegand, Cooper, & Aronson, 1997). Prior to my work, hypocrisy induction had not been used to encourage people to reduce their toleration of human rights violations.

Overview and Hypotheses

For Study 1 of my PhD, I used hypocrisy induction to try to reduce the toleration of torture, a human rights violation. First, participants publicly expressed their abstract support for the right to humane treatment. Participants then provided baseline responses to a scenario involving torture (i.e., baseline toleration of torture). Next, in a separate session, participants were assigned to a hypocrisy induction condition, a condition in which they simply advocated for the importance of supporting the right to humane treatment, or a control condition. In the hypocrisy induction condition, after advocating support for the right to humane treatment, participants reflected on times when they
might tolerate the use of torture. I expected all participants in this condition to be able to find a circumstance in which they would consider tolerating torture. Recognizing that one’s toleration of torture was inconsistent with their advocated position (i.e., supporting human rights) was expected to arouse dissonance, reflected in elevated feelings of discomfort (Elliot & Devine, 1994). Finally, participants were given the opportunity to respond to a violation of the right to humane treatment in a way that was consistent with their advocated position; that is, they were given the opportunity to show that they do not tolerate torture.

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, to reduce their toleration of torture the most. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on toleration of torture to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more they would reduce their toleration of torture.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, to be the most willing to help the target of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on willingness to help the target to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more they would be willing to help the target of torture.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the hypocrisy induction condition,
compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on suggested donation to a torture-related charity to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher their suggested donation to the torture-related charity.

**Method**

**Sample size selection.** I conducted a power analysis in G*Power 3.1.9.2 using an effect size of Cohen’s $f^2 = 0.085$ (halfway between a small and moderate effect), $\alpha = .05$ and power of .80. I needed at least 95 participants to achieve the desired level of statistical power. To ensure that I would have enough participants who supported the right to humane treatment, I oversampled by about 40%.

**Participants.** I recruited 241 Brock University students as participants for this study using the university’s Psychology Research Pool website (SONA). A total of 103 participants were excluded from all analyses, making the final sample $N = 138$ (104 female, 33 male, 1 unknown) age 18-39 years ($M = 20.18, SD = 2.76$).

Participants were excluded for the following reasons. Thirty-seven participants completed Session 1 but not Session 2. Seventeen participants were excluded because they entered their codes incorrectly across sessions, making it impossible to properly match their Session 1 and Session 2 data. During the debriefing, two participants asked that their data not be analyzed. One participant was excluded because he or she did not
complete the procedure for the study in the correct order. Three participants were excluded because they left their essay packets blank. One participant was removed because he or she wrote about why he or she disagreed, rather than agreed, with the right to humane treatment. Additionally, people from Eastern/collectivistic cultures are less likely to experience dissonance from personal inconsistency than people from Western/individualistic backgrounds because of cultural differences in self-concept organization (Hoshino-Browne et al., 2005; Zanna, 2004). Therefore, five participants were excluded because they were from non-Western cultures.

Moreover, the focus of this study was on hypocrisy induction. Thus, I only examined those participants who could have hypocritically tolerated torture (i.e., scored above neutral [4] on the composite measure of support for humane treatment, indicating support for the right to humane treatment). A total of 37 participants were excluded from analyses because they scored at or below neutral on the composite measure of support for the right to humane treatment (for a similar procedure in the context of racism, see Son Hing, Li, & Zanna, 2002). The students signed up for a study on “Current Events and Emotion,” and received course credit or $10 for their participation. Participants were run alone or worked separately in booths, with 1-4 other participants in other private booths.

**Procedure.** Figure 1 presents a visual overview of the procedure.
Figure 1. Overview of the procedure for Study 1.
Study 1 took place over two sessions. After signing the informed consent form (Appendix A), participants completed the questionnaire for Session 1 on a computer using Qualtrics.

They first completed measures of Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Appendix B), Right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1996; Appendix C), and Preference for Consistency (Cialdini, Trost, & Newsom, 1995; Appendix D). Preference for consistency was included as a potential moderator variable. Social dominance orientation and RWA were included to help hide two items assessing the extent to which participants supported the right to humane treatment. These two items were embedded in the RWA scale. I also examined social dominance orientation and RWA as exploratory moderator variables (though I had no \textit{a priori} predictions). None of the three individual difference variables moderated the effect of the manipulation on the dependent variables; thus, they will not be mentioned further (except in footnotes).

Next, participants read and responded to three scenarios (Appendix E): two filler scenarios and one scenario about an interrogation involving torture. The scenario involving torture was also used by Drolet et al. (2016), and is based on the scenario used by Carlsmith and Sood (2009). In the scenario involving torture, participants read about an Afghan man (Sahad) who was detained while working near an insurgent encampment. The man was interrogated based on the suspicion that he might have
overheard some useful information, and the interrogation involved torture. Participants were also told that the man had been involved with an extremist group several years earlier when he was a teenager, during which time he had shot four school children in order to create a distraction during an attack. They also read that he had not been in contact with the group for several years. Moreover, the scenario indicated that Sahad repeatedly said that he did not have any information on terrorist activities.

Following the scenario involving torture were items assessing the extent to which participants tolerated the torture that was used in the interrogation (Appendix F). Similar items followed each of the filler scenarios (Appendix G), although these items were not analyzed. Finally, at the end of Session 1, participants completed a demographic form (Appendix H).

Participants returned for Session 2 seven to fourteen days after completing Session 1. When they arrived for Session 2, the researcher told them that an organization called the Human Rights Research Centre (HRRC) provided some of the materials for the study. In exchange, the researcher was asking participants to fill out a packet of information for the HRRC. Participants were told that the HRRC packets were not part of the study. The information included in the packet contained the hypocrisy manipulation (Appendix I).

Next, participants completed an affect measure used to assess whether or not dissonance was aroused (Elliot & Devine, 1994; Appendix J). After the affect measure,
participants read and responded to the same three scenarios as in Session 1; that is, two filler scenarios and the torture scenario. The responses to the torture scenario included the toleration measure from Session 1, as well as a measure of participants’ willingness to help the target of torture (Appendix K). Again, responses to the filler scenario were similar to those for the torture scenario but were not analyzed.

Next, participants were told that the study was over, but that the HRRC wanted some additional feedback about where to make their annual donations. Participants then gave their recommendations about the size of donation that was to go to an anti-torture charity and other organizations (Appendix L). After the donation task, participants were verbally debriefed (Appendix M). The verbal debriefing included questions that assessed for suspicion. Finally, participants were given a written debriefing form (Appendix N) and thanked for their time.

**Manipulation.**

**Hypocrisy condition.** In the hypocrisy condition, participants were first asked to write a short, persuasive essay about why it is important to support the right to humane treatment. Moreover, participants were told that excerpts from their essay might be used in promotional materials alongside their names (making their advocacy public). Participants were asked to write their names directly below their essays. After finishing the first essay, participants in the hypocrisy condition were told, “To get a better

---

1 No participants guessed the purpose of the study.
understanding of how people think about human rights, we have an additional question about your thoughts and opinions related to human rights.” They were asked to write an essay about a time when they might feel conflicted about supporting the right to humane treatment. In order to induce hypocrisy, it was important that participants were easily able to reflect on times when they might respond hypocritically, and that they elaborated on these examples (Stone & Fernandez, 2011). For this reason, before they wrote the essay, participants were given a checklist of circumstances in which people might tolerate torture (e.g., “If the person has tortured or killed others,” “The person has physically assaulted children,” “To extract information from someone who won’t talk”). They were asked to check off any circumstances in which they might tolerate torture. Several blanks were provided for participants to list other circumstances in which they might tolerate torture. Then participants were told:

“Now that you have thought about times when you might feel conflicted about supporting this right, please write a short essay (about one paragraph) about one or more situations in which you might feel conflicted about supporting the human right. You may use the examples from the list or come up with additional examples for your essay.”

The checklist procedure for helping participants come up with examples was similar to that used in other hypocrisy induction studies (e.g., Stone et al., 1997).

Advocacy-only condition. In the advocacy-only condition, participants were
asked only to complete the first task in the hypocrisy condition. That is, participants wrote an essay, presumably for possible use in promotional materials, about why it is important to support the right to humane treatment, then wrote their name on the essay. Thus, these participants publicly advocated for the right to humane treatment, but were not made to reflect on times when they might hypocritically tolerate the use of torture.

**Control condition.** Participants in the control condition were told that the HRRC was interested in who chooses to attend university in Ontario. Participants then completed several demographic items. There was no mention of the right to humane treatment.

**Dependent measures.**

*Toleration of torture (Session 1 [α = .88] and Session 2 [α = .90]).* Three items assessed the extent to which the participants tolerated the torture of Sahad described in the scenario (e.g., “The severity of the treatment was appropriate”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). High scores on the composite variable indicated high toleration of torture in the scenario (Appendix F).

*Willingness to help (r = .72).* Two items assessed participants’ willingness to help the target from the scenario (i.e., “If Sahad’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover his legal fees?” “How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the treatment Sahad received during his interrogation?”).
Participants rated the extent to which they were willing to help the target of the human rights violation in each of these ways from 1 (not at all willing) to 7 (completely willing). High scores on the composite variable indicated high willingness to help the target (Appendix K).

**Donation task.** Participants were asked to suggest what percentage of funds should go to each of four different charities: Centre for Victims of Torture, Forest Fire Response (Red Cross), United Nations Development Programme, and the International Fund for Animal Welfare. The total percentage for the donation suggestions to the four charities had to sum to 100%. The suggested donation to the Centre for Victims of Torture was a behavioural indicator of toleration of torture, but the focus of this measure was on victims of torture in general and not a specific victim like in the scenario. I expected that those in the hypocrisy condition would suggest the highest donation to the Centre for Victims of Torture compared to participants in the other conditions. Donations to the torture-related charity indicate support for the right to humane treatment, and thereby should help participants to reduce the dissonance aroused in the hypocrisy condition. Each of the other charities was included for specific reasons. First, participants might suggest higher donations to the torture-related charity simply because they had just read about torture in one of the scenarios that came directly before the donation task. To rule out this explanation, I also included the Forest Fire Response (Red Cross) charity, because one of the filler scenarios was about a forest fire. Additionally,
participants might suggest higher donations to the torture-related charity simply because
the charity was consistent with the title of the organization (i.e., The Human Rights
Research Centre). Therefore, I included another, more general, human rights charity, the
United Nations Development Programme. Finally, the International Fund for Animal
Welfare was included because it was unrelated to both human rights and the topics of the
filler scenarios (Appendix L).

*Affect measure (Elliot & Devine, 1994).* Participants rated the extent to which
each of 29 emotions described their state after the hypocrisy manipulation, using a scale
ranging from 1 (*does not apply at all*) to 7 (*applies very much*). The measure contains
five subscales: Discomfort ($\alpha = .89$), Negative Emotions Toward the Self ($\alpha = .89$),
Negative Emotions about Others ($\alpha = .88$), Positive Emotions ($\alpha = .92$), and Depressed ($\alpha$
= .92). High scores on the Discomfort subscale indicated greater negative arousal.
Consistent with previous research (e.g., Elliot & Devine, 1994), I did not expect the
hypocrisy manipulation to affect any of the other subscales (Appendix J).

*Other variables.* Three measures were included at the beginning of Session 1.
One was a two-item measure that examined participants’ support for the right to humane
treatment, on which I expected very little variability. The other variables were
exploratory individual differences.

*Support for the right to humane treatment ($r = .77$).* Two items assessed
participants’ abstract support for the right to humane treatment (“No one should ever be
subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason”) and how important they felt it was to support the right to humane treatment (“It is important to me personally that no one ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with these statements from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores indicated high support for the right to humane treatment (Appendix C).

**Social dominance orientation scale (Pratto et al., 1994; α = .88).** This 16-item scale measures how much participants favour social hierarchy and maintaining dominance (e.g., “Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Eight of the sixteen items were reverse scored. High scores indicated a high preference for social hierarchy and maintaining dominance (Appendix B).

**Right wing authoritarianism scale (Altemeyer, 1996; α = .83).** This 12-item abbreviated version of Altemeyer’s scale measures participants’ willingness to submit to legitimate authority and their adherence to conventionalism, as well as levels of aggression related to those values (e.g., “The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High
scores indicated high willingness to submit to authority, high support for conventionalism, and high levels of aggression related to these values (Appendix C).

*Preference for consistency scale (Cialdini et al., 1995; α = .92).* This 18-item scale measures participants’ dispositions toward or against behaving consistently (e.g., “It is important to me that my actions are consistent with my beliefs.”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). One item on the scale was reverse scored. High scores indicated a high preference for consistency, and low scores indicated that participants did not particularly care about being consistent (Appendix D).

**Results**

An alpha of .05 is used throughout. Correlations between all variables, as well as means and standard deviations, can be found in Table 1.

**Preliminary results.**

*Outliers and normality.* Participants were excluded from individual analyses if they were considered univariate or multivariate outliers on any of the variables involved. Univariate outliers were identified as scores falling at or outside three standard deviations from the mean. There was one univariate outlier on Session 1 toleration of torture in the hypocrisy condition ($z = 3.13$), one univariate outlier on Session 2 toleration of torture in the hypocrisy condition ($z = 3.05$), and one univariate outlier on the donation variable in the control condition ($z = 4.40$).
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Variables in Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toleration</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Hypocrisy</td>
<td>Willingness to Help</td>
<td>Discomfort</td>
<td>Support for Humane Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Toleration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hypocrisy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness to Help</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for Humane Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01. All tests are two-tailed. With the exception of the Donation variable, all variables had a potential range of 1-7. The potential range for the Donation variable was 0-100.
Outliers were only excluded from analyses that included the variables on which they were outliers. Exclusion of the outliers did not substantially change the results of hypothesis tests.

Multivariate outliers were identified based on the criteria described by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007): if the proportion of Mahalanobis Distance scores that fall below a given score is less than .001, then that score is considered a multivariate outlier. No multivariate outliers were identified for any of the main analyses.

Examination of the Q-Q plots, histograms, skewness, and kurtosis scores indicated that the distribution for Session 2 toleration of torture in the hypocrisy condition might be leptokurtic ($kurtosis = 2.08$). However, $z$-$kurtosis = 2.93$ for the distribution, indicating that the variable could still be used in analyses. Examination of the Q-Q plots, histograms, skewness, and kurtosis scores for all other variables indicated no serious deviations from normality.

**Affect analyses.** If the hypocrisy induction procedure aroused dissonance as I expected, then participants should have reported experiencing more discomfort in the hypocrisy condition compared to participants in the other two conditions. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with discomfort as the dependent variable. Feelings of discomfort did not differ significantly between the conditions, $F(2, 135) = 1.57, p =$
0.21, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$. Thus, mediation was not tested for Hypotheses 1-3.³

Tests of hypotheses.³ ⁴

Hypothesis 1. I expected that participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, would reduce their toleration of torture the most. I tested this hypothesis using a 2×3 mixed model ANOVA, with time of toleration measure (toleration of torture measured in Session 1 vs. Session 2) as the within-subjects factor and condition (hypocrisy vs. advocacy vs. control) as the between-subjects factor. There was a significant main effect of time, such that participants

³ For exploratory purposes, I also examined whether participants differed on the other affect variables between the three conditions by conducting three one-way ANOVAs using positive emotions, depressive emotions, and negative emotions about others as the dependent variables. There were no significant differences between the three conditions in negative emotions about the self, $F(2, 135) = 0.26, p = 0.77, \eta_p^2 = 0.004$, positive emotions, $F(2, 135) = 1.57, p = .21, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$, depression, $F(2, 135) = 1.11, p = .33, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$, or negative emotions about others, $F(2, 135) = 1.05, p = .35, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$.

⁴ I tested whether social dominance orientation, RWA, or preference for consistency moderated the effect of condition on any of the three dependent variables. None of the individual difference variables were moderators, although RWA and social dominance orientation were correlated with all three dependent variables ($rs$ from .22 to .48), similar to previous findings (e.g., Larsson, Björklund, & Bäckström, 2012; McFarland & Mathews, 2005). Preference for consistency, however, was not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables (all $ps > .15$).

³ It was still possible that participants who did not support the right to humane treatment in the abstract would experience dissonance as a result of writing the essay about supporting the right to humane treatment. For these individuals, the essay would have been counterattitudinal and, therefore, dissonance arousing (Elliot & Devine, 1994). For this reason, I also conducted the analyses for affect and Hypotheses 1-3 including participants who did not support the right to humane treatment, which was a sample of $N = 175$ (126 female, 48 male, 1 unknown) age 18-39 years ($M = 20.26, SD = 2.93$). These analyses can be found in Appendix O.
tolerated the torture less in the second session ($M = 2.32, SD = 1.47$) than in the first ($M = 2.68, SD = 1.40$), $F(1, 133) = 7.82, p = .006, \eta^2_p = .06$. There was no main effect of condition on average toleration of torture, $F(2, 133) = 1.06, p = .35, \eta^2_p = .02$. There was a marginally significant interaction between time and condition, $F(2, 133) = 2.73, p = .07, \eta^2_p = .04$ (see Figure 2).
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**Figure 2.** The effect of condition and session on toleration of torture in Study 1. Error bars represent ±1SE.

Simple effects testing the effect of time at each level of condition indicated that participants in the advocacy-only condition significantly reduced their toleration of the torture from Session 1 to Session 2 ($M_{difference} = .70, p = .001$), but participants in the hypocrisy ($M_{difference} = 0.34, p = .13$) and control ($M_{difference} < 0.001, p > .99$) conditions did not. Additionally, simple effects testing the effect of condition at each level of time indicated that toleration of the torture did not differ across conditions in Session 1 (all $ps$
> .10). However, participants in the hypocrisy condition tolerated the torture marginally less than those in the control condition in Session 2 ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.55, p = 0.08$).

Toleration of torture in Session 2 did not differ significantly between the hypocrisy and advocacy conditions ($p = 0.84$) or between the advocacy and control conditions ($p = 0.11$). Results from this analysis indicate, given that toleration of the torture did not differ between conditions in Session 1, that participants in the hypocrisy condition reduced their toleration of torture to a greater extent than those in the control condition (although this reduction in toleration in the hypocrisy condition was not significant).

However, because toleration of torture in Session 2 did not significantly differ between the hypocrisy and advocacy-only conditions, or between advocacy-only and control, it is unclear from these analyses whether the hypocrisy induction procedure was more effective at reducing toleration of torture than simply having participants advocate for the right to humane treatment.

Because I was interested in the relative reduction in toleration of torture between the three conditions, I also ran a one-way ANOVA using the difference scores for toleration of torture (Session 1 toleration – Session 2 toleration) to examine whether the reduction in toleration of the torture differed significantly between conditions as stated.

---

There were three total extreme outliers on the difference score variable. Inclusion of these outliers made the distribution of scores too non-normal for use in ANOVA. Skewness and kurtosis values indicated that the data were normally distributed after the outliers were removed ($N = 134$). Therefore, the analyses reported here do not include the outliers.
hypothesized. Higher positive scores on the difference score indicated a greater reduction in toleration of the torture. There was a significant main effect of condition, $F(2, 131) = 3.83, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = 0.06$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the hypocrisy condition reduced their toleration of torture significantly more than participants in the control condition ($M_{difference} = 0.58, p = .03$) and participants in the advocacy-only condition reduced their toleration of torture significantly more than participants in the control condition ($M_{difference} = 0.65, p = .01$). The reduction in toleration of torture did not significantly differ between the hypocrisy and advocacy-only conditions ($M_{difference} = -0.07, p = .78$).

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected that participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, would be the most willing to help the target of torture. I tested this hypothesis using a one-way ANOVA with willingness to help the target as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. Contrary to what I had expected, willingness to help the target did not significantly differ between the three conditions, $F(2, 135) = 0.05, p = .95, \eta_p^2 = .001$.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. I tested this hypothesis using a one-way ANOVA with donations to the torture-related charity as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant main effect of condition on suggested
donations to the torture-related charity, $F(2, 133) = 3.26, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .05$. Tukey’s HSD post-hoc analysis indicated that participants in the hypocrisy condition suggested higher donations than did those in both the advocacy-only ($M_{\text{difference}} = 3.92, p = .04$) and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 4.52, p = .02$; see Figure 3). Suggested donations did not significantly differ between the advocacy-only and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.60, p = .75$).

**Figure 3.** The effect of condition on suggested donations to the torture-related charity in Study 1. Error bars represent ±1SE.

**Discussion**

The general purpose of this study was to investigate whether hypocrisy induction could lead people to reduce their toleration of torture (a human rights violation). Results offered support for only some of my hypotheses, such that there was some support for the
predicted effect of condition on the dependent variables, though none of the mediation hypotheses were supported.

For Hypothesis 1, I expected that participants in the hypocrisy condition would reduce their toleration of torture more than participants in the other two conditions. Inconsistent with my prediction, only those in the advocacy-only condition significantly reduced their toleration of the torture from Session 1 to Session 2. However, given that toleration of torture did not significantly differ across conditions in Session 1 and that toleration of torture was marginally less in the hypocrisy than in the control condition in Session 2, it appears that there was some reduction in toleration of torture in the hypocrisy condition as well. Moreover, the analysis of the difference scores for toleration of torture indicated that, although there was significantly more reduction of toleration of torture in both the advocacy-only and hypocrisy conditions compared to the control condition, the reduction in toleration of the torture did not significantly differ between the hypocrisy and advocacy-only conditions. Thus, reducing toleration of human rights violations might be accomplished either by having individuals advocate their support of a relevant right or by having them advocate then recognize their hypocrisy, though there is stronger evidence in this study for the former technique.

Although it seems like the advocacy-only and perhaps the hypocrisy conditions were effective for reducing toleration of torture, there was no evidence that participants who supported the right to humane treatment experienced dissonance from reflecting on
their hypocritical toleration of torture. An explanation for why dissonance was not aroused is that participants might not have seen their toleration of torture as very harmful.

Cooper and Fazio (1984) have argued that it is crucial that one sees oneself as having created an aversive or harmful situation as a result of one’s inconsistent response in order for dissonance to occur. Although tolerating a human rights violation might indirectly contribute to the continued occurrence of human rights violations, it does not directly cause such violations to occur. Participants in the present study, therefore, might have thought that their toleration of torture was not particularly harmful, precluding the arousal of discomfort due to dissonance.

If hypocrisy induction did not arouse dissonance as I expected, what could account for the effect of my manipulation on toleration of a human rights violation? The pattern of results for toleration of torture is consistent with research indicating that advocating a position one already holds tends to increase the salience and accessibility of that position (Powell & Fazio, 1984), making it more likely for individuals to behave in a way that is consistent with that position. Participants in both the hypocrisy and advocacy-only conditions advocated for the right to humane treatment. Moreover, my primary analyses only included those who already supported the right to humane treatment. Participants’ advocacy in these two conditions might have increased their confidence in their already supportive attitude, leading them to reduce their toleration of torture in order to be consistent with their abstract support. Thus, I found weak support for Hypothesis 1,
given that hypocrisy induction was not more effective than simply advocating one’s support for the violated right, for reducing the toleration of a human rights violation. Moreover, any effects of the hypocrisy induction procedure were not the result of dissonance.

Although there was some weak support for Hypothesis 1, the results of Study 1 did not offer any support for Hypothesis 2. Participants were similarly willing to help the target of the torture across conditions. One reason why people might have reduced their toleration of torture in certain conditions, but not have been more willing to help the target, is the nature of the torture scenario I used for the present study. To increase the likelihood that some individuals would tolerate the target’s torture, I created a target who had engaged in morally reprehensible behaviour (Carlsmith & Sood, 2009; Drolet et al., 2016). Because of the target’s morally reprehensible behaviour, participants might have disliked him and were thus less willing to help him after he was tortured, even if they thought his torture was inappropriate. That is, participants might have believed that the target should not be tortured, but not necessarily that he was deserving of their help after the fact. My results suggest that, in cases where the target of a human rights violation has behaved particularly badly in the past, neither hypocrisy induction nor simply advocating for a right one supports will be effective at encouraging people to help the target.

Despite weak support for Hypothesis 1 and a lack of support for Hypothesis 2, the results from Study 1 did offer some support for Hypothesis 3. Participants in the
hypocrisy condition suggested the highest donations to the torture-related charity, compared to participants in the other two conditions. Additionally, the suggested donations to the torture-related charity did not differ significantly between the control and advocacy-only conditions.

This pattern is consistent with my reasoning based on cognitive dissonance theory and research; however, results for the affect measure again showed no evidence that dissonance arousal (in the form of discomfort) was the mediating mechanism. One possibility for the differences between the advocacy-only and hypocrisy conditions on the donation measure and not the toleration of torture measure, is that writing the additional essay in the hypocrisy condition made participants’ supportive attitudes regarding humane treatment more salient and accessible compared to participants in the advocacy-only and control conditions. Writing the additional essay about feeling conflicted about supporting humane treatment would have made participants’ supportive attitudes even more accessible than they would have been after writing the first essay (Powell & Fazio, 1984). The more accessible a given attitude is in one’s mind, the more likely it is that the attitude would continue to be used to inform relevant responses (see Higgins, 1996). Thus, participants in the hypocrisy condition would be more likely to respond to the donation task at the end of the session in a way that was consistent with their supportive attitude, because their supportive attitude was more accessible than it would have been for participants in the advocacy-only and control conditions.
In summary, perhaps the hypocrisy induction procedure resulted in greater donations to the torture-related charity not because of dissonance reduction, but because participants in the hypocrisy condition spent more time than other participants elaborating on their abstract support for humane treatment. Regardless of the mechanism, the pattern of results suggests that simply advocating for a human right is not enough to influence subsequent indicators of support for the right.

**Limitations.** One limitation of Study 1 is that the sample was overwhelmingly female (72% of the sample). Future research on this topic might benefit from a sample with a more equal number of men and women, given evidence of differences in men’s and women’s tendency to empathize and engage in prosocial behaviours (Christov-Moore et al., 2014; Eagly, 2009). Additionally, it is unclear whether these results could be generalized to other human rights violations, or if these effects are specific to the topic of humane treatment. Finally, a sizeable number of participants did not return for the second session. Perhaps there was something different about the participants who remained in the study, versus the 37 who did not, that reduces the generalizability of the results.

---

I tested whether or not participants who dropped out (versus stayed) differed on SDO, RWA, PFC, and HR support using both independent-samples *t* tests and Mann-Whitney *U* tests (the non-parametric equivalent). Participants who dropped out versus stayed did not significantly differ on any of those variables in any of the analyses. Moreover, a \( \chi^2 \) analysis indicated that participant sex was not related to whether or not participants dropped out.
Implications for cognitive dissonance research. Similar to past research on hypocrisy induction (Focella & Stone, 2013; Stone et al., 1994), the results of my first study indicate that the hypocrisy induction procedure is effective for encouraging people to behave in a way that is consistent with the position that they advocated, which, in this case, was support for the right to humane treatment. Participants who reflected on their hypocritical toleration of torture after advocating for the right to humane treatment suggested higher donations to the torture-related charity than participants in the other two conditions. This finding adds to past research on hypocrisy induction by suggesting that reflecting on one’s hypocritical responses, in addition to advocating support, makes one’s supportive position more accessible, making it more likely to influence relevant responses following the hypocrisy induction procedure. It is not clear whether reflecting on hypocrisy itself is necessary for changing responses, or if any form of additional elaboration on one’s supportive attitude would suffice.

Moreover, few hypocrisy induction studies test the suggested mediating mechanism (i.e., discomfort from dissonance), or test affect at all (e.g., Fointiat, 2011; Stone et al., 1997). The results of my study raise the question of what the mechanism behind past findings might be, at least in certain cases. For example, dissonance might only be behind the effect of hypocrisy induction on an attitude or behaviour when the hypocrisy is seen as causing very aversive consequences (see Cooper, 1999). In
situations when the hypocrisy is not seen as harmful, some other mechanism (e.g., elaboration, accessibility) might be responsible.

**Applied implications.** Regardless of the possible mechanism underlying the current pattern of results, my findings offer promising options for encouraging pro-human rights responses. The results for toleration of torture indicate that, for programs aimed at reducing the toleration of human rights violations, simply advocating support might be equally effective as hypocrisy induction for reducing such toleration (provided that the toleration in question is occurring soon after the advocacy or hypocrisy induction).

Furthermore, it appears that having people both reflect on their support for humane treatment, and engage in some additional elaboration concerning their support toward humane treatment, is effective for encouraging people to engage in pro-rights responses for a longer period of time (compared to just reflecting on one’s supportive attitude). Therefore, programs aiming to encourage responses that support human rights could benefit from not only having people publicly express support for human rights, but also having them engage in some additional reflection concerning their support. However, it is unclear whether the additional reflection would necessarily need to involve reflecting on one’s hypocritical toleration of a human rights violation. Moreover, neither advocacy alone nor advocating with the addition of reflecting on one’s hypocrisy appear to be effective for encouraging people to help the victim of a human rights violation.
Programs aimed at encouraging people to help victims after a human rights violation has occurred might benefit more from strategies that combat perceptions that the target deserved harsh treatment or shifting focus off of contextual factors suggesting deservingness (Drolet et al., 2016; Hafer, 2011).

**Future directions.** Study 1 is one of the first investigations of hypocrisy induction in the context of reducing the toleration of human rights violations (see also Drolet, 2014). Despite interesting findings, several questions remain. First, given that discomfort did not mediate any of the effects on the dependent variables, the underlying mechanism driving these effects is unclear. Future research could further explore dissonance reduction and alternative mechanisms, like attitude elaboration and accessibility.

Second, similar to what has been argued by other cognitive dissonance researchers (e.g., Cooper & Fazio, 1984), I proposed that dissonance might only be responsible for changing responses following hypocrisy induction procedures when the hypocrisy is seen as harmful. It is worth looking into a method where participants are confronted with a situation that is directly related to the occurrence of human rights violations. One option would be to have participants recall times when they have actually committed, rather than simply tolerated, a human rights violation. However, participants are unlikely to be committing human rights violations like torture in their everyday lives. Thus, instead of having participants reflect on times when they have
committed a human rights violation, participants could be made to reflect on the
behaviour of a fellow ingroup member who has committed a human rights violation. Past
research suggests that witnessing an ingroup member’s hypocritical behaviour might
arouse dissonance in the witness, leading the witness to change his or her own relevant
responses (e.g., Focella et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2012). Therefore, in Study 2 of my
PhD, I explored how people respond when an ingroup member is directly involved with
the occurrence of a human rights violation. In my second study, I continued to explore
dissonance as the mechanism underlying changes in relevant responses as the result of
hypocrisy. Additionally, I addressed two limitations from Study 1 that I noted earlier: the
problem of participant attrition, and unequal numbers of male and female participants.
Study 2

Dissonance from an Ingroup Member’s Hypocrisy

As I discussed earlier, dissonance can arise when individuals recognize that their responses in certain situations are inconsistent with their personal standards. According to Aronson and colleagues (1995), the inconsistent responses arouse dissonance due to the threat they pose to people’s self-concept. The discomfort associated with dissonance motivates people to alter their relevant responses to be more in line with their personal standards, thereby alleviating the dissonance and resolving the threat to their self-concept.

One important way in which people derive their overall self-concept is through their group memberships (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Specifically, belonging to groups that are positively evaluated and distinct from other groups results in a positive social identity, which helps individuals achieve a positive self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986).

Similar to how individuals’ personal standards contribute to their positive self-concept, the standards of people’s ingroup contributes to their positive social identity, and therefore their positive self-concept (Marques, Abrams, Paez, & Martinez-Taboada, 1998). For example, according to the subjective group dynamics approach to social identity (Abrams, Marques, Bown, & Henson, 2000), people can achieve a positive social identity to the extent that their ingroup is perceived as having standards that are legitimate and valid, especially if these standards differentiate the ingroup from
outgroups. Moreover, responses of ingroup members that are inconsistent with important ingroup standards undermine the perceived legitimacy of those standards, threatening the group’s positive social identity (Marques et al., 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, observing an ingroup member who behaves in a way that is inconsistent with the ingroup’s standards should arouse dissonance, due to the threat the inconsistency poses to the ingroup’s positive image. The dissonance should be experienced as an unpleasant state of arousal and discomfort, and the discomfort should in turn motivate people to reduce the dissonance and repair the group’s image. There are a number of ways for people to reduce dissonance in this context (e.g., derogating the ingroup member [Pinto, Marques, Levine, & Abrams, 2010], changing perceptions of the ingroup’s standard [Glasford, Pratto, & Dovidio, 2008]). Most relevant to the present study, people could compensate for the ingroup member’s inconsistency by changing their own responses to be more in line with the group’s standards (Focella et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2012), similar to the way people change their inconsistent responses to be more in line with their important personal attitudes and standards.

In summary, I propose that people not only experience dissonance when their own cognitive elements (e.g., attitudes and behaviour) are inconsistent, they can also experience dissonance when an ingroup member responds in a way that is inconsistent with the ingroup’s standards. I refer to this phenomenon as “group-level dissonance.”
A few researchers suggest similar ideas to group-level dissonance. Glasford, Pratto, and Dovidio (2008) found evidence for what they called “intragroup dissonance,” which is dissonance aroused when individuals observe their ingroup behaving in a way that is inconsistent with the individual’s personal standards. Their results suggest that people can experience dissonance, at least in part, due to others’ responses, similar to group-level dissonance. However, with group-level dissonance, I propose that people experience cognitive dissonance from observing an ingroup member (not the ingroup as a whole) responding in a way that is inconsistent with the ingroup’s standards.

Another idea similar to group-level dissonance is vicarious dissonance. Research on vicarious dissonance indicates that people can experience dissonance from the inconsistency displayed by a similar other (e.g., Monin, Norton, Cooper, & Hogg, 2004; Norton, Monin, Cooper, & Hogg, 2003). Vicarious dissonance is experienced as vicarious discomfort; that is, discomfort that one can imagine the similar other feels (Norton et al., 2003). Like the idea of intragroup dissonance, vicarious dissonance studies support the notion that the inconsistent behaviour need not be performed by the individual experiencing dissonance. However, with group-level dissonance, I propose that people feel direct discomfort, not vicarious discomfort, as a result of an ingroup member’s inconsistency (not the inconsistency of any similar other). For the second study of my PhD, I build on the idea that dissonance can occur due to a similar other’s behaviour by proposing that dissonance (in the form of directly-experienced discomfort)
will result from the inconsistency between an important ingroup standard and an ingroup member’s behaviour that conflicts with said standard.

**Group-Level Hypocrisy Induction**

For Study 2 of my PhD, I examined one way in which hypocrisy can be induced at the group level. As I explained earlier, hypocrisy induction involves having people publicly advocate for an important standard, privately recognize times when they have not lived up to said standard, then giving them the opportunity to change their responses to be more in-line with the advocated standard (Stone & Fernandez, 2008). Similarly, group-level hypocrisy induction would involve having people observe an ingroup member who advocates for an important ingroup standard and subsequently responds in a way that is inconsistent with that standard. People would then be given the opportunity to respond to a relevant situation in a way that is consistent with the ingroup’s advocated standard. Responding in a way that is consistent with the ingroup’s standard should allow people to repair the ingroup’s positive image, and reduce the dissonance caused by the inconsistent ingroup member.

Proposing that ingroup members will alter their own responses to compensate for the threat to the ingroup image posed by an ingroup member’s hypocrisy is not unprecedented (e.g., Focella et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2012). Focella et al. (2015) directly examined the role of dissonance in response to a hypocritical ingroup member, but their rationale differs slightly from the argument that I make about group-level
dissonance. Across four studies, Focella and colleagues examined people’s reactions to
an ingroup hypocrite in the context of sunscreen use. They found that people were more
likely to acquire sunscreen following an ingroup member’s hypocritical decision not to
wear sunscreen. This result is consistent with my reasoning regarding group-level
dissonance. Focella et al., however, claim that this effect is due to vicarious dissonance,
which again is when one experiences dissonance on behalf of a similar other (Norton et
al., 2003). Although they directly measured vicarious discomfort in their first study (i.e.,
asked participants how they would have felt if they were in the speaker’s position) as an
indicator of vicarious dissonance, vicarious discomfort did not mediate the effect of the
hypocrisy manipulation on sunscreen acquisition. In fact, the hypocrisy manipulation
had no influence on vicarious discomfort. Interestingly, in Study 4, Focella et al. found
indirect evidence, using a misattribution paradigm, that the hypocrisy manipulation did
lead to increased arousal, another indicator of dissonance (Zanna & Cooper, 1974).
Taken with the results of their first study, Study 4 results suggest that their procedure
does arouse dissonance, but it is not vicarious. Rather, the threat to the ingroup’s image
presumably caused by the hypocritical ingroup member might have actually aroused what
I refer to as group-level dissonance. If that is the case, then I would expect participants’
directly-experienced discomfort, not the anticipated discomfort of another (i.e.,
vicarious), to drive the effect of the manipulation.
Focella et al.’s findings provide some support for my reasoning that a hypocritical ingroup member should motivate ingroup observers to compensate for the ingroup member’s inconsistent actions, repairing the ingroup’s positive image (see also Gaffney et al., 2012). For the second study of my PhD, I directly examined the idea of group-level dissonance in responding to an ingroup hypocrite. Specifically, I examined group-level dissonance in the context of an ingroup member who is hypocritical with regards to human rights.

**Overview and Hypotheses**

In Study 2 of my PhD, Canadian participants read a news story about an ingroup member. In the hypocrisy/inconsistent condition, the ingroup member publicly advocated for the importance of upholding the right to humane treatment. I assumed opposing torture was an important standard for the Canadian ingroup, given that Canada is a signatory of the UN Convention Against Torture (United Nations, 2015) and that torture is prohibited under the Canadian Criminal Code (*Criminal Code - R.S.C., 1985*). The ingroup member then admitted to tolerating violations of that right (i.e., torture). In the consistent condition, the ingroup member advocated for the same right, but did not show hypocrisy, instead behaving in a way that was consistent with the advocated standard. In a control condition, the ingroup member engaged in a neutral activity. The ingroup member’s inconsistency in the hypocrisy/inconsistent condition should arouse
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* I also tested this assumption empirically.
group-level dissonance in participants, with its associated feeling of direct discomfort. Participants were then given the opportunity to respond to a violation of the right to humane treatment in a way that was consistent with the ingroup’s support for the right; that is, they were given a chance to show intolerance of torture.

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least toleration of an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected that the effect of condition on toleration of torture would be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the less they would tolerate the torture.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to be the most willing to help the target of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on willingness to help the target to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more they would be willing to help the target of torture.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on suggested donation to a torture-related charity to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher their suggested donation to the torture-related charity.
Method

**Sample size selection.** I planned to recruit 30 male and 30 female participants per condition. There were three conditions (inconsistent, consistent, control) making the desired sample size 180.

**Participants.** I recruited 239 Brock University students for this study using the university’s Psychology Research Pool website (SONA). Because the manipulation was expected to be relevant only to participants who were Canadian citizens, I excluded participants who were not Canadian citizens. Eight participants were excluded for this reason. The final sample \( N = 231 \) (129 female, 102 male) age 18-43 \((M = 20.26, SD = 3.00)\). All participants in the final sample were Canadian citizens, though 19 had dual citizenship in another country and 20 were not born in Canada. The majority of participants were Caucasian \((n = 175, 75.76\%)\), but the sample included individuals identifying as Asian \((n = 25, 10.82\%)\), Hispanic \((n = 2, 0.87\%)\), Middle Eastern \((n = 9, 3.90\%)\), and Black \((n = 18, 7.79\%)\). Political orientation was measured by having participants rate their political orientation on a scale from 1 (very liberal) to 7 (very conservative). Mean political orientation was 3.37 \((SD = 1.45)\). Around half of participants identified as somewhat to very liberal political orientation \((n = 125, 54.11\%)\), with the other half identifying as somewhat to very conservative \((n = 46, 19.91\%)\), neutral \((n = 49, 21.21\%)\), or they did not respond \((n = 11, 4.76\%)\). The students signed up for a single-session study called “Study on Interaction with News Media,” for which
they received course credit or $10 for their participation. Participants were run alone in adjacent, individual testing rooms. The experimenter ran two participants at a time, going back and forth between the two rooms as necessary.

**Procedure.** Figure 4 shows a visual summary of the procedure. After signing the informed consent form (Appendix P), participants completed all of the study materials, except the pre-debriefing questionnaire, on a computer using Qualtrics. Participants first gave demographic information (Appendix Q). Within the demographic items was a measure of the extent to which being Canadian was an important part of participants’ identities. This measure was important because the group-level dissonance effect requires that participants see themselves as part of the same group (in this case, Canadians) as the “ingroup” member to which they are exposed. The rest of the items on the demographics page were for describing the sample.

Following the demographic items, participants completed the RWA scale (Altemeyer, 1996). Two items assessing participants’ support for the right to humane treatment were embedded in the RWA measure (Appendix R) to prevent participants from guessing that the study specifically focused on torture. I also examined RWA as an exploratory moderator variable.
Figure 4. Overview of the procedure for Study 2.
Next, participants answered questions about their habits regarding different types of news media (e.g., newspaper, radio news), as well as four items about their attitudes regarding two different news topics (Appendix S). Two of these questions assessed participants’ belief that most Canadians support the right to humane treatment. These items were important because the group-level dissonance effect requires that participants believe the standard advocated by the ingroup member (in this case, opposing torture) to be an important norm for their ingroup (i.e., Canadians). The rest of the items in this section were filler items meant to prevent participants from guessing that the main focus of the study was torture. Next, participants were randomly assigned to the inconsistent condition, consistent condition, or control condition. Participants read and responded to a scenario about a Canadian MP. This scenario differed depending on the condition (Appendix T).

Following the scenario were memory checks, as well as manipulation checks (Appendix U). Participants then completed a multi-item affect measure that assessed how they felt after reading the scenario (Appendix V), including their level of discomfort (the proposed mediator in Hypotheses 1 to 3); this measure was the same as the affect measure used in Study 1.

Participants then read and responded to a filler scenario about a forest fire (Appendix W), followed by items assessing participants’ memory of, and reactions to, the
scenario (Appendix X). I did not analyze these items because the forest fire story and response items were included merely to help disguise the main focus of the study.

After the filler scenario, participants read about an individual, Sahad, who was subjected to an enhanced interrogation involving torture (Appendix Y). The scenario was similar to the torture scenario used in Study 1. Following the scenario were memory checks (Appendix Z). After the memory checks, participants completed the same toleration of torture (Appendix Z), willingness to help (Appendix Z), and donation (Appendix AA) measures as in Study 1 (which assessed the dependent variables in Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, respectively).

Before being debriefed, participants completed a pre-debriefing questionnaire (Appendix BB). The questionnaire assessed the extent to which being Canadian was an important part of participants’ identities, the extent to which they supported the right to humane treatment, and the extent to which they believed it was normative for Canadians to oppose the use of torture (all measures taken earlier in the session). Additionally, I measured participants’ evaluations of the Canadian MP described in the first news story (e.g., general impressions, prototypicality). These questions allowed me to assess alternative ways in which participants might resolve the dissonance caused by the hypocritical ingroup member, other than by responding in ways that are intolerant of torture (including more willingness to help the victim and greater funds allotted to the anti-torture charity). Specifically, participants might have resolved the dissonance by one
of the following alternative means: by reducing their identification as Canadian (Glasford et al., 2008), by reducing the extent to which they supported the right to humane treatment (Monin et al., 2004), by changing the extent to which they claimed it was normative for Canadians to oppose the use of torture (see Cooper, Kelly, & Weaver, 2001), or by distancing themselves from the hypocritical MP (Rullo, Presaghi, & Livi, 2015), either by derogating him or by claiming he is not prototypical of the ingroup.

After participants completed this final set of measures, they were verbally debriefed (Appendix CC). The verbal debriefing included questions that assessed for suspicion. Finally, participants were given a printed debriefing form (Appendix DD), compensated, and thanked for their time.

**Manipulation.**

**Hypocrisy/inconsistent condition.** Participants read about a Canadian MP who publicly opposed the use of torture in interrogations, but later allowed for Canadian organizations to use information collected through the use of torture. Moreover, participants read that the MP also allowed for Canadian prisoners to be sent to facilities that were known for using torture.

**Consistent condition.** Participants read about a Canadian MP who publicly opposed the use of torture and took steps to prevent Canadian organizations from using information obtained through the use of torture. Moreover, participants read that the MP
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\*No participants guessed the purpose of the study.\*
also refused to send Canadian prisoners to facilities that were known for using torture.

**Control condition.** Participants read about a Canadian MP talking about a recent book he published and about the writing process. Nothing in the control scenario was related to human rights.

**Primary dependent measures.**

*Toleration of torture (α = .92), willingness to help (r = .77), and donation task.*

These measures were identical to those in Study 1, with one exception. Unlike in Study 1, the organization that was supposedly asking for suggestions about donations for the donation task was called the International Research Network, to prevent participants from suggesting donations based on how consistent the charities were with the title of the organization (Appendix Z).

**Affect measure (Elliot & Devine, 1994).** This measure was identical to the affect measure in Study 1 (α’s = .91[Discomfort], .94[Positive], .92[Depressed], .90[NegSelf], .94[NegOther]) (Appendix V).

**Other variables.**

*Canadian identity items (α = .92[pre], α = .84[post]; adapted from Sidanius, van Laar, Levin, & Sinclair, 2003).* Three items assessed the extent to which being Canadian was an important part of participants’ identities (e.g., “I feel very close to other Canadians”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores indicate that being Canadian is a
more important part of participants’ identities (Appendix Q).

Support for the right to humane treatment \((r = .71[\text{pref}], \ r = .94[\text{post}])\). These items were identical to those in Study 1.

Right wing authoritarianism scale \((\alpha = .86; \text{Altemeyer, 1996})\). The measure of RWA was the same as in Study 1.

Canadians’ views on humane treatment \((r = .76[\text{pref}], r = .89[\text{post}])\). Two items assessed participants’ perceptions of Canadians’ abstract support for the right to humane treatment (“Most Canadians agree that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason,” “It is important to most Canadians that no one ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with these statements from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores indicate stronger agreement that most Canadians support the right to humane treatment (Appendix S).

Memory checks. Three memory checks followed the scenario about the Canadian MP. Findings from Gaffney et al. (2012) suggest that the threat to the ingroup’s positive image will be greatest when an outgroup member comments on an ingroup member’s hypocrisy. Thus, the news outlet from which the first article was supposedly taken was a US (outgroup) news outlet. To assess whether participants noticed that this news article was from the US, the first two memory check questions asked, “What news agency
published the article?” and “What country was the news agency from?” To assess comprehension of the article’s content (especially the crucial information in the inconsistent and consistent conditions) participants were then asked, “Which of the following appeared at the end of the article?” This question was followed by three options that were the final line of the article in each of the three conditions (Appendix U).

Following the torture scenario, participants were also asked to recall the news agency that published the article and to select the last sentence of the article. These questions were included to be consistent with the format of the questions that followed the manipulated scenario. Only the memory check where participants selected the last sentence of the article was analyzed to assess comprehension of the article’s content.

**Manipulation checks (r = .94).** Two items measured participants’ beliefs about how the MP’s actions reflected on the Canadian ingroup (“How does this story reflect on Canada?” and “How does this story make Canada look?”). Participants rated each item on a 1 (very negatively/very bad) to 7 (very positively/very good) scale. Low scores indicate that the MP’s actions pose a threat to the positive ingroup image (Appendix U).

**Impression of the MP (α = .82).** Six items assessed participants’ impressions of the Canadian MP. Participants indicated how much they liked the MP (1 = dislike very much to 7 = like very much), their impression of him (1 = very positive to 7 = very negative), the extent to which they thought he was a good symbol of Canada (1 = very bad symbol to 7 = very good symbol), his competence (1 = very competent to 7 = very
incompetent), his honesty (1 = very dishonest to 7 = very honest), and how favourably they saw him (1 = very favourable to 7 = very unfavourable). The liking, symbol of Canada, and honesty items were reverse scored. High scores indicate a negative evaluation of the MP (Appendix BB).

**Prototypicality (r = .73).** Two items assessed participants’ perceptions of how prototypical the MP was of other Canadians (“How similar is Nathan Costello to other Canadians?” and “How much does Nathan Costello have in common with other Canadians?”). Participants rated the extent to which the MP was prototypical from 1 (not very similar/nothing) to 7 (very similar/a lot). High scores indicate high prototypicality (Appendix BB).

**Results**

An alpha of .05 is used throughout. Correlations between all variables, as well as means and standard deviations, can be found in Table 2.

**Preliminary Analyses.**

**Outliers and normality.** There was one outlier on the donation measure ($z = 3.17$) and one outlier on post-manipulation Canadian identity ($z = -3.73$) in the inconsistent condition. There were three outliers on the pre-manipulation Canadian identity variable ($z = -3.64, -3.15$) and one outlier on the donation variable ($z = 3.05$) in the consistent condition. There were two outliers on post-manipulation Canadian identity ($z = -3.47$) in the control condition.
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Variables in Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflects positively on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong>**</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Toleration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Donation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Canadian identity (pre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Canadian identity (post)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Variables in Study 2 (continued)
Outliers were only excluded from analyses that included the variables on which they were outliers. Exclusion of the outliers did not substantially change the results of hypothesis tests.

Multivariate outliers were identified based on the criteria described by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). No multivariate outliers were identified for any of the main analyses.

The pre-manipulation Canadian identity variable was extremely leptokurtic in the consistent condition ($kurtosis = 3.45$). The post-manipulation Canadian identity variable was both negatively skewed and leptokurtic in the inconsistent ($skewness = -2.30$, $kurtosis = 10.43$) and control ($skewness = -2.40$, $kurtosis = 8.34$) conditions. Post-manipulation perceived Canadian support for humane treatment was leptokurtic ($kurtosis = 3.52$) in the inconsistent condition. Skewness and kurtosis values for all other distributions were between ±2. Taken with examination of histograms and Q-Q plots, I concluded that only distributions for pre-manipulation Canadian identity in the consistent condition, post-manipulation Canadian identity in the inconsistent and control conditions, and post-manipulation Canadian support for humane treatment in the inconsistent condition substantially deviated from normality.

For variables that were only analysed as outcome variables, if normality and/or homogeneity of variance assumptions were violated for a given analysis, I ran the analysis with and without bootstrapping to account for the violated assumptions. For
variables that were analysed both as outcome variables and later as predictors (i.e.,
covariates, mediators, moderators), if normality and/or homogeneity of variance
assumptions were violated for a given analysis, I ran the analysis with and without
transforming the variable to account for the violated assumptions. The type of
transformation that was used depended on which assumptions were violated. Results for
analyses using bootstrapped or transformed variables are reported in footnotes, unless
otherwise stated.

**Assumptions.** The reasoning behind the effectiveness of my manipulation on
discomfort and the other main dependent variables relied heavily on the assumption that
the majority of participants would see both being Canadian as an important part of their
identity and supporting the right to humane treatment as important to most Canadians.
The majority of participants did report that being Canadian was an important part of their
identity ($M = 5.69, SD = 1.55, 87\%$ above neutral) and that it was normative for
Canadians to support the right to human treatment ($M = 5.48, SD = 1.33, 79.2\%$ above
neutral). Although not as central to the effectiveness of the manipulation, I also checked
whether most participants supported the right to humane treatment. The majority of
participants reported that they supported the right to humane treatment ($M = 4.20, SD =
0.60, 61.9\%$ above neutral). Single sample $t$ tests indicated that the means for Canadian
identity, $t(227) = 18.92, p < .001$, Canadian support for humane treatment, $t(230) =
16.97, p < .001$, and support for humane treatment, $t(230) = 5.09, p < .001$, were all
significantly higher than neutral (i.e., 4). Moreover, ANOVAs indicated that participants did not differ by condition on these three variables prior to the manipulation.

**Memory checks.** The majority of participants (88.31%) correctly selected the last sentence from the story about the MP. There were 13 participants in the inconsistent condition, 13 participants in the consistent condition, and only one participant from the control condition, who did not correctly select the last sentence. It is not surprising that more participants responded incorrectly in the inconsistent and consistent conditions than in the control condition, as the final sentences of the inconsistent and consistent scenarios only differed by a few words. Thus, participants in those conditions might have selected the wrong option if they did not read the sentences in the memory check very carefully. For this reason, participants were retained for all analyses regardless of how they responded to the memory check. Results did not differ substantially after excluding participants who answered the memory check incorrectly.

Gaffney et al. (2012) found evidence that an outgroup member commenting on an ingroup member’s hypocrisy makes said hypocrisy more threatening. Therefore, participants in the current study were led to believe that the scenario about the Canadian MP was written by a US news agency. However, only a minority of participants noticed that the news agency was from the US (inconsistent = 31 [39.74%], consistent = 25 [33.78%], control = 19 [24.05%]). Because the country of the news agency was not
crucial to arousing dissonance, participants were retained regardless of whether or not they correctly indicated that the news agency was from the US.

For the scenario about an interrogation involving torture, the majority of participants (97%) were able to correctly identify the last sentence. There were 3 participants in the inconsistent condition, 3 in the consistent condition, and 1 in the control condition who did not correctly select the last sentence from the torture scenario. Results for hypothesis tests did not substantially differ after removing participants who failed to select the correct sentence. Thus, participants were retained for analyses regardless of how they responded to the memory check.

**Manipulation check.** If the manipulation of the Canadian MP’s behaviour in the scenario was effective, then participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to those in the other conditions, should have reported that the MP’s behaviour reflected more poorly on Canadians. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with the composite of the two manipulation check items as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on how the MP’s behaviour reflected on Canadians, $F(2, 228) = 175.07, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .61$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition thought the

---

*The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for this analysis. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, results for the analysis without bootstrapping is reported in this section.*
MP’s behaviour reflected worse on Canadians compared to participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -3.46, p < .001$) and control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -2.31, p < .001$). Additionally, participants in the consistent condition thought the MP’s behaviour reflected more positively on Canadians compared to participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.15, p < .001$). Thus, the manipulation of the MP’s behaviour worked as I expected.

**Affect analyses.** Consistent with my cognitive dissonance framework, I expected that participants in the inconsistent condition would experience more discomfort as a result of reading about the MP’s behaviour than participants in the other two conditions. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with discomfort as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on discomfort, $F(2, 228) = 12.60, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$ (see Figure 5). Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = .94, p < .001$) and control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = .95, p < .001$). Additionally, the amount of discomfort experienced by participants in the consistent and control conditions did not significantly differ ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.01, p = .99$).

---

*The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for this analysis. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, I log transformed the discomfort variable (Field, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Results did not substantially differ from those for the untransformed variable. Thus, results for the untransformed variable are reported in this section.*
For exploratory purposes, I also examined whether participants differed on the other affect variables between the three conditions by conducting three one-way ANOVAs using positive emotions, depressive emotions, negative emotions about the self, and negative emotions about others as the dependent variables. There was a significant effect of condition on positive emotions, $F(2, 228) = 3.66, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .03$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the consistent condition experienced more positive emotions than participants in the inconsistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.61, p = .05$). No other comparisons reached significance for positive emotions. Additionally, there was a significant effect of condition on depressed emotions, $F(2, 228) = 7.68, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .06$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more depressed emotions than participants in the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.84, p = .001$) and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}}$...
Participants in the consistent and control conditions experienced similar amounts of depressed emotions ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.23, p = .56$). Condition did not affect negative emotions about the self, $F(2, 228) = 1.07, p = .34, \eta^2_p = .01$. Finally, there was a significant effect of condition on negative emotions about others, $F(2, 228) = 21.34, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .16$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more negative emotions about others than participants in both the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.00, p = .002$) and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.87, p < .001$). Additionally, participants in the consistent condition experienced more negative emotions about others than participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.86, p = .01$).

Tests of hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least toleration of an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on toleration of torture to be

---

1. RWA did not moderate any of the effects on discomfort or the three primary dependent variables, although it was correlated with toleration of torture ($r = .27$) and suggested donation ($r = .12$), similar to previous findings (e.g., Larsson, Björklund, & Bäckström, 2012; McFarland & Mathews, 2005).
2. Participant sex (0 = female, 1 = male) significantly predicted toleration of torture ($r = .28$), willingness to help the target ($r = -.26$), and donation to the torture-related charity ($r = -.15$). Sex was also significantly correlated with discomfort ($r = -.18$), the expected mediator. Thus, I also tested my three hypotheses using participant sex as a covariate. Participant sex did not interact with condition, nor did the results including sex as a covariate substantially differ from those without the covariate. Results without sex as a covariate are reported in this section.
mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the less they would tolerate the torture. I first tested whether there was an effect of condition on toleration of torture using a one-way ANOVA with toleration of torture as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was no significant effect of condition on toleration of torture, $F(2, 228) = 0.73, p = .48, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Because there was no total effect of condition on toleration of torture, I did not test for mediation by discomfort.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to be the most willing to help the target of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on willingness to help the target to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more willing they would be to help the target of torture. I first tested whether there was an effect of condition on willingness to help the target using a one-way ANOVA with willingness to help as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was no significant effect of condition on willingness to help the target, $F(2, 228) = 0.95, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .01$. Because there was no total effect of condition on willingness to help the target, I did not test for mediation by discomfort.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-
related charity. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on suggested donation to a torture-related charity to be mediated by the discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher their suggested donation to the torture-related charity. First, I tested for the total effect of condition on donation using a one-way ANOVA with condition as the independent variable and donation as the dependent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on donation, $F(2, 225) = 4.10, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .04$ (see Figure 6). Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition suggested significantly higher donations than participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 4.36, p = .02$) and marginally more than those in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 3.25, p = .098$). Suggested donations did not significantly differ between the consistent and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = -1.12, p = .76$).

As I noted in the affect analyses section, there was an effect of condition on discomfort. Thus, I proceeded to test whether discomfort predicted donations to the torture-related charity by regressing donation onto discomfort. Discomfort predicted donations, $b = 1.56, \beta = 0.22, t(226) = 3.45, p = .001, sr^2 = .05, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.67, 2.45]$.

---

I also checked that the $a$-path for the effect of condition on discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -0.97, \beta = -0.32, t(225) = -4.42, p < .001, sr^2 = .08, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-1.40, -0.54]$, and control conditions, $b = -1.02, \beta = -0.34, t(225) = -4.71, p < .001, sr^2 = .09, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-1.44, -0.59]$. 
such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher the donation they suggested to the torture-related charity.14

![Graph showing the effect of condition on donation in Study 2. Error bars represent ±1SE.](image)

Figure 6. The effect of condition on donation in Study 2. Error bars represent ±1SE.

Finally, I regressed donation onto both condition and discomfort. Condition was dummy coded, such that one dummy code compared the consistent condition (coded as 1) to the inconsistent condition (coded as 0) and the other compared the control condition (coded as 1) to the inconsistent condition (coded as 0). Discomfort continued to predict donation, $b = 1.28$, $\beta = 0.18$, $t(224) = 2.69$, $p = .01$, $sr^2 = .03$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.34, 2.23], such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher the donation they

14 Given that I found a similar effect of condition on some of the other affect variables, I also examined whether any of the other affect variables might mediate the effect of condition on suggested donation. I regressed donation onto all five of the affect variables simultaneously. Only discomfort significantly predicted donation, $b = 1.80$, $\beta = 0.26$, $t(222) = 2.02$, $p = .045$, $sr^2 = .02$ (all other $ps > .12$). Thus, only discomfort was tested as a possible mediator.
suggested to the torture-related charity. Consistent with full mediation, neither the dummy code for the inconsistent versus consistent conditions ($p = .06$) nor for the inconsistent versus control conditions ($p = .23$) predicted donation after accounting for the effect of discomfort.\(^\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\) I used PROCESS (Hayes, 2016) to test for the indirect effect of condition through discomfort on donation using 1,000 bootstrapped samples. Consistent with mediation, there was an indirect effect of the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions through discomfort on donation, $b = 1.31$, 95% CI of $b$ [.38, 2.67]. However, there was no indirect effect of the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions through discomfort on donation, $b = .063$, 95% CI of $b$ [-.43, .71].

**Additional analyses.** In addition to my three hypotheses, I examined other potential methods for dissonance reduction: distancing one’s self from the Canadian ingroup identity, changing one’s attitude toward humane treatment, changing one’s perception of what most Canadians think about the right to humane treatment, and distancing one’s self from the hypocritical ingroup member by perceiving him as not prototypical of Canadians or by evaluating him negatively. Analyses involving these variables can be found in Appendix EE. Change in the extent to which participants

\(^{a}\) I also checked that the initial $c$-path for the effect of condition on suggested donation was significant in the regression analysis. Before entering discomfort as a predictor, the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions significantly predicted suggested donation, $b = -4.36$, $\beta = -0.21$, $t(225) = -2.75$, $p = .01$, $sr^2 = .03$, 95% CI of $b$ [-7.49, -1.23], as did the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions, $b = -3.25$, $\beta = -0.16$, $t(225) = -2.07$, $p = .04$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b$ [-6.33, -0.16].
identified as Canadian and perceptions of Canadians’ support for humane treatment did not differ by condition. However, participants in the inconsistent condition bolstered their personal support for the right to humane treatment more, saw the MP as less prototypical, and evaluated the MP more negatively than participants in the other conditions. Results were consistent with partial mediation by discomfort only for evaluation of the MP.

**Discussion**

The general purpose of this study was to examine whether observing an ingroup member’s hypocritical behaviour regarding human rights would arouse dissonance among ingroup observers, thereby motivating them to act in a way that is supportive of human rights. Similar to Study 1, I found inconsistent support for my hypotheses across my three main dependent variables. I found the expected effect of condition on donation, such that participants who read about the hypocritical MP suggested the highest donations to the torture-related charity. However, unlike in Study 1, I did find some support for mediation of the effect of condition on donation by the discomfort associated with dissonance. This is the first study to show how hypocrisy induction can be used in response to others’ hypocrisy in the context of human rights, as well as being one of the first hypocrisy studies to find evidence of mediation by discomfort (see also Eibach & Mock, 2011; Glasford et al., 2008).
For Hypotheses 1 and 2, I expected that participants in the inconsistent condition would tolerate Sahad’s torture less and be more willing to help him than participants in the other two conditions. However, participants tolerated the torture to a similar extent and were similarly unwilling to help Sahad in all three conditions. There are a number of possible reasons why I was unable to find an effect of condition on these variables. First, because the target had killed children, participants might have seen him as relatively deserving of torture. This scenario was chosen because, in a previous study (Drolet et al., 2016), people were particularly likely to tolerate this target’s torture because he was seen as deserving of such treatment due to his past transgressions (i.e., killing children). Using a scenario with such strong deservingness cues might have made it difficult for participants to ignore such cues. However, the same scenario was used in Study 1, where I did find some reduction in toleration of torture across sessions. Thus, it is difficult to be certain whether the deservingness information in the scenario is responsible for the lack of results on toleration of torture and willingness to help the target.

Another possible explanation for the lack of support for Hypotheses 1 and 2 is that the manner in which I assessed these variables was not relevant enough to the ingroup member’s hypocrisy. In many hypocrisy induction studies (e.g., Stone et al., 1994), including those that have examined the effects of an ingroup member’s hypocrisy (e.g., Focella et al., 2015), participants are given a direct strategy for resolving their dissonance, meaning that they are able to correct or alter the response that was
responsible for the arousal of dissonance. For example, in studies examining condom usage, participants are explicitly asked to advocate for condom use to prevent the spread of AIDS, and are later offered the opportunity to take condoms for later use.

Additionally, in the study by Focella et al. (2015), participants observed an ingroup member who advocated for sunscreen use (and subsequently did not use it) and were later given the opportunity to obtain sunscreen. Research by Stone et al. (1997) indicates that people are more likely to engage in direct strategies for reducing dissonance, compared to indirect strategies (e.g., self-affirmation; Sherman & Cohen, 2006), suggesting that the direct strategies are seen as more effective for reducing dissonance.

In the current study, participants read about an MP who tolerated an instance of torture by agreeing to use information that was gained through the use of torture and by sending prisoners to known torture centres in the Middle East. Participants were later asked about how appropriate an instance of torture was and if they would be willing to help the target. These items might not be as directly related to the dissonance arousing response—in this case, the MP permitting the use of torture—as would be necessary for participants to see them as a valid means for reducing dissonance. Not only are both of these measures about perceptions that have no impact on the situation presented in the torture scenario, but they also do not directly oppose the MP’s hypocritical behaviour. Moreover, particularly for the willingness to help items, these measures might not have offered an indirect means for reducing dissonance. If the items assessing toleration of
torture had asked about using the information derived from the interrogation, participants might have seen the items as more relevant to the MP’s hypocrisy and, therefore, as a viable option for reducing dissonance.

Another potential reason for the lack of support for Hypothesis 1 (though not explaining lack of support for Hypothesis 2), is that there was a floor effect on toleration. Although the means for all three conditions were above the low endpoint of the 1- to 7-point scale, they were just above 2 (e.g., the mean for the control condition was 2.63). Thus, while there was some room for participants to show less toleration of torture, there might not have been enough room for there to be a noticeable difference between the conditions. A scenario where baseline toleration of torture (i.e., toleration of torture in the control condition) was closer to the midpoint of the scale might have been more useful.

A floor effect does not, however, explain the lack of support for Hypothesis 2. One possibility is that participants were reluctant to help the target because the methods offered to them were too costly (i.e., writing a letter or donating money to cover legal fees). Alternatively, similar to my explanation for the null findings on willingness to help in Study 1, the reprehensibility of the target’s past behaviour might have prevented the hypocrisy induction from encouraging participants to help the target.

Despite the lack of support for Hypotheses 1 and 2, I did find support for Hypothesis 3. Participants in the inconsistent condition suggested higher donations to the
torture-related charity compared to participants in the other two conditions, and this
effect appeared to be mediated by discomfort. Consistent with explanations from self-
standards models of dissonance (Stone & Cooper, 2001) and subjective group dynamics
(Marques et al., 1998), participants who read about the hypocritical MP experienced
more discomfort than participants in the other conditions, likely because of the threat
posed to the groups’ image by the MP’s actions. This discomfort, in turn, motivated
participants to repair the ingroup’s image (i.e., being supportive of the right to humane
treatment) by acting in a way that promoted the ingroup’s position; specifically, by
donating to the charity that helps torture victims.

Some affect variables other than discomfort were influenced by the condition
manipulation. Specifically, participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more
negative emotions about others, more depressed emotions, and fewer positive emotions
than participants in the consistent condition. Although the effect of condition on these
variables were similar to what I observed on discomfort, only discomfort predicted
suggested donation when these variables were included in the model simultaneously.
Thus, consistent with Elliot and Devine’s (1994) original assertion, it appears that
discomfort associated with dissonance arousal is the main variable that predicts changes
to relevant responses.

Although I found promising results for Hypothesis 3, it is important to ask why
participants opted to reduce dissonance using the donation measure and not by reducing
their toleration of the target’s torture or helping the target. As I mentioned earlier, perceptions of the target’s deservingness might have prevented participants from reducing their toleration of the target’s torture or wanting to help the target. However, in donating to a charity that aids torture victims, participants are not aware of any information about the deservingness of the victims the charity helps. Thus, they might have been more comfortable resolving the dissonance by donating to the charity. Additionally, the donation measure was not subject to the same potential floor effect that I noted for toleration of torture, given that participants in the consistent and control conditions tended to suggest about 20% of the funds, well above the low endpoint of 0, be donated to the torture-related charity. A final reason why participants might have preferred the donation to the torture-related charity for reducing dissonance is that their donation suggestions were expected to be made public. Participants were told that an outside organization was going to be using their suggestions to make a public donation to the four charities listed on the donation measure. The public nature of the donation measure might have made it the most viable option for repairing the ingroup’s public image because it had the greatest potential to actually influence others’ perceptions of the ingroup.

In addition to my three main dependent variables, I included several other methods that participants could have used to reduce dissonance. Discomfort did partially mediate the effect of the MP’s hypocrisy on evaluation of the MP. Participants filled out
these items after the donation measure. Therefore, participants in the inconsistent condition had likely already reduced much of the dissonance aroused by reading about the hypocritical MP by the time they rated these final items. Participants might have reduced any remaining dissonance using the evaluation items, though it is unclear why participants would use these items and not the other measures to reduce dissonance.

In all, it appears that reading about a hypocritical ingroup member who permits a human rights violation, thereby threatening the positive image of the ingroup, can arouse dissonance and motivate people to behave in a way that is supportive of human rights. Although the hypocrisy manipulation did not have an effect on toleration of a specific human rights violation, it does show promising results for encouraging general behavioural support for a given human right.

**Implications for cognitive dissonance.** To date, the two studies examining hypocrisy induction based on an ingroup member’s hypocrisy have not found conclusive evidence that dissonance actually mediated the effects of an ingroup member’s hypocrisy on behaviour or attitude change (Focella et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2012). Gaffney et al. (2012) did not measure discomfort or any other indicator of dissonance. Focella et al. (2015), though finding indirect evidence that participants were more aroused after exposure to a hypocritical ingroup member, found no effect of the hypocrisy manipulation on a measure of vicarious discomfort. The current study is the first to examine both hypocrisy induction in the context of group membership and to find
evidence of mediation by directly-experienced discomfort. I refer to the directly-experienced discomfort that is experienced as a result of an ingroup member’s hypocrisy as group-level dissonance.

**Applied implications.** In the current study, Canadian participants experienced dissonance as a result of a US news outlet reporting on a Canadian MP’s hypocrisy. Given that the US has a history of not only hypocritically using torture-derived information, but also committing torture (United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 2014), it is interesting that Canadian participants did not simply dismiss the comments of an arguably more hypocritical outgroup, and many failed to notice that the news outlet was from the US, altogether. That participants continued to experience dissonance indicates that it might not matter if the news outlet calling attention to the hypocrisy is foreign or domestic. News outlets could apply the findings from the current study in terms of determining how and if they choose to pursue stories about the hypocrisy of their own and other nations’ leaders. More specifically, my results indicate that it might be beneficial for both foreign and domestic news agencies to directly comment on leaders’ hypocrisy regarding human rights violations, as doing so could motivate citizens of those nations to act in a way that promotes the violated rights.

**Limitation and future directions.** I argue that group-level hypocrisy induction is distinct from vicarious hypocrisy induction. What I refer to as group-level hypocrisy induction is concerned more with responding to the directly-experienced dissonance
aroused by the conflict between an ingroup norm and an ingroup member’s relevant hypocrisy (what I refer to as group-level dissonance), rather than with dissonance experienced on behalf of a similar other (i.e., vicarious dissonance). However, an important limitation of my study is that I assessed only directly-experienced discomfort as an indicator of dissonance arousal, and not vicarious discomfort (i.e., discomfort experienced on behalf of another). Thus, my methodology does not allow me to test whether vicarious dissonance drove some of the responses instead of or in addition to group-level dissonance. In the future, researchers could include measures of vicarious discomfort as well as directly-experienced discomfort in order to distinguish which form of dissonance is driving the effect of the hypocrisy on relevant responses.

Researchers should also examine possible reasons why participants did not reduce their toleration of torture in response to the hypocritical MP. There are several reasons that I suggested might be responsible for the lack of an effect of my hypocrisy manipulation on toleration of torture. First, perhaps the way in which toleration of torture was measured was not relevant enough to the MP’s hypocrisy for participants to see it as a viable option for reducing their dissonance. Using a toleration measure that is more directly relevant to the dissonance arousing hypocrisy would make it more likely for participants to use the toleration of torture measures to reduce dissonance. Second, given the strong influence deservingness judgments have on toleration of torture (Drolet et al., 2016), as well as evidence that deservingness cues are particularly difficult to ignore (see...
Hafer, 2011), participants might only reduce their toleration of a rights violation to resolve dissonance if they do not see the target of the violation as deserving of such treatment. Finally, in assessing how toleration of torture is affected by an ingroup member’s hypocrisy, it is necessary to use a scenario where participants’ baseline level of toleration of torture is farther from the scale’s endpoint than in the current study. Doing so would give participants more space to actually reduce their toleration of torture.

In Study 3, I addressed each of these reasons why the hypocrisy manipulation did not affect toleration of torture and/or willingness to help. Moreover, Study 3 included measures of both vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort.
Study 3

Overview

In my final study, I built on the findings of Study 2 by attempting to replicate the findings from the donation task. I also measured both vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort in order distinguish if one or both were responsible for the effects of the group-level hypocrisy induction procedure. Finally, I addressed three possible explanations for the lack of an effect of the hypocrisy manipulation on toleration of torture and/or willingness to help in Study 2.

Vicarious discomfort was assessed in a similar manner as Focella et al. (2015). Participants rated the extent to which they would have felt each of several discomfort-related emotions if they were in the MP’s position. In my Study 2, I found that the effect of condition on suggested donation was mediated by directly-experienced discomfort. Furthermore, Focella et al. (2015) found no evidence of mediation by vicarious discomfort. Based on these two sets of findings, I expected directly-experienced, but not vicarious, discomfort to mediate the effect of condition on my main dependent variables (i.e., toleration of the target’s torture, willingness to help, and suggested donation).

In the discussion for Study 2, I gave three reasons for why I did not find an effect of my manipulation on toleration of torture: relevance of the toleration of torture measures, deservingness judgments, and possible floor effects on toleration of torture. I addressed each of these reasons in Study 3.
First, to make it possible for participants to respond in a way that is relevant to the MP’s hypocrisy (i.e., using torture-derived information), the last paragraph of the torture scenario told participants that Sahad revealed further information about future attacks against Canadian forces, but that the Canadian government had not yet decided whether to use the information. Thus, in addition to asking participants how acceptable the torture was, participants were asked to what extent they believed the Canadian government should use the information gained from Sahad’s torture. If participants did not use the toleration of torture measure from Study 2 to reduce dissonance because the measure itself was not relevant enough to the ingroup member’s hypocrisy, then participants should reduce dissonance using these new, more relevant items.

Second, I included items assessing how deserving participants believed that Sahad was of harsh treatment. As I suggested in my discussion of Study 2, one reason why participants might not have differed in their toleration of torture across conditions is if they saw Sahad as particularly deserving of harsh treatment, such as torture. Thus, including a measure of deservingness allowed me to assess whether participants would only show less toleration of torture in the inconsistent condition, compared to the other conditions, to the degree that they thought the target was not deserving of harsh treatment (i.e., the effect of condition might be moderated by deservingness).

Third, I modified the scenario describing an interrogation involving torture in order to address the possibility of a floor effect on toleration of torture. I combined the
information from the scenario used in Studies 1 and 2 with information from a scenario used by Batson, Chao, and Givens (2009). In their study, Batson and colleagues suggested that torture might be seen as most acceptable when it is used to save lives and when the individual being tortured is an outgroup member. Thus, in the updated version of the torture scenario, Sahad (an Afghani man) was tortured in order to save the lives of eight civilians living in an apartment building in Iraq. Moreover, minor edits were made to the description of Sahad (i.e., he was still involved with the insurgency, he had orchestrated other attacks on civilians in addition to killing children). These edits should have made participants more likely to tolerate the torture on the basis of both utilitarian (i.e., the torture saved lives) and retributive (i.e., Sahad deserves harsh treatment for his acts) concerns (see Carlsmith & Sood, 2009). To ensure that toleration of torture ratings were higher than for the previous scenario, the updated torture scenario was pre-tested before use in Study 3.

In addition to including a measure of vicarious discomfort, adding the response items about using torture-derived information, and changing the torture scenario, I also made two additional changes to the method for Study 3. First, in case participants were not willing to help the target in the torture scenario because the methods for doing so were too costly (i.e., donating money or writing a letter), I included an additional item assessing participants’ willingness to help the target that was less costly. Participants
rated how willing they would be to sign a petition opposing the torture used in Sahad’s interrogation.

**Hypotheses**

Other than the changes mentioned above, the procedure for Study 3 was identical to the procedure used in Study 2. My hypotheses for Study 3 are described in the following paragraphs. Hypotheses 1 and 3 were tentative, in that support for these hypotheses depended on the reason for the null findings in Study 2. I also looked at whether deservingness moderated the effect of the hypocrisy manipulation for Hypotheses 1-3.

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least toleration of an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on toleration of torture to be mediated by directly-experienced discomfort, but not vicarious discomfort, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced, the less they would tolerate the torture.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least support for using the torture-derived information. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on support for using the information to be mediated by directly-experienced discomfort, but not vicarious discomfort, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced,
the less they would support using the information.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to be the most willing to help the target of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on willingness to help the target to be mediated by directly-experienced discomfort, but not vicarious discomfort, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more they would be willing to help the target of torture.

**Hypothesis 4.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on suggested donation to a torture-related charity to be mediated by directly-experienced discomfort, but not vicarious discomfort, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the higher their suggested donation to the torture-related charity.

**Method**

**Pilot.** I first conducted a pilot study to examine whether the changes I made to the torture scenario did make participants tolerate the torture to a greater extent than in Study 2. I collected 31 participants for the pilot study (24 female, age 18-31 years, \( M_{age} = 19.81 \) years). Participants read the edited scenario about an interrogation involving torture and then responded to the toleration of torture items used in Studies 1 and 2 (\( \alpha = .87 \)). A single-sample \( t \) test indicated that toleration of the target’s torture was
significantly higher for the new scenario ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.25$) compared to the mean of the scenario used in Studies 1 and 2 ($M = 2.59$), $t(30) = 7.15, p < .001, d = 1.28, 95\% CI$ of $M_{\text{difference}} [1.15, 2.06]$.

**Sample size selection.** I determined sample size in the same way as in Study 2.

**Participants.** I recruited 258 Brock University students for this study using the university’s Psychology Research Pool website (SONA). Two participants were excluded because they spent less than 25 seconds reading the manipulated scenario. The remaining sample consisted of 256 participants (210 female, 18-51 years, $M_{\text{age}} = 20.21, SD_{\text{age}} = 3.62$). All participants in the final sample were Canadian citizens, though 32 had dual citizenship in another country and 21 were not born in Canada. The majority of participants were Caucasian ($n = 196, 76.56\%$), but the sample included individuals identifying as Indigenous ($n = 4, 1.56\%$), Asian ($n = 29, 11.33\%$), Hispanic ($n = 5, 1.95\%$), Middle Eastern ($n = 7, 2.73\%$), and Black ($n = 13, 5.08\%$). Political orientation was measured by having participants rate their political orientation on a scale from 1 (very liberal) to 7 (very conservative). Mean political orientation was 3.46 ($SD = 1.54$). Approximately half of participants identified as somewhat to very liberal political orientation ($n = 118, 46.09\%$), with the other half identifying as somewhat to very conservative ($n = 58, 22.66\%$), neutral ($n = 58, 22.66\%$), or they did not respond ($n = 22, 8.62\%$).

* The 25 second cut-off was based on the minimum time it took participants to read the manipulated scenario in Study 2 (25.84 s). Both excluded participants were from the consistent condition.
8.59%). The students signed up for a single session study called “Study on Interaction with News Media,” for which they received course credit or $10 for their participation. The experimenter ran up to eight participants at a time in separate, private cubicles.

**Procedure and manipulation.** Figure 7 shows a visual summary of the procedure. Much of the procedure for Study 3 was identical to the one used in Study 2. Except for the informed consent form, the entire procedure for Study 3 was completed on a computer using Qualtrics.

After signing the informed consent form (Appendix FF), participants completed the same demographic and identity items as in Study 2 (Appendix GG). They then completed the RWA scale with the human rights support items embedded in the scale (Appendix HH), followed by a series of questions about their habits regarding news media (Appendix II). As in Study 2, most of the questions about news media were filler items, except for two questions that assessed participants’ perceptions of Canadians’ support for humane treatment.

Participants were then randomly assigned to the inconsistent, consistent, or control conditions. The scenarios about the Canadian MP that were read in each of these conditions were the same as those used in Study 2 (Appendix JJ). Following the scenario about the MP were the same memory and manipulation checks as in Study 2 (Appendix KK). Participants then completed measures of both directly-experienced and vicarious discomfort (Appendix LL).
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Donation Task
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Figure 7. Overview of procedure for Study 3.
Next, participants read and responded to the same filler scenario as in Study 2 (Appendix MM). In addition to the items that followed the filler scenario in Study 2, changes were made to the willingness to help the target in the filler scenario such that they were consistent with the changes made to the items following the torture scenario (Appendix NN).

After the filler scenario, participants read about an individual who was subjected to an enhanced interrogation involving torture (Appendix OO). Participants first read that Sahad was tortured to gain information that prevented the bombing of an apartment building, and that this information saved the lives of eight civilians. Participants then read that Sahad was arrested by Iraqi Special Forces because he was believed to have important information about terrorist activities, that he had been an active member of the insurgency since 2008, that he had orchestrated several attacks on civilians, and that he killed four children during one of these attacks. Participants then read that the commander in charge of the interrogation was certain that Sahad had information about the bombing, so he tortured Sahad without receiving authorization. As a result, Sahad lost a couple of toes. Finally, participants learned that Sahad divulged further information about future attacks against Canadian forces, but that the Canadian government had not yet decided how to respond to these claims.

Following the scenario, participants completed memory checks and three deservingness items (Appendix PP). Next, participants completed the toleration of
torture and willingness to help items, as well as four items assessing the extent to which participants thought it was appropriate for the Canadian government to use the information from Sahad’s interrogation (Appendix QQ). Finally, participants completed the same donation task as in Studies 1 and 2 (Appendix RR), and then were probed for suspicion* and debriefed via video (Appendix SS).

**Dependent measures.**

*Toleration of torture ($\alpha = .92$).* This measure was identical to the ones used in Studies 1 and 2.

*Appropriate government action ($\alpha = .94$).* Four items assessed the degree to which participants thought it was appropriate for the Canadian government to use the information gathered during the interrogation involving torture (e.g., “It is appropriate for the Canadian government to use the information from Sahad’s interrogation.”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). High scores on the composite variable indicated high approval for using the torture-derived information (Appendix QQ).

*Willingness to help ($\alpha = .84$).* Three items assessed participants’ willingness to help the target. The first two items were identical to the items used in Studies 1 and 2. The third item was added to assess whether participants were unwilling to help the target in the previous studies because of the costliness of the options (e.g., giving money to *no participants guessed the purpose of the study.***
cover legal fees). The new item asked participants, “How willing would you be to sign a petition opposing the torture that took place during Sahad’s interrogation?” Participants responded to this item using the same scale as the other two willingness to help items—from 1 (not at all willing) to 7 (completely willing)—with high scores indicating high willingness to help. Although responses to the new item (M = 3.44, SD = 1.98) were significantly higher than the mean responses to the other two items (M = 2.41, SD = 1.46), t(249) = 11.52, p < .001, d = 0.73, 95% CI of M_difference [0.86, 1.21], results of hypothesis tests using only this item did not substantially differ from the results using only the other two items or a composite of all three items. Moreover, the new item was strongly correlated with the other two willingness to help items (rs = .56 and .70). Thus, I used a composite of all three willingness to help items in my hypothesis tests, rather than analyzing the new item separately (Appendix QQ).

**Donation task.** This measure was identical to the one used in Studies 1 and 2.

**Affect.** Unlike in Studies 1 and 2, participants completed only the 7-item discomfort subscale of the Elliot and Devine’s (1994) affect measure (α = .95). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which each of the words (e.g., “uncomfortable”) described their current state on a scale from 1 (does not apply at all) to 7 (applies very much). High scores on the composite variable indicated high discomfort. Participants were also asked to indicate how much vicarious discomfort they experienced by rating the extent to which each of the words from the discomfort subscale described
how they would feel if they were in the MP’s position, using the same rating scale as the other discomfort measure. High scores on the composite variable for these items indicated high vicarious discomfort. The discomfort and vicarious discomfort items appeared on separate, consecutive pages of the survey, and the order of these measures was randomized (Appendix LL).

**Other variables.**

**Deservingness ($\alpha = .86$).** Three items assessed the degree to which participants thought the target deserved the treatment that he received in the scenario (e.g., “Sahad deserved treatment that was this severe”). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores on the composite variable indicated high perceived deservingness (Appendix PP).

**Canadian identity ($\alpha = .91$), support for the right to humane treatment ($r = .79$), right wing authoritarianism scale ($\alpha = .85$), Canadian’s views on humane treatment ($r = .82$), manipulation checks ($r = .89$).** These measures were identical to the ones used in Study 2.

**Memory checks.** In addition to the memory checks that were included in Study 2, I added two memory checks following the torture scenario. These questions asked people, “What information was gained from Sahad’s interrogation?” and “What was Sahad accused of in the past?” to check whether participants could recall the information that was expected to be most relevant to the main dependent variables (Appendix PP).
Results

An alpha of .05 is used throughout. Correlations between all variables, as well as means and standard deviations, can be found in Table 3.

Outliers and normality. In the inconsistent condition, there was one outlier on Canadian identity ($z = -3.36$), one outlier on the reflection of the MP’s behaviour on Canadians ($z = 3.24$), and two outliers on vicarious discomfort ($z = -3.12$ and -3.77). In the consistent condition, there was one outlier on the support for humane treatment ($z = 3.12$) and one outlier on the reflection of the MP’s behaviour on Canadians ($z = -3.18$). In the control condition, there were three outliers on Canadian identity ($z = -3.25$), two outliers on Canadian support for humane treatment ($z = -3.03$), one outlier on the reflection of the MP’s behaviour on Canadians ($z = -4.01$), one outlier on discomfort ($z = 3.37$), one outlier on vicarious discomfort ($z = 3.25$), and two outliers on appropriate government action ($z = -3.12$ and -3.32). Outliers were only excluded from analyses that included the variables on which they were outliers. Exclusion of the outliers did not substantially change the results of hypothesis tests.

Multivariate outliers were identified based on the criteria described by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). No multivariate outliers were identified for any of the main analyses.
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Variables in Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflects positively on Canadians</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discomfort</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vicarious</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deservingness</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Toleration</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriate</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Willingness</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **p < .01, *p < .05
### Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Variables in Study 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>注</th>
<th><strong>p</strong>&lt; .01</th>
<th><strong>p</strong>&lt; .05</th>
<th>0'&gt;0.1</th>
<th>All tests are two-tailed. Possible range for all variables except Donation was 1-7. Possible range for Donation was 0-100.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Donations</td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Canadian identity</td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

- **p**< .01
- **p**< .05

Possible range for all variables except Donation was 1-7. Possible range for Donation was 0-100.
Three distributions of variables within condition were extremely leptokurtic: vicarious discomfort in the inconsistent condition \( (kurtosis = 2.20) \), Canadian identity in the control condition \( (kurtosis = 3.37) \), and the reflection of the MP’s behaviour on Canadians in the control condition \( (kurtosis = 3.63) \). After removing the outliers, only the distribution for Canadian identity in the control condition was still extremely leptokurtic \( (kurtosis = 3.78) \). Skewness and kurtosis values for all other distributions were between ±2. Taken with the examination of histograms and Q-Q plots, I concluded that only the distribution of Canadian identity in the control condition substantially deviated from normality. Violations of assumptions for individual analyses were dealt with in the same way as in Study 2.

**Assumptions.** The reasoning behind the effectiveness of my manipulation on discomfort and the other main dependent variables relied heavily on the assumption that the majority of participants would see both being Canadian as an important part of their identity and supporting the right to humane treatment as important to most Canadians (variables that were assessed before the manipulation). The majority of participants did report that being Canadian was an important part of their identity \( (M = 5.58, SD = 1.44, 84\% \text{ above neutral}) \) and that it was normative for Canadians to support the right to humane treatment \( (M = 5.40, SD = 1.31, 77\% \text{ above neutral}) \). Although not as central to the effectiveness of the manipulation, I also checked whether most participants supported the right to humane treatment. The majority of participants reported that they supported
the right to humane treatment ($M = 4.66, SD = 0.66, 83\% \text{ above neutral}$). Single sample $t$ tests indicated that the means for Canadian identity, $t(251) = 17.36, p < .001$, Canadian support for humane treatment, $t(250) = 16.95, p < .001$, and support for humane treatment, $t(254) = 15.89, p < .001$, were all significantly higher than neutral (i.e., 4).

ANOVA indicated that participants did not differ by condition on either support for humane treatment or the extent to which they thought it was normative for Canadians to support the right to humane treatment.

In part due to the non-normality of the distribution of scores for Canadian identity in the control condition, the three conditions did not meet the homogeneity of variance assumption for ANOVA. To account for the non-normality, I used a reverse reciprocal transformation on the identity scores (Field, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007): I subtracted responses from the highest possible score +1 to reverse score all responses, then divided 1 by those scores ($M = 0.55, SD = 0.27$). An ANOVA comparing scores on the transformed variable between conditions indicated that the importance of being Canadian to one’s identity differed marginally by condition, $F(2, 249) = 2.57, p = .08, \eta^2_p = .02$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the control condition saw being Canadian as marginally more important to their sense of identity than did participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.09, p = .07$). Because of the

* This effect was significant when using the untransformed variable, $F(2, 249) = 5.70, p = .004, \eta^2_p = .04$. Only the Tukey’s HSD post hoc comparison between consistent and control reached significance ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.74, p = .002$).
importance of Canadian identity in the manipulation, all hypothesis tests were conducted both with and without the transformed Canadian identity variable as a covariate.

Canadian identity did not significantly predict any of the outcome variables, nor did the interactions between Canadian identity and condition (all $p$s > .05). Results did not substantially differ when using the untransformed variable. Thus, the hypothesis tests reported here do not include Canadian identity as a covariate.

**Memory checks.** The majority of participants (87%) correctly selected the last sentence of the story about the MP. There were 14 participants in the inconsistent condition, 18 in the consistent condition, and 2 in the control condition who did not correctly select the last sentence. As I mentioned in Study 2, it is not surprising that more participants would respond incorrectly in the inconsistent and consistent conditions than in the control condition, given that the final sentences of the stories in the inconsistent and consistent conditions only differed by a few words. Thus, participants in those conditions might have selected the wrong option if they did not read the sentences in the memory check very carefully. For this reason, participants were retained for analyses regardless of how they responded to the memory check. Results for hypothesis tests did not substantially differ after removing participants who did not correctly select the last sentence of the scenario.

Just as in Study 2, participants were led to believe that the news story about the MP was from a US news outlet in order to make the MP’s hypocrisy in the inconsistent
scenario more threatening to the Canadian ingroup’s image. However, only a minority of participants (46%) recognized that the news outlet was from the US (inconsistent = 51 [59%], consistent = 32 [39%], control = 36 [41%]). Because recognizing the country of the news outlet was not crucial to arousing dissonance, participants were retained regardless of whether or not they correctly identified that the agency was from the US.

For the scenario about an interrogation involving torture, the majority of participants (76%) were able to correctly identify the last sentence. There were 16 participants in the inconsistent condition, 20 in the consistent condition, and 26 in the control condition who did not correctly select the last sentence from the torture scenario. The sentences were worded very similarly, so participants might have selected the wrong option if they did not read the sentences in the memory check very carefully. Moreover, results for hypothesis tests did not substantially differ after removing participants who failed to select the correct sentence. For these reasons, participants were retained for analyses regardless of how they responded to the memory check.

Participants were also asked to recall what Sahad had been accused of before he was detained (i.e., killing children and participating in attacks on civilians) and what information was gained from his interrogation (i.e., the location of a bomb). The majority of participants recalled what Sahad had been accused of before his detention (91%) and what information Sahad told his interrogators (88%). There were 10 (12%) participants in the inconsistent condition, 4 (5%) in the consistent condition, and 8 (9%)
in the control condition who did not correctly remember what Sahad had been accused of before he was detained. There were 14 (16%) participants in the inconsistent condition, 10 (12%) in the consistent condition, and 7 (8%) in the control condition who did not correctly remember what Sahad had told his interrogators. Results for hypothesis tests did not substantially differ after removing participants who did not correctly remember one or both pieces of information. Thus, participants were retained for analyses regardless of how they responded to these memory questions.

**Manipulation check.** If the manipulation of the Canadian MP’s behaviour in the scenario was effective, then participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to those in the other conditions, should have reported that the MP’s behaviour reflected significantly less positively on Canadians. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with the composite of the two manipulation check items as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on how the MP’s behaviour reflected on Canadians, $F(2, 250) = 180.24, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .590$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition thought the MP’s behaviour reflected more negatively on Canadians than did participants in both the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 3.21, p < .001$) and

---

*a* The Levene’s test for this analysis was significant, $F(2, 250) = 14.53, p < .001$. To compensate for this lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, the results for the analysis without bootstrapping are reported in this section.
control ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.04, p < .001$) conditions. Thus, the manipulation of the MP’s behaviour worked as I expected. Additionally, participants in the consistent condition thought the MP’s behaviour reflected less negatively on Canadians than did participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 2.17, p < .001$).

**Affect analyses.** Consistent with my cognitive dissonance framework, I expected that participants would experience greater discomfort as a result of reading about the MP’s behaviour in the inconsistent condition compared to the consistent and control conditions. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with discomfort as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on discomfort, $F(2, 252) = 33.57, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .21$ (see Figure 8). Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition experienced significantly more discomfort than participants in the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.11, p < .001$) and control ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.76, p < .001$) conditions. Moreover, participants in the consistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.65, p = .01$).

---

* The Levene’s test was significant for this analysis, $F(2, 252) = 4.51, p = .01$. The Levene’s test was no longer significant after square root transforming discomfort. Results using the transformed variable did not differ significantly from those using the untransformed variable. Thus, all reported analyses including discomfort use the untransformed variable.
In line with the reasoning offered by Focella et al. (2015), the MP’s behaviour in the inconsistent scenario could arouse vicarious dissonance, which, in turn, might account for any effects on my main outcome variables. Thus, I also examined whether vicarious discomfort differed by condition. I tested this prediction using a one-way ANOVA with vicarious discomfort as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on vicarious discomfort, $F(2, 250) = 140.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .53$ (see Figure 9). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced significantly more vicarious discomfort than did participants in the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.89, p < .001$) and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 3.24, p < .001$). Moreover, participants in the consistent condition experienced more vicarious discomfort than did participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 1.34, p < .001$). Because both vicarious and directly-
experienced discomfort were affected by condition, both variables were tested as simultaneous mediators in Hypotheses 1-4.

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9.** The effect of condition on vicarious discomfort in Study 3. Error bars represent ±1SE.

**Tests of hypotheses.**

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least toleration of an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on toleration of the target’s torture to be mediated by the directly-experienced discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced, the less they would tolerate the torture. I first tested whether there was an effect of condition on toleration of

---

*I tested whether RWA moderated the effect of condition on any of the dependent variables. RWA only moderated the effect of condition on appropriate government action (see Footnote 23), though it was correlated with toleration of torture (r = .21, p = .001) and appropriate government action (r = .19, p = .003).
torture using a one-way ANOVA with toleration of torture as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was no significant effect of condition on toleration of torture, \( F(2, 250) = 1.24, p = .29, \eta^2 = .01 \). Because there was no total effect of condition on toleration of torture, I did not test for mediation by discomfort or vicarious discomfort.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to express the least approval for the Canadian government to use information derived from an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on appropriate government action to be mediated by the directly-experienced discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced, the less appropriate they would think it was to use the torture-derived information. I first tested whether there was an effect of condition on appropriate government action using a one-way ANOVA with appropriate government action as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable.\(^2\) There was a significant effect of condition on appropriate government action, \( F(2, 250) = 7.15, p = .001, \eta^2 = .05 \) (see Figure 10). Participants in the control condition thought it was more

\(^2\) The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for this analysis. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, results for the analysis without bootstrapping are reported in this section.
appropriate for the government to use the torture-derived information than those in the inconsistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.78, p = .001$) or consistent conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.61, p = .02$). Participants in the inconsistent and consistent conditions did not significantly differ in how appropriate they thought it was for the government to use the information ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.17, p = .71$).\footnote{I also examined whether RWA moderated the effect of condition on appropriate government action. In a regression analysis, appropriate government action was significantly predicted by RWA, $b = 0.30, \beta = .20, t(249) = 3.32, p = .001, sr^2 = .04, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.12, 0.48]$, and the interaction between RWA and the dummy code for the inconsistent versus control comparison, $b = -0.63, \beta = -.21, t(247) = -2.70, p = .01, sr^2 = .03, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-1.08, -0.17]$. Control participants thought it was more appropriate to use the torture-derived information than participants in the inconsistent condition at low (-1SD), $b = 1.39, t(247) = 4.63, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.80, 1.98]$, and mean levels of RWA, $b = 0.78, t(247) = 3.72, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.37, 1.95]$, but not at high levels of RWA (+1SD), $b = 0.18, t(247) = -0.56, p = .58, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.45, 0.80]$.}
As noted in the affect analyses section, there was a total effect of condition on both discomfort and vicarious discomfort. Therefore, I proceeded to test whether discomfort and vicarious discomfort predicted appropriate government action by regressing appropriate government action onto discomfort and vicarious discomfort. Appropriate government action was significantly predicted by discomfort, $b = -0.22, \beta = -0.24, t(247) = -3.07, p = .002, sr^2 = .04, 95\% $ CI of $b [-0.36, -0.08]$, but not vicarious discomfort, $b = -0.04, \beta = -0.05, t(247) = -0.68, p = .50, sr^2 = .002, 95\% $ CI of $b [-0.17, 0.08]$. The more discomfort participants experienced, the less appropriate they thought it was for the government to use the torture-derived information.

Finally, I regressed appropriate government action onto discomfort, vicarious discomfort, and condition. Condition was dummy coded, such that one dummy code compared the consistent condition (coded as 1) to the inconsistent condition (coded as 0) and the other compared the control condition (coded as 1) to the inconsistent condition

---

* I also checked that the $\alpha$-path for the effect of condition on discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -1.13, \beta = -0.34, t(247) = -5.17, p < .001, sr^2 = .08, 95\% $ CI of $b [-1.57, -0.70]$, and control conditions, $b = -1.81, \beta = -0.53, t(247) = -8.25, p < .001, sr^2 = .21, 95\% $ CI of $b [-2.24, -1.38]$.  
* I also checked that the $\alpha$-path for the effect of condition on vicarious discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more vicarious discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -1.89, \beta = -0.49, t(247) = -9.66, p < .001, sr^2 = .18, 95\% $ CI of $b [-2.28, -1.51]$, and control conditions, $b = -3.21, \beta = -0.83, t(247) = -16.39, p < .001, sr^2 = .52, 95\% $ CI of $b [-3.60, -2.82]$.  

(coded as 0). Discomfort continued to significantly predict appropriate government action after the dummy codes were entered, $b = -0.22$, $\beta = -0.24$, $t(245) = -3.08$, $p = .002$, $sr^2 = .03$, 95% CI of $b [-0.36, -0.08]$, while vicarious discomfort was not a significant predictor, $b = 0.04$, $\beta = 0.05$, $t(245) = 0.47$, $p = .64$, $sr^2 < .001$, 95% CI of $b [-0.12, 0.19]$. Neither the comparison between the consistent and inconsistent conditions, $b = 0.01$, $\beta < .001$, $t(245) = 0.02$, $p = .98$, $sr^2 < .001$, 95% CI of $b [-0.49, 0.50]$, nor that between the inconsistent and control conditions, $b = 0.53$, $\beta = 0.17$, $t(245) = 1.69$, $p = .09$, $sr^2 = .01$, 95% CI of $b [-0.09, 1.14]$, significantly predicted appropriate government action.* This pattern of results is consistent with full mediation by directly-experienced discomfort.

I used PROCESS v2.16.3 Model 4 (Hayes, 2016) in SPSS with 1,000 bootstrapped samples to test the indirect effect of condition through discomfort on appropriate government action. Both discomfort and vicarious discomfort were included in the model to be consistent with previous regressions in this section. There was a significant indirect effect of the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions through discomfort on appropriate government action, $b = 0.39$, 95% CI of $b$.

* I also checked that the initial $c$-path for the effect of condition on appropriate government action was significant in the regression analysis. Before entering discomfort as a predictor, the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions significantly predicted appropriate government action, $b = 0.80$, $\beta = 0.26$, $t(247) = 3.65$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .05$, 95% CI of $b [0.37, 1.23]$. However, the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions did not significantly predict appropriate government action, $b = 0.18$, $\beta = 0.06$, $t(247) = 0.83$, $p = .41$, $sr^2 = .002$, 95% CI of $b [-0.25, 0.61]$. 
There was also a significant indirect effect of the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions on appropriate government action, $b = 0.25$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.10, 0.52], but the lack of a total effect of condition (inconsistent versus consistent) on appropriate government action leads me to conclude that this path was not mediated by discomfort.

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to be more willing to help the target of an instance of torture. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on willingness to help the target to be mediated by the directly-experienced discomfort aroused by dissonance, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced, the more they would be willing to help the target of torture. I first tested whether there was an effect of condition on willingness to help the target using a one-way ANOVA with willingness to help as the dependent variable and condition as the independent variable. There was no significant effect of condition on willingness to help the target, $F(2, 251) = 0.25, p = .78$, $\eta^2_p = .002$. Because there was no total effect of condition on willingness to help the target, I did not test for mediation by discomfort or vicarious discomfort.

**Hypothesis 4.** I expected participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to the consistent and control conditions, to suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. Moreover, I expected the effect of condition on suggested donation to a torture-related charity to be mediated by the directly-experienced discomfort aroused by
dissonance, such that the more directly-experienced discomfort participants experienced, the higher their suggested donation to the torture-related charity. First, I tested for the total effect of condition on donation using a one-way ANOVA with condition as the independent variable and donation as the dependent variable. There was no significant effect of condition on donation, $F(2, 249) = 0.37, p = .69, \eta^2_p = .003$. Because there was no total effect of condition on donation, I did not test for mediation by discomfort or vicarious discomfort.

**Additional analyses.** In addition to testing my four hypotheses, I examined whether deservingness worked as a potential moderator of the effect of condition on responses to the torture scenario. The effect of reading about the hypocritical MP in the inconsistent scenario might have had less of an effect on responses to the torture scenario the more participants thought the target deserved to be treated harshly. I conducted three regressions in which I regressed toleration of torture, appropriate government action, or willingness to help onto the dummy codes for condition (described in Hypothesis 3 section), and the mean-centred scores for deservingness on the first step, and the interaction term for deservingness and each of the dummy codes on the second step.

I also examined whether deservingness moderated the association between discomfort and responses to the torture scenario. Participants’ responses might have been

---

$^2$ Deservingness did not significantly differ by condition, $F(2, 252) = 0.07, p = .93, sr^2 < .001$. 


less affected by their discomfort the more they thought the target deserved to be treated harshly. To test this prediction, I conducted three regressions in which I regressed toleration of torture, appropriate government action, or willingness to help onto the dummy codes for condition, the mean-centred scores for discomfort, and the mean-centred scores for deservingness on the first step, and the interaction term for discomfort and deservingness on the second step.

**Condition by deservingness on toleration of torture.** In the first step, deservingness judgments significantly predicted toleration of torture, $b = 0.80, \beta = 0.76, t(249) = 18.54, p < .001, sr^2 = .57, 95\% CI of b [0.72, 0.89]$, such that the more participants thought the target was deserving of torture, the more they tolerated it. The dummy code comparing the inconsistent and control conditions marginally predicted toleration of torture, $b = 0.28, \beta = 0.08, t(249) = 1.70, p = .09, sr^2 = .005, 95\% CI of b [-0.04, 0.60]$, such that participants in the control condition tolerated the torture marginally more than did participants in the inconsistent condition. The dummy code comparing the inconsistent and consistent conditions did not significantly predict toleration of torture, $b = 0.02, \beta = 0.01, t(249) = 0.15, p = .89, sr^2 < .001, 95\% CI of b [-0.30, 0.35]$. In the second step, deservingness did not significantly interact with either dummy coded

---

* Deservingness and toleration of torture were highly correlated, $r = .76, p < .001$. However, multicollinearity statistics for the regression predicting toleration of torture from deservingness and the two dummy codes indicated that multicollinearity was not a concern in this analysis ($VIF = 1.00$, tolerance = 1.00).
comparison to predict toleration of torture ($ps > .63$).

**Condition by deservingness on appropriate government action.** In the first step, deservingness significantly predicted appropriate government action, $b = 0.38$, $\beta = 0.41$, $t(249) = 7.29$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .17$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.28, 0.49]. The comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions also significantly predicted appropriate government action, $b = 0.72$, $\beta = 0.24$, $t(249) = 3.68$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .04$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.34, 1.11], such that participants in the inconsistent condition thought it was less appropriate for the government to use the torture-derived information. However, the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions did not significantly predict appropriate government action, $b = 0.18$, $\beta = 0.06$, $t(249) = 0.89$, $p = .38$, $sr^2 = .003$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.21, 0.56].

In the second step the $R^2_{change}$ was not significant ($p = .14$), but the interaction between deservingness and the comparison for the inconsistent and control conditions marginally predicted appropriate government action, $b = -0.24$, $\beta = -0.14$, $t(247) = -1.82$, $p = .07$, $sr^2 = .01$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.50, 0.02]. Because the $R^2_{change}$ for the step was not significant and the interaction only marginally predicted appropriate government action, I did not conduct simple slopes analysis for the interaction. Deservingness did not significantly interact with the other dummy coded comparison to predict appropriate government action, $b = -0.19$, $\beta = -0.12$, $t(247) = -1.56$, $p = .12$, $sr^2 = .01$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.44, 0.05].
**Condition by deservingness on willingness to help.** In the first step, deservingness significantly predicted willingness to help, \( b = -0.59, \beta = -0.60, t(250) = -11.81, p < .001, r^2 = .36, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.69, -0.49], \) such that the more participants thought the target was deserving of torture, the less willing they were to help him.

Neither dummy coded comparison significantly predicted willingness to help (\( ps > .44 \)).

In the second step, deservingness did not significantly interact with either dummy coded comparison to predict willingness to help (\( ps > .48 \)).

**Discomfort by deservingness on toleration of torture.** In the first step, deservingness judgments significantly predicted toleration of torture, \( b = 0.81, \beta = 0.76, t(247) = 18.33, p < .001, r^2 = .57, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.72, 0.89], \) such that the more participants thought the target was deserving of torture, the more they tolerated it. The dummy code comparing the inconsistent and control conditions marginally predicted toleration of torture, \( b = 0.31, \beta = 0.09, t(247) = 1.67, p = .096, r^2 = .005, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.06, 0.67], \) such that participants in the control condition tolerated the torture marginally more than did participants in the inconsistent condition. Neither discomfort, \( b = 0.02, \beta = 0.02, t(247) = 0.45, p = .66, r^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.07, 0.12], \) nor the other dummy code comparing the inconsistent and consistent conditions, \( b = 0.05, \beta = 0.01, t(247) = \)

\(^*\) Deservingness and toleration of torture were highly correlated, \( r = .76, p < .001. \) However, collinearity statistics for the regression predicting toleration of torture from deservingness, discomfort, and the two dummy codes indicated that multicollinearity was not a concern in this analysis (\( VIF = 1.02, \text{tolerance} = .98 \)).
0.27, \( p = .78, sr^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b \) [-0.30, 0.39], significantly predicted toleration of torture. On the second step, the interaction between deservingness and discomfort significantly predicted toleration of torture, \( b = -0.06, \beta = -0.09, t(246) = -2.13, p = .03, sr^2 = .01, 95\% \text{ CI of } b \) [-0.11, -0.004].

Simple slopes analyses for the interaction between deservingness and discomfort on toleration of torture were examined using PROCESS v2.16.3 Model 1 (Hayes, 2016), with toleration of torture as the dependent variable, discomfort and deservingness as the independent and moderator variables respectively, and the dummy codes for condition as covariates. I first examined the effect of discomfort on toleration of torture at low (-1 SD = -1.57), moderate (\( M = -0.01 \)), and high (+1 SD = 1.54) values for deservingness. None of the slopes were significantly different from 0 (all \( ps > .10 \)).

Given that none of the slopes in the previous paragraph were significant, for exploratory purposes, I conducted simple slopes analyses for the association between deservingness and toleration of torture at low (-1 SD = -1.60), moderate (\( M = 0.001 \)), and high (+1 SD = 1.60) values for discomfort. The slope for low, \( b = 0.89, t(246) = 15.08, 95\% \text{ CI of } b \) [0.77, 1.01], moderate, \( b = 0.80, t(246) = 18.26, 95\% \text{ CI of } b \) [0.71, 0.88], and high, \( b = 0.71, t(246) = 11.17, 95\% \text{ CI of } b \) [0.58, 0.83], levels of discomfort all significantly differed from 0 (see Figure 11). At all levels of discomfort, participants tolerated the torture to a greater extent the more they believed the target was highly deserving of harsh treatment, but the slope for this relationship was steepest for those
who were low in discomfort. These results imply that discomfort dampened the effect of deservingness judgments on toleration of the target’s torture.

\[ \text{Figure 11. The effect of deservingness on toleration of torture at low (-1 } SD\text{), moderate (M), and high (+1 } SD\text{) levels of discomfort in Study 3.} \]

**Discomfort by deservingness on appropriate government action.** In the first step, deservingness judgments significantly predicted appropriate government action, \( b = 0.37, \beta = 0.39, t(247) = 6.98, p < .001, sr^2 = .15, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.26, 0.47], \) such that the more participants thought the target deserved to be tortured, the more appropriate they thought it was for the government to use the torture-derived information. Discomfort also significantly predicted appropriate government action, \( b = -0.15, \beta = -0.16, t(247) = -2.60, p = .01, sr^2 = .02, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.26, -0.036], \) such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the less appropriate they thought it was for the government to use the torture-derived information. The dummy code for the comparison between the
inconsistent and control conditions significantly predicted appropriate government action, 
\[ b = 0.47, \beta = 0.16, t(247) = 2.16, p = .03, sr^2 = .01, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.04, 0.91], \] 
such that participants in the control condition thought it was more appropriate for the government to use the torture-derived information than participants in the inconsistent condition. However, the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions did not significantly predict appropriate government action, 
\[ b = 0.01, \beta = 0.003, t(247) = 0.05, p = .96, sr^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.39, 0.41]. \] 
On the second step, the interaction between deservingness and discomfort did not significantly predict appropriate government action, 
\[ b = -0.01, \beta = -0.02, t(246) = -0.38, p = .70, sr^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.08, 0.05]. \]

Discomfort by deservingness on willingness to help. In the first step, deservingness judgments significantly predicted participants’ willingness to help the target of torture, 
\[ b = -0.57, \beta = -0.58, t(248) = -11.42, p < .001, sr^2 = .33, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.67, -0.473], \] 
such that participants were more willing to help the target the less they thought he was deserving of torture. Discomfort significantly predicted willingness to help the target, 
\[ b = 0.12, \beta = 0.13, t(248) = 2.19, p = .03, sr^2 = .01, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.01, 0.23], \] 
such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more willing they were to help the target. Neither of the dummy codes for condition significantly predicted willingness to help (\( ps > .10 \)). On the second step, the interaction between deservingness and discomfort did not significantly predict willingness to help the target, 
\[ b = 0.0, \beta = -0.01, t(247) = -0.11, p = .91, sr^2 < .001, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.06, 0.06]. \]
Discussion

The general purpose of this study was threefold. First, I addressed several possible explanations for the lack of an effect of my manipulation on toleration of torture and willingness to help in Study 2. Second, I attempted to replicate the effect of the manipulation on the donation task. Third, I examined whether directly-experienced and/or vicarious discomfort were the mechanism behind the effect of the MP’s hypocrisy on responses to torture.

Addressing the lack of an effect on toleration of torture and willingness to help. As in Study 2, participants tolerated the torture to a similar extent, and were similarly unwilling to help the target, in all three conditions. I explored three possible reasons for the lack of an effect of my manipulation on these dependent variables.

Floor effect. I suggested that the lack of an effect of condition on toleration of torture might have been due to a floor effect, such that baseline toleration of torture was too low to detect any differences in toleration of torture between the control and the consistent and inconsistent conditions. Despite that the mean level of toleration of torture in Study 3 was higher than in Studies 1 and 2, I still did not find differences in toleration of torture between conditions. Thus, it is unlikely that the lack of an effect of condition on toleration of torture in Study 2 was the result of a floor effect.

Deservingness judgments. One potential reason for the lack of an effect of condition on both toleration of torture and willingness to help was that many participants
were unable to ignore the deservingness cues in the scenario (i.e., the target’s morally reprehensible past actions), which might have prevented the MP’s hypocrisy from affecting toleration of torture or willingness to help. However, in Study 3, participants’ perceptions of the target’s deservingness for harsh treatment did not interact with condition to predict toleration of torture or willingness to help.

I also examined whether discomfort interacted with deservingness to predict toleration of torture or willingness to help. Although there was a significant interaction between deservingness and discomfort on toleration of torture, the pattern of results was not as expected. The more participants thought the target deserved harsh treatment, the more they tolerated the target’s torture; but this relation was weaker for the participants who experienced a high degree of discomfort (presumably from reading about the hypocritical MP). These results suggest that discomfort from dissonance arousal might dampen the effect of retributive motives. However, I did not find the same pattern of results on willingness to help the target. The reprehensibility of the target’s past behaviour might have prevented any dampening effect of discomfort when it came to actually helping the target.

In summary, perceptions of the target’s deservingness for harsh treatment did moderate the effect of discomfort on toleration of the target’s torture. However, there was no evidence that the lack of an effect of my manipulation on toleration of torture or
willingness to help in Study 2 was caused by the fact that many participants saw the target as deserving of harsh treatment.

**Relevance.** I also suggested that the toleration of torture and willingness to help measures were not relevant enough to the MP’s hypocrisy for participants to use them to reduce dissonance. Therefore, in Study 3, I included an additional measure of toleration of torture that was directly relevant to the ingroup member’s hypocrisy. Specifically, one way the hypocritical MP had violated the ingroup standard of supporting the right to humane treatment was by knowingly using torture-derived information. Thus, participants’ views on how appropriate it would be for the Canadian government to use newly uncovered information from an interrogation involving torture would be directly relevant to the MP’s hypocrisy.

Partly as hypothesized, participants in the inconsistent condition, compared to control condition, said it was less appropriate to use the torture-derived information. Moreover, the lack of an effect of condition on the three other dependent variables is consistent with previous evidence that people will take the most direct method for reducing dissonance over other, less direct methods (Stone et al., 1997). In summary, I might not have found an effect of the manipulation on toleration of torture and willingness to help in Study 2 because these options were not relevant enough to the MP’s hypocrisy for participants to use them to reduce dissonance.

**Replication of suggested donation findings.** In Study 3, I also tried to replicate
the effect of the ingroup member’s hypocrisy on suggested donation to the torture-related charity that I found in Study 2. However, suggested donation was not affected by the hypocrisy manipulation in Study 3. One possibility for a lack of an effect of condition on suggested donation is that participants’ stereotype of torture victims was adversely influenced by the torture scenario used in Study 3, dissuading them from suggesting higher donations for an organization that helps torture victims. In Studies 1 and 2, the target had committed morally reprehensible acts when he was a teenager, but was not involved in any wrongdoing at the time of his detainment. The conclusion one could draw from this version of the scenario is that interrogations involving torture are sometimes conducted on people who do not have ties to terrorist groups and who are not a danger to the public. However, I changed the torture scenario in the current study to increase baseline levels of toleration of the target’s torture. Specifically, the target was helping orchestrate attacks against civilians at the time of his detainment. This depiction might have supported stereotypical views of torture victims (e.g., “evil others” for whom torture might be the only effective way to get information; Janoff-Bulman, 2007). Thus, the information in the torture scenario might have led participants to believe that torture victims are similar to the target in the scenario and, therefore, should not be helped.

**Directly-experienced and vicarious discomfort.** In addition to examining the effect of condition on the dependent variables, I examined whether the effect of condition was mediated by directly-experienced and/or vicarious discomfort. If group-level
dissonance was responsible for any effects of condition, as I proposed, then participants should have experienced direct, rather than vicarious, discomfort. Participants felt the greatest amount of both directly-experienced and vicarious discomfort in the inconsistent condition. However, the results of the mediation analyses indicated that only directly-experienced discomfort mediated the effect of condition on judgments of appropriate government action. Thus, consistent with my explanation of group-level dissonance, it appears that discomfort was aroused by the threat posed by the hypocritical MP, which in turn motivated participants to oppose the use of the torture-derived information.

Focella et al. (2015) suggest that vicarious dissonance underlies attempts to repair the ingroup image in response to an ingroup hypocrite. However, Focella et al. did not find that vicarious discomfort mediated any of the effects of the ingroup member’s hypocrisy, and suggested that the hypocrisy described in their study (i.e., promoting sunscreen use, but then failing to use it) might not have been severe enough for participants to report noticeable differences in vicarious discomfort. In my Study 3, the MP’s hypocrisy was severe and did, as Focella et al. would predict, arouse vicarious discomfort. However, it was still only directly-experienced discomfort that mediated the effect of the MP’s hypocrisy on judgments of appropriate government action. Thus, although a severe instance of hypocrisy might be sufficient to arouse vicarious discomfort, such discomfort does not appear to underlie efforts to repair the ingroup image and resolve dissonance in the case of an ingroup member’s hypocrisy.
Implications for cognitive dissonance. Previous studies examining hypocrisy induction based on an ingroup member’s hypocrisy did not find conclusive evidence that dissonance mediated the effects of the ingroup member’s hypocrisy on relevant responses (Focella & Stone, 2013; Gaffney et al., 2012). In Study 3, as in Study 2, I found conclusive evidence that discomfort mediates the effect of ingroup hypocrisy (relative to the control condition) on a relevant response (i.e., appropriateness of the government using torture-derived information). Moreover, I found evidence in Study 3 that it is directly-experienced discomfort, not vicarious discomfort, that is responsible for pro-human rights responses following an ingroup member’s hypocrisy. These results suggest that certain reactions to ingroup hypocrisy might be due to a perceived threat to the ingroup’s positive image leading to direct feelings of discomfort, rather than to identifying with the experience of the ingroup hypocrite.

Applied implications. Similar to Study 2, the results of Study 3 have implications for how news outlets present information about government leaders’ hypocrisy. For the news article about the MP, most participants failed to notice that the news outlet was from the US. This finding suggests that the ingroup image will be threatened by a hypocritical leader, even if it is not noted by outgroup members. Thus, publishing information about leaders’ hypocrisy might be effective at influencing ingroup members’ behaviour regardless of whether the information is published by a foreign or domestic news outlet.
Moreover, given that it was directly-experienced, not vicarious, discomfort that led participants to be more opposed to the use of the torture-derived information in the inconsistent condition (compared to the control condition), news outlets might want to emphasize how leaders’ hypocrisy threatens the ingroup’s positive image. Highlighting the threat to the ingroup image, as opposed to how personally embarrassing it would be for the leader or for relevant government organizations, should be more effective at motivating people to respond in ways that support the violated right.

**Limitation and future directions.** There is one important limitation that should be noted when interpreting the results of Study 3 and, in particular, the conclusions regarding vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort. The example of hypocrisy that was used in Study 3 (i.e., using torture-derived information and sending prisoners to known torture centres) is something that average Canadians are unlikely ever to do themselves. In previous studies examining the possible role of vicarious dissonance, the ingroup member’s hypocrisy was something that participants could presumably see themselves doing (e.g., Focella et al., 2015; Gaffney et al., 2012), possibly making it easier to identify with the ingroup hypocrite’s experience. Participants in my study would have been unlikely to readily identify with the hypocritical MP’s experience, possibly accounting for why vicarious discomfort played a lesser role than directly-experienced discomfort. Future research on ingroup hypocrisy and dissonance could examine whether, in severe cases of hypocrisy, it is necessary for people to be able to
identify with the experience of the ingroup hypocrite in order for vicarious discomfort to influence their responses.
General Discussion

Despite documents such as the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 2014) and widespread support for universal human rights (United Nations, 2015), people who support human rights still tolerate their violation. My dissertation focused on using hypocrisy induction to reduce toleration of these violations and to encourage responses that support the violated rights. My studies are the first to look at hypocrisy induction within the context of human rights.

In Study 1, I examined whether people who support human rights would reduce their toleration of a violation and engage in other pro-human rights responses when confronted with information about their previous hypocritical toleration of a human rights violation. In Studies 2 and 3, I extended the hypocrisy induction procedure to examine how people react to the hypocrisy of ingroup members regarding human rights (for an ingroup for whom it was normative to support human rights). More specifically, I examined whether Canadians would respond more favourably with respect to a given right when exposed to a Canadian official who advocated for the right, but permitted its violation. Moreover, in Study 3 I examined whether changes in toleration of a rights violation and other relevant responses were the result of directly-experienced or vicarious discomfort.

Across all three studies, I did find evidence that hypocrisy induction encourages responses that promote human rights, both when the hypocrisy is one’s own or that of an
ingroup member. In Study 1, being confronted with one’s own hypocrisy regarding the right to humane treatment led to greater suggested donations to a charity supporting that right. In Study 2, being confronted with an ingroup member’s hypocrisy regarding the right to humane treatment led to greater suggested donations to a charity supporting that right. In Study 3, being confronted with an ingroup member’s hypocrisy regarding the right to humane treatment led to greater opposition toward government use of torture-derived information. Despite these promising results, I found little evidence that hypocrisy induction could reduce toleration of a rights violation specifically. I also did not find consistent evidence that differences in responses between conditions were due to the discomfort aroused by dissonance in the hypocrisy condition. In this General Discussion, I will tie together the results of my three studies by examining two broad themes: the use of hypocrisy to arouse dissonance and the difficulty with reducing toleration of human rights violations.

**Arousing Dissonance Through Hypocrisy**

The reasoning behind my use of the individual- and group-level hypocrisy induction methods was rooted in the self-concept explanation of cognitive dissonance. According to this perspective, dissonance is aroused due to the threat that is posed to one’s positive sense of self when one’s actions violate an important personal standard (Stone & Cooper, 2001). In Study 1, I expected that support for the right to humane treatment would function as an important personal standard. Because tolerating an
instance of torture is at odds with supporting the right to humane treatment, I expected that recalling instances of such toleration of torture would arouse dissonance among those who supported the right to humane treatment. However, in Study 1 I did not find evidence of dissonance (assessed via discomfort) resulting from hypocrisy.

For Studies 2 and 3, I expanded the self-concept perspective to group standards. People derive their self-concept, in part, through group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986), such that the standards of their ingroup contribute to their positive social identity, and therefore their positive self-concept (Marques et al., 1998). Observing an ingroup member who advocates a position the ingroup strongly supports, but who then does not live up to this position, should arouse dissonance in the observer because the ingroup member’s hypocritical behaviour is inconsistent with the observer’s positive ingroup image. Therefore, I used the hypocrisy of an ingroup political leader regarding human rights to induce dissonance among ingroup members. Unlike in Study 1, I did find evidence of dissonance in both Studies 2 and 3, in that there was greater discomfort in the inconsistent condition compared to the other conditions. Moreover, in Study 3, although I found evidence that both vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort were aroused, only directly-experienced discomfort appeared to act as a mediator of the effect of the hypocrisy manipulation on pro-human rights responses. I will come back to this finding when I discuss the implications for the cognitive dissonance literature.
Despite the fact that my explanations for the (potential) arousal of dissonance in all three studies come from the self-concept perspective, I only found evidence of dissonance in Studies 2 and 3. Why did the hypocrisy that was the focus of Studies 2 and 3 arouse dissonance, whereas the hypocrisy that was the focus of Study 1 did not?

Previous research on cognitive dissonance offers two compelling explanations for why dissonance was not consistently aroused across my studies: the role of aversive consequences (Cooper & Fazio, 1984) and the potential pitfalls of using essay tasks to arouse dissonance (see Harmon-Jones, 2000).

**Aversive consequences.** In Study 1, hypocrisy was induced by having participants publicly endorse the right to humane treatment and then reflect on times when they might tolerate its violation. One explanation for the lack of evidence of dissonance in this paradigm is that the hypocritical toleration of a violation did not cause the rights violation, or any other harm, to occur. According to Cooper and Fazio (1984) the inconsistent cognitive element must be the cause of some aversive consequence (e.g., harm) in order to arouse dissonance. Because tolerating an instance of torture does not directly contribute to or cause its occurrence, it likely is not seen as causing harm. In contrast to Study 1, the hypocrisy that was the focus of Studies 2 and 3 did directly cause aversive consequences (e.g., the MP sent prisoners to known torture centres), and I did find evidence of dissonance arousal in both studies. In summary, although tolerating torture is at odds with supporting the right to humane treatment, recognizing mere
toleration of torture might not be enough to arouse dissonance because such toleration does not directly result in aversive consequences. Thus, if the goal is to arouse dissonance in a human rights context using hypocrisy, my results suggest that harm has to be a consequence of the hypocrisy.

**Use of essay tasks.** Another explanation for the inconsistency in the arousal of dissonance across my studies comes from suggested shortcomings of the essay writing tasks used in some cognitive dissonance studies. One major difference between Study 1 and Studies 2 and 3, aside from the focus on one’s own or an ingroup member’s hypocrisy, was that the (supposed) dissonance arousing task in Study 1 involved writing, whereas the task in Studies 2 and 3 did not. Some researchers (e.g., Harmon-Jones, 2000) have suggested that participants often justify or rationalize their hypocritical responses in the process of writing these sorts of reflective essays, and that doing so helps resolve dissonance. In Study 1, although participants might have recognized that their toleration of torture was at odds with their supportive attitude, they might have been able to reconcile this inconsistency through the process of explaining why they felt conflicted about upholding the right to humane treatment in particular situations. That is, the hypocrisy essay might have given participants the opportunity to defend their toleration of a particular instance of torture by explaining why such a circumstance was not representative of their overall support for the right to humane treatment. Thus, although initially recognizing the inconsistency between their toleration of an instance of torture
and support for humane treatment might have aroused dissonance, participants could have resolved this dissonance through the process of writing their essays.

Although some past hypocrisy induction studies (e.g., Stone et al., 1994; Stone & Fernandez, 2011) have had success with the use of essay tasks, there are likely differences between the social acceptability of justifications for the hypocritical responses that were the focus of those studies, and the hypocrisy in the current study. Many of the past studies involved a hypocrisy for which the main justification that participants likely wrote about in their essays would not have restored their positive self-concept and, therefore, resolved dissonance. For example, the study by Stone and Fernandez (2011) focused on the failure to use sunscreen as a means for arousing dissonance. The justifications for failing to use sunscreen despite recognizing the risks would most likely be that individuals either forgot to use sunscreen or were too lazy to apply it before spending time in the sun. These justifications do not reflect positively on individuals who failed to use sunscreen, making these justifications insufficient for resolving dissonance. However, the justifications that participants likely used for their toleration of torture in Study 1 (e.g., that the target deserved the treatment) would be socially acceptable, given that such justifications conform to socially acceptable justice norms (Carlsmith, 2008; Carlsmith, Darley, & Robinson, 2002; Carlsmith & Sood, 2009; Drolet et al., 2016).
In contrast to Study 1, Studies 2 and 3 involved reading about an instance of hypocrisy that both explicitly threatened the ingroup image and that gave no information about the deservingness of the people who were tortured as a result of the MP’s hypocrisy. Both of these qualities could have prevented participants from fully justifying the ingroup member’s hypocrisy before completing the measure of discomfort.

In summary, the manipulation used in Study 1 might have allowed participants to resolve any dissonance by justifying their toleration of torture. In contrast, the manipulation used in Studies 2 and 3 did not provide such an opportunity. This difference might account for why I found evidence of dissonance arousal in Studies 2 and 3, but not Study 1.

**The Problem of Reducing the Toleratation of Torture**

The manipulation of hypocrisy affected different outcome variables in different studies. Change in toleration of torture was greater for participants in the hypocrisy and advocacy-only condition compared to the control condition in Study 1, though this change was only significant in the advocacy-only condition. However, I did not find differences in toleration of torture by condition in Studies 2 and 3. For suggested donation to a charity that aids torture victims, my manipulation worked as expected in Studies 1 and 2, but not Study 3, in which the manipulation affected only the perceived appropriateness of using torture-derived information. I also proposed that the relevance of the response to the ingroup member’s hypocrisy might account for the lack of an effect
on toleration of torture and willingness to help the target in Study 2. Although this explanation accounts for the lack of an effect on toleration of torture and willingness to help in Studies 2 and 3, the relevance explanation does not account for the lack of an effect on these measures in Study 1.

The most consistent finding across my studies was the lack of an effect of my manipulation on willingness to help the target of a human rights violation. One explanation for the lack of an effect on willingness to help (and the infrequent effect on toleration of torture) comes from research on the differential influence of individuals’ abstract attitudes and of contextual information. Previous research suggests that abstract attitudes are based on factors other than information specific to a given context (Finkel, 2001; Trope & Liberman, 2010). Moreover, there is evidence that some contextual cues, such as those that are relevant to deservingness (Hafer, 2011), are particularly difficult for people to ignore. Thus, when responding to individual situations, people might sometimes respond on the basis of contextual cues rather than their abstract attitude, even when the contextual cues suggest a response that is at odds with the abstract attitude.

In the current studies, the torture scenario contained contextual information that was relevant to the target’s deservingness (i.e., his morally reprehensible past behaviour; Carlsmith & Sood, 2009; Drolet et al., 2016) and, in Study 3, information that was relevant to utilitarian motives for tolerating torture (i.e., saving civilian lives; Batson et al., 2009). This information was included to give participants reason to tolerate the
torture (given that the focus of my studies was on reducing/preventing toleration of torture). However, given the difficulty people have ignoring contextual information, this information might have dissuaded participants from responding to the target in a way that was consistent with their abstract support for humane treatment, even when they were confronted with their own or an ingroup member’s hypocrisy. Although I expected that threats to the self-concept and ingroup image would be enough to overcome the influence of contextual information, my results for toleration of torture and willingness to help measures indicate that this is not necessarily the case.

Interestingly, measures that were not as specific to the treatment of a given target were more consistently affected by the hypocrisy manipulation (i.e., suggested donation to a torture-related charity and perceived appropriateness of using torture-derived information). Because these measures concerned more general responses that were not as relevant to the treatment of the specific target, they were likely not as influenced by the contextual information in the torture scenario as were the toleration of torture and willingness to help measures.

In summary, some of the inconsistency of my hypocrisy manipulations on my dependent variables might be due to the influence of contextual information in the torture scenario; that is, information suggesting reasons why the target should have been treated harshly. Participants might have found it too difficult to ignore this information when responding to the target’s treatment.
Implications for Cognitive Dissonance Research

Taken together, the results of my three studies have several important implications for cognitive dissonance research. First, my studies demonstrate that hypocrisy induction can be extended to human rights issues. Up until my work, hypocrisy induction had mainly been used to promote healthy behaviour and environmentally friendly practices (e.g., Focella & Stone, 2013; Kantola et al., 1984; Stone et al., 1994; Stone et al., 1997). My studies are the first to examine the use of hypocrisy induction, and to find some significant effects of hypocrisy induction, in the context of human rights violations.

Additionally, my results have implications regarding the proposed mechanism underlying the effects of hypocrisy induction. The inconsistency in the effect of my hypocrisy manipulation on discomfort suggests that dissonance was not always responsible for the effects on the dependent variables. For example, although the effects of the manipulation on suggested donation in both Studies 1 and 2 were consistent with the pattern of results that would be expected if dissonance were aroused, discomfort only appeared to be the mechanism behind this effect in Study 2. The inconsistency in the role of discomfort across my studies highlights the importance testing whether the mechanism is as theorized. Few hypocrisy induction studies directly test the proposed mechanism (for some exceptions, see Fointiat, 2011; Takaku, 2001, 2006).
Regarding the mechanism underlying the effects of hypocrisy induction, I found evidence that directly-experienced and vicarious discomfort are empirically distinct and can both be aroused by an ingroup member's hypocrisy. Although some vicarious dissonance studies have also found evidence that vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort are distinct constructs (Norton et al., 2003), my Study 3 goes further by showing that only directly-experienced discomfort appears to account for efforts to repair the ingroup image in response to an ingroup hypocrite. I refer to the dissonance responsible for this discomfort as “group-level” dissonance. These findings add to the literature that examines dissonance beyond personal dissonance (e.g., intragroup [Glasford et al., 2008], vicarious [Norton et al., 2003]) by identifying a new avenue for dissonance arousal. Moreover, my findings suggest that it is important to not only assess directly-experienced discomfort, but also other forms of discomfort (e.g., vicarious) in situations where it is unclear what form of discomfort is the underlying mechanism.

My studies draw attention to the question raised in previous literature of whether aversive consequences (e.g., harm) are necessary to arouse dissonance. Discomfort was only aroused in response to hypocrisy for Studies 2 and 3. The dissonance arousing hypocrisy in these studies directly resulted in harm (i.e., the hypocritical MP sent prisoners to torture centres), whereas the hypocrisy that was the focus of Study 1 (i.e., toleration of torture) did not have any obvious aversive consequences. Thus, at least for
the context used in the current studies, my findings support Cooper and Fazio’s (1984) assertion that aversive consequences are necessary to arouse dissonance.

Finally, the results of Studies 2 and 3 show that observing a hypocritical ingroup member can lead to directly-experienced discomfort. Specifically, results from Study 3 show that not only are the experiences of vicarious and directly-experienced discomfort distinct, but that directly-experienced discomfort seems to be responsible for the effects of the ingroup member’s hypocrisy on relevant responses.

Applied Implications

In addition to the theoretical implications, there are several important implications for the application of my findings. First, the results of my studies suggest that if the goal is to encourage support through dissonance, focusing on the hypocrisy of ingroup leaders who might directly commit or permit a violation, could be more effective than focusing on individuals’ own toleration of human rights violations. Alternatively, if the intention is to target individuals’ own toleration of human rights violations, it might be necessary to impress upon them how such toleration actually does cause harm (e.g., it permits violations to continue).

I suggested that one explanation for the lack of dissonance in Study 1 was due to participants resolving any dissonance by justifying their toleration of torture during the essay task. Thus, programs that rely on dissonance to encourage pro-human rights responses should ensure that the procedure used to arouse dissonance does not also allow
participants to justify their hypocrisy and reduce dissonance before they are offered the opportunity to respond in a way that is in line with their support for the given right.

Finally, my results for toleration of torture and willingness to help the target of torture in an interrogation indicate that hypocrisy induction procedures might not be effective for influencing all kinds of human rights-related responses. For example, in Studies 2 and 3, the threat to the ingroup's image was not enough to overcome the influence of contextual cues regarding the target's deservingness for harsh treatment. However, measures that were not focused on the target (i.e., appropriateness of the government using torture-derived information, suggested donation) were not subject to the same contextual cues and showed more promising results. Given that hypocrisy induction procedures are not effective on all types of responses, it is important to consider the nature of the response one is trying to influence when determining whether hypocrisy induction is the most appropriate approach.

**Limitations**

There are two important limitations that should be taken into account when interpreting the results of my studies. First, all three of my studies used student samples, which have been known to be some of the least representative samples (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). Thus, my findings might not generalize to more diverse or representative samples. Second, all three of my studies focused on torture. Torture is a particularly violent human rights violation. Especially given the possible role of harm in
arousing dissonance, it is difficult to know if my findings can be generalized to other types of human rights violations.

**Future Directions**

Future research could examine the use of cognitive dissonance paradigms to encourage support for other human rights violations (e.g., the denial of voting rights). Such studies could help to examine both the role of harm in arousing dissonance (i.e., can these findings be replicated using less violent human rights violations?), as well as whether dissonance paradigms are useful for encouraging support for all or only some types of human rights violations.

Future research could also examine whether my results generalize to other samples. Because my studies only examined university students, it would be useful to know whether my results generalize to more representative samples. Moreover, future research could examine whether my results generalize outside of Western samples. Past research has indicated that the experience of dissonance differs based on variations in the self-concept that are strongly related to cultural differences (Hoshino-Browne et al., 2005; Zanna, 2004). Thus, even if the results of my studies can be generalized to more representative Western samples, it is unclear whether they might generalize to samples from other cultures.

Given that dissonance might not have been aroused in Study 1 because there were not aversive consequences, future research on the use of hypocrisy induction in the
context of human rights could focus on violations to which individuals’ behaviour directly contributes. For example, future studies could focus on hypocrisy regarding the purchase of products from companies that deny human rights to their workers (e.g., sweatshops in the garment industry; Thomas, 2018) or to communities in the areas where they operate (e.g., denying access to basic necessities like water; Samson, 2018).

Given that threats to the self-concept and group image were not enough to overcome the influence of contextual information, future research could explore other methods for reducing toleration of a specific instance of a human rights violation. For example, there is some evidence that those who emphasize self-transcendent values are able to overcome their own prejudiced responses despite strong contextual cues (e.g., Norman et al., 2010). Moreover, there is some evidence that self-transcendent values are positively related to both concern with human rights and human rights behaviours (Hackett, Omoto, & Matthews, 2015). Thus, using self-transcendent values rather than hypocrisy induction might be more effective for overcoming the influence of contextual cues and, thereby, reducing the toleration of human rights violations.

Conclusions

The results of my studies offer some promising methods for encouraging pro-human rights responses, as well as include evidence of a heretofore unstudied form of dissonance. My studies suggest several challenges for strategies aimed at reducing the toleration of human rights violations, including overcoming the influence of contextual
cues, measuring proposed mechanisms, and understanding the boundary conditions of the procedures being used (e.g., aversive consequences for hypocrisy induction procedures).

Despite these challenges, finding practical methods for reducing and discouraging the toleration of violations among those who already support human rights is an important first step in ending human rights abuses.
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APPENDIX A: Informed Consent Letter in Study 1

Date: November 2014

Project Title: Personal Opinions about Current Events
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(905) 688-5550 Ext. 4297; chafer@brocku.ca

Student Principal Investigator: Caroline Drolet, PhD student
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INVITATION
You are invited to participate in a study that involves research. The study will take place over two sessions. The purpose of this study is to investigate people’s opinions on a variety of general topics and their reactions to specific news stories.

WHAT’S INVOLVED
For the first session, you will be asked to rate several statements related to your opinions of people, yourself, the world in general, and various social issues. Additionally, you will be asked to read a few summaries of news stories and then respond to several questions about what you read. The second session will take place approximately 1 week after the first session. For the second session, you will be asked to rate the extent to which various words apply to you. Additionally, you will be asked to read a few summaries of news stories and then respond to several questions about what you read. Participation will take approximately 60 minutes of your time (30 minutes for each session).

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS
Possible benefits of participation include a first-hand experience of what social science research involves for the participants. The researchers will also benefit from a more complete understanding of how people look at and react to certain social issues. There also may be risks associated with participation, as you might be uncomfortable with the situations presented in the news stories. Please note that such emotional discomfort is expected to be no more than that experienced by reading a newspaper or watching news on television.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All information you provide is considered confidential; your name will not be included with your responses or in any other way associated with the data collected in the study. Furthermore, because our interest is in the average responses of the entire group of participants, you will not be identified individually in any way in written reports of this research. Data collected during this study will be
stored indefinitely on a computer in the social psychology laboratory at Brock University. Access to these data will be restricted to Dr. Carolyn Hafer and her research students at Brock University.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your data will be deleted and not analyzed if you withdraw from the study before your participation is over. To withdraw from the study, simply alert the researcher that you do not wish to continue. Please note that once the questionnaires are completed they are anonymous and therefore impossible to remove from the data should you wish to withdraw after completing your participation.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS
Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available after November 2016. Participants who wish to receive information about the findings of this study at that time can e-mail chafer@brocku.ca or cd11da@brocku.ca or see our lab’s Facebook page (Social Justice Lab - Brock University).

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE
If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact Dr. Carolyn Hafer or Caroline Drolet using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University [13-101-HAFER]. If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your assistance in this project. Please keep a copy of this form for your records.

CONSENT
I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit

☐ $10

*Please note that credit/payment will be issued after the second session. It is your responsibility to contact the researcher to receive payment if you do not attend the second session.
I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Information Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

Name (printed)  Signature  Date

[The researcher will keep this portion and participants will keep the rest of the form.]

CONSENT

I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit

☐ $10

*Please note that credit/payment will be issued after the second session. It is your responsibility to contact the researcher to receive payment if you do not attend the second session.

I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Information Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

Name (printed)  Signature  Date
APPENDIX B: Social Dominance Orientation Scale in Study 1

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by selecting a number on the scale that is provided. Please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

Please answer the next few items using the scale below.

```
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree    Neutral    Strongly Agree
```

_____ Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
_____ In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
_____ It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
_____ To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
_____ If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
_____ It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
_____ Inferior groups should stay in their place.
_____ Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
_____ It would be good if groups could be equal.
_____ Group equality should be our ideal.
_____ All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
_____ We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
_____ Increased social equality.
_____ We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.
_____ We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.
_____ No one group should dominate in society.
APPENDIX C: Short Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale and Human Rights Items in Study 1

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by selecting a number on the scale that is provided. Please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

Please answer the next few items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.

Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.

There are many radical, immoral people in our country today who are trying to ruin it for their godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.

No one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.**

Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.

The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path.

Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.

People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.

The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.

It is important to me personally that no one ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.**

There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.

What our country really needs, instead of more “civil rights” is a good, stiff dose of law and order.

Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the “normal way” things are supposed to be done.

The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show that we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and trouble-makers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

** indicates a human rights related item.
APPENDIX D: Preference for Consistency Scale in Study 1

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by using the scale that is provided. Please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

Please answer the next few items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ I prefer to be around people whose reactions I can anticipate.
_____ It is important to me that my actions are consistent with my beliefs.
_____ Even if my attitudes and actions seemed consistent with one another to me, it would bother me if they did not seem consistent in the eyes of others.
_____ It is important to me that those who know me can predict what I will do.
_____ I want to be described by others as a stable, predictable person.
_____ Admirable people are consistent and predictable.
_____ The appearance of consistency is an important part of the image I present to the world.
_____ It bothers me when someone I depend on is unpredictable.
_____ I don’t like to appear as if I am inconsistent.
_____ I get uncomfortable when I find my behaviour contradicts my beliefs.
_____ An important requirement for any friend of mine is personal consistency.
_____ I typically prefer to do things the same way.
_____ I dislike people who are constantly changing their opinions.
_____ I want my close friends to be predictable.
_____ It is important to me that others view me as a stable person.
_____ I make an effort to appear consistent to others.
_____ I’m uncomfortable holding two beliefs that are inconsistent.
_____ It doesn’t bother me much if my actions are inconsistent.
APPENDIX E: Scenarios in Study 1

We are interested in how people respond to different kinds of current events. We have written brief summaries of many different kinds of current events based on actual news stories. You will read 3 of these.

Please read each news story carefully as you will be asked to answer some questions about what happened.

[Torture Scenario]

**Topic:** Interrogation  
**Person Described:** Yasir Sahad

Sahad was arrested because he was believed to have information about terrorist activities. He was captured while harvesting wheat close to an insurgent encampment. Officials later found that, as a teenager, Sahad had been an active member of the insurgency until 2008. While he was a member of the insurgency he was involved in an attack as a sniper, during which time he shot and killed four elementary school children to create a distraction and allow the other insurgents to get into position. He cut off contact with this group several years before his recent arrest. Sahad was interrogated based on the assumption that he had overheard some useful information. He was subjected to an “enhanced” interrogation, which involved torture. As a result, he lost a couple of toes.

[Filler Scenario 1—Forest Fire]

**Topic:** Forest Fire  
**Person Described:** Mark Johnson

Johnson was hospitalized after being caught in an out of control forest fire. Although it had been a particularly dry summer, the park and wildlife officials decided to start a controlled burn in order to avoid having an out of control forest fire in the future. Nearby residents were notified about the controlled burn and were warned that they may need to evacuate if the situation were to get out of hand. Johnson had been camping in the woods...
near his home at the time, and did not know about the situation. After only a day, the winds in the area picked up and caused the fire to spread uncontrollably. Residents were told to evacuate as soon as possible. Johnson was not aware that an evacuation had been ordered and was caught in the fire as he tried to run to safety. He sustained severe burns and is currently in critical condition.

[Filler Scenario 2—Car Accident]

**Topic:** Car Accident  
**Person Described:** Sarah Smith

Smith was taken to the emergency room after being hit by a truck while she was on the side of the road. Smith had stopped after her car stalled on the highway. She was able to get it onto the shoulder and determine that the engine failure was the result of failing to get the oil changed last month. She was on her phone with a mechanic discussing repairs when she was struck by a semi truck. It had been very sunny that morning and the driver had probably been blinded by the sun, so he probably did not even see Smith or realize that he hit her. Police currently do not know the identity of the driver who was responsible for the crash. Smith is currently unconscious and doctors are unsure about her likelihood of waking up.
APPENDIX F: Torture Scenario Response Items in Study 1

The next few questions are about your reactions to this case. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions.

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ The methods used in Sahad's interrogation were appropriate
_____ The way Sahad was treated during the interrogation was justified
_____ The use of torture in the interrogation of Sahad was acceptable.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Sahad deserved to be treated harshly.
_____ Sahad deserved to be punished.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad/Immoral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Very Good/Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ To what extent do you think Sahad is a good or bad person?
_____ To what extent do you think Sahad is a moral or immoral person?
_____ To what extent do you think Sahad’s past behaviour was good or bad?
_____ To what extent do you think Sahad’s past behaviour was moral or immoral?
The next few questions are about your reactions to this case. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions.

(Fire Scenarios)

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

_____ Johnson deserved to be caught in the fire.
_____ Johnson deserved to be hurt.
_____ Johnson did not deserve to be trapped in the fire.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Bad/Immoral Neutral Very Good/Moral

_____ To what extent do you think Johnson is a good or bad person?
_____ To what extent do you think Johnson is a moral or immoral person?
_____ To what extent do you think Johnson’s behaviour was good or bad?
_____ To what extent do you think Johnson’s behaviour was moral or immoral?

**Participants will only answer the next two items in Session 2.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at All Willing Neutral Completely Willing

_____ It is not uncommon for cases like Johnson to become the subject of negligence lawsuits against park and wildlife officials. If Johnson’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover the legal fees?

_____ Cases like Johnson’s often catch the attention of various fire safety organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the use of the controlled burn that injured Johnson

(Car Accident Scenarios)
Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Smith deserved to be hit by a truck.
_____ Smith deserved to be hurt.
_____ Smith did not deserve to be in a coma.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Bad/Immoral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Very Good/Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ To what extent do you think Smith is a good or bad person?
_____ To what extent do you think Smith is a moral or immoral person?
_____ To what extent do you think Smith’s behaviour was good or bad?
_____ To what extent do you think Smith’s behaviour was moral or immoral?

**Participants will only answer the next two items in Session 2.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All Willing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Completely Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ It is not uncommon for cases like Smith’s to become the subject of lawsuits. If Smith’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover the legal fees?

_____ Cases like Smith’s often catch the attention of various traffic safety organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter supporting the creation of new driving laws that would help prevent accidents like the one that put Smith in a coma?
APPENDIX H: Demographic Information in Study 1

What is your sex? __________________________

What is your age in years? __________________________
APPENDIX I: Packet Information in Study 1
We are interested in how people think about human rights and why they are motivated to support universal human rights. You are being asked to write a persuasive essay about why you believe it is important to support human rights. Excerpts from your essay might be featured in promotional materials encouraging support for human rights and informing people why universal human rights are important.

Universal human rights are rights that are granted to everyone (e.g., regardless of race, gender, behaviour, sexual orientation, and so on) and are described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN General Assembly, 1948). This document claims that every person has the right to such things as access to adequate medical care, participation in the political process, and humane treatment. In order to better understand what motivates people to support universal human rights, we would like you to write a short essay (about one paragraph) about how people benefit from human rights. There are several different rights about which we are asking people to write. The one that has been assigned to you is displayed below.

Human Right Description: “No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment.”

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

Your Name (as you would like it to appear):

____________________________________________________________________________________________
To get a better understanding of how people think about human rights, we have an additional question about your thoughts and opinions related to human rights.

In order to better understand why people might not support universal human rights, we would like you to write a short essay (about one paragraph) about a situation in which you might feel conflicted about supporting a human right. You will be writing about the same human right as on the previous page; the right has been displayed on this page, as well. First, in order to help you think of an example of when you might feel conflicted about supporting this right, we have provided a list of possible reasons why people might tolerate a violation of this right. If any of these are reasons why you might tolerate a violation, please check them off. Additionally, feel free to include your own reasons in the blanks provided.

Human Right Description: “No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment.”

☐ If the person has tortured or killed others
☐ The person has physically assaulted children
☐ The person has sexually assaulted children
☐ To extract information from someone who won’t talk
☐ The person has committed treason
☐ Giving eye-for-an-eye closure to victim’s families
☐ The person is a rapist
☐ If the person severely hurt a loved one
☐ To influence someone’s behaviour (through means of fear)
☐ ______________________________________________________
☐ ______________________________________________________
☐ ______________________________________________________

Now that you have thought about times when you might feel conflicted about supporting this right, please write a short essay (about one paragraph) about one or more situations in which you might feel conflicted about supporting the human right. You may use the examples from the list or come up with additional examples for your essay.

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
The Human Rights Research Centre (HRRC) is interested in who chooses to attend university in Ontario. For this reason, you are being asked to complete the following demographic questions.

What is your political orientation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With which political party do you most closely identify?

Do you have an immediate family member who is affiliated with the military?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is your nationality?

What is your sex?

What is your age?

What is your ethnicity?

What is your religious orientation?

- Catholic
- Protestant
- Christian Orthodox
- Christian not included elsewhere
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Hindu
- Sikh
- Buddhist
- Atheist (i.e., do not believe in God)
- Agnostic (i.e., are uncertain whether or not God exists)
- Other

What is your annual household income (or your family’s annual household income if you are a student living away from home)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under $5000</th>
<th>$50,000-59,999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5000-9999</td>
<td>$60,000-69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-19,999</td>
<td>$70,000-79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>$80,000-89,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>$90,000-99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your level of education?

- less than grade 9
- grade 9-11
- high school graduation
- some community college
- community college diploma
- some university
- completed bachelor’s degree
- some graduate school or professional school (e.g., law)
- completed Masters or professional school (e.g., law)
- some doctoral work (Ph.D or M.D.)
- completed doctoral work (Ph.D or M.D.)
APPENDIX J: Affect Measure in Study 1
Please rate the extent to which these terms describe your current state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply at All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applies Very Much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Negative Emotions about the Self]
-  ______ Angry at myself
-  ______ Guilty
-  ______ Annoyed with myself
-  ______ Disgusted with myself
-  ______ Regretful
-  ______ Shameful
-  ______ Self-critical

[Negative Emotions about Other]
-  ______ Angry at others
-  ______ Irritated at others
-  ______ Disgusted with others

[Discomfort]
-  ______ Fearful
-  ______ Uneasy
-  ______ Embarrassed
-  ______ Bothered
-  ______ Tense
-  ______ Threatened
-  ______ Uncomfortable

[Positive Emotions]
-  ______ Friendly
-  ______ Happy
-  ______ Energetic
-  ______ Optimistic
-  ______ Content
-  ______ Good

[Depressed]
-  ______ Low
-  ______ Depressed
-  ______ Sad
-  ______ Helpless
-  ______ Anxious
-  ______ Frustrated
APPENDIX K: Willingness to help items in Study 1

**Participants will only answer the next two items in Session 2.**

*Please answer the next items using the scale below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Willing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Completely Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ It is not uncommon for interrogations like Sahad’s to become the subject of lawsuits claiming that those who were interrogated were treated inhumanely. If Sahad’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover his legal fees?

_____ Cases like Sahad’s often catch the attention of various anti-violence organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the treatment Sahad received during his interrogation?
Thank you for your participation in this study.

The Human Rights Research Centre (HRRC), with whom we have partnered for the current study, is looking for feedback on where to make donations in the upcoming year. We agreed to ask participants in the current study to provide some feedback on what proportion of donation funds to allot to various non-profit organizations. The results of this feedback will be presented at an annual meeting this summer, where the HRRC leaders will be finalizing the budget for next year.

Each year, the HRRC donates some of its funds to a few non-profit organizations. Please indicate how you think these donations should be divided across the following organizations.

[ ] % Forest Fires Response (Red Cross) {show more}

*Part of the Disaster and Crisis Management branch of the Red Cross, this organization helps to ensure that the victims of forest fires have access to food, shelter, and medical attention. This organization “aims to respond to disasters as rapidly and effectively as possible, by mobilizing its resources (people, money and other assets) and using its network in a coordinated manner so that the initial effects are countered and the needs of the affected communities are met.”*

[ ] % Centre for Victims of Torture (CVT) {show more}

*This organization “aids survivors in overcoming the lasting effects of torture and war. In partnership with the community, the Centre supports survivors in the process of successful integration into society, works for their protection and integrity, and raises awareness of the continuing effects of torture and war on survivors and their families. The CVT gives hope after the horror.”*

[ ] % International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) {show more}

*“Founded in 1969, the International Fund for Animal Welfare saves individual animals, animal populations and habitats all over the world. With projects in more than 40 countries, IFAW provides hands-on assistance to animals in need, whether it’s dogs and cats, wildlife and livestock, or rescuing animals in the wake of disasters. We also advocate saving populations from cruelty and depletion, such as our campaign to end commercial whaling and seal hunts.”*

[ ] % The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) {show more}

*“Since 1966 UNDP partners with people at all levels of society to help build nations that can withstand crisis, and drive and sustain the kind of growth that improves the quality of life for everyone. On the ground in more than 170 countries and territories, we offer global perspective and local insight to help empower lives and build resilient nations.”*

[ ] % Total
APPENDIX M: Verbal Protocol for Debriefing in Study 1

I want to explain the work we’re doing in a little more detail before you go today. Do you have anything you would like to ask before I start? {Record questions on the debriefing notes sheet}

I have a couple of questions for you that will help us assess if the procedures need to be changed in future studies. During any of the research you participated in today, was there anything unclear about the instructions or any of the procedures? Did anything seem odd or strange about the instructions or any other part of the research? Did you notice that the scenarios in Session 2 were the same as in Session 1, and, if so, did that seem strange to you? Can you explain in your own words what you think this study is about? {Make notes on answers; tell them they are on the right track if they answer the last question}

Now I’m going to tell you about the purpose of the research in more detail.

As you know, we are interested in people’s reactions to news stories. More specifically, we are interested in how people respond to scenarios about human rights violations. In Sessions 1 and 2, one of the scenarios you read described a violation of the right to protection against torture (that is, the right to humane treatment). We expected that, due to the immorality of the man’s past actions (i.e., killing children), some people would be willing to tolerate his being tortured. Moreover, we expected that the extent to which people tolerated the torture would depend on their support for the right to humane treatment. This is why, in Session 1, you were asked a couple of questions about your attitude toward the right to humane treatment.

I need to tell you that all of the scenarios were fictional, although some of the events they depicted were taken from actual news stories. We want people to believe the stories are actual events so that their responses are more realistic.

For Session 2, some participants were asked to complete demographic information and others were asked to write an essay about why it is important to support the right to humane treatment. Additionally, some participants were asked to write a second essay, explaining reasons for why they might feel conflicted about supporting the right to humane treatment. Those who wrote about feeling conflicted about supporting the right to humane treatment were shown a list of reasons why people might tolerate torture, in order to help them come up with examples of when they might feel conflicted.

We predicted that some participants who wrote about times when they might feel conflicted would see an inconsistency between their support for the right to humane treatment and their toleration of torture in certain situations—that this should not be the case.
for participants who did not write about feeling conflicted. We also predicted that participants who see an inconsistency will reduce their toleration of torture so that they are more consistent with their overall support for humane treatment. We tested this prediction in a couple of ways. You were asked to read and respond to three scenarios in both sessions. These scenarios were the same in both sessions. Those who felt they behaved inconsistently with respect to human rights should tolerate the violation less this second time compared to when they had first read and responded to the scenarios. We asked participants to wait at least one week between Session 1 and Session 2 to prevent participants from guessing that we are interested in how their responses might change from Session 1 to Session 2; if they knew, it might affect how they answer the questions.

After responding to the scenarios, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We predicted that those who felt that they behaved inconsistently would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those who did not feel they behaved inconsistently.

One last point about the procedure I have to explain. You were told that we partnered with an organization, the Human Rights Research Centre, for the current study. This organization was made up for this study and does not actually exist. Additionally, if you were asked to write an essay, you were told that your responses might be used in promotional materials. However, I want you to understand that your responses will not, in any way, be used outside of analysing the results of this study. Your responses will remain confidential and will not be shared with anyone. The reason we tell participants that their responses might be used in promotional materials is that past research has shown that people who have been inconsistent in how they respond to some issue are more bothered by that inconsistency if they think they will have to publicly state what they believe, rather than just saying what they believe to themselves. To keep the responses in the essay task anonymous, we remove the part of the response form where participants wrote their names. {Cut the participant’s name off the bottom of their essay and give the slip of paper with their name to the participant.} Your name will be in no way associated with any of your data in this study—all of your responses are anonymous, like it said in the consent form.

Remember that there are no right or wrong ways to respond to anything in the studies you took part in today. Everyone has their own beliefs about things, and those beliefs should be respected.

Do you have any questions about anything I have told you so far?

Now I want to explain why we didn’t tell you everything about the purpose and the procedure of the research until the study was over. If people know everything about the research before they come in here, they may respond according to what they think we
are looking for – either unconsciously or just to be helpful and cooperative. Then we wouldn’t know if the responses we are getting are people’s true and honest reactions or not. We would prefer not to hide anything about the research, but we also have to make sure that we are getting spontaneous and realistic responses from people. Does that make sense to you?

You’ve been very helpful. Thank you for all of your suggestions and for your honesty. I have to ask a favour of you before we wrap things up. It’s very important that you don’t discuss this study or anything I told you with anyone else. If people know what is expected of them before they come in here, their reactions in the study may be influenced in some way, and the data that we are collecting would be useless. I can’t emphasize enough how important it is that people come into the study not knowing exactly what we are trying to do. With that in mind, it would be very helpful to me if you can let me know what, if anything, you heard about this study before you came here today. I don’t care where or from whom you heard anything, just what you may have heard. {Take notes}. If anyone asks you about the study, you can just tell them what is in the SONA advertisement -- that they have to fill out questionnaires and do a computer task.

Now that the study has been fully explained, you can decide whether or not you would like your data to be included. If you choose to have your data removed from the dataset, it will be deleted and cannot be recovered later. Additionally, you will not be able to have your data removed from the dataset after this session. Please indicate whether or not you agree to have your data included in the study using this consent form. Additionally, please fill out the participant ID information so that we can handle your data appropriately. {Hand the participant the reconsent form and the ID form.}

Okay, the last thing I’m going to give you is a written explanation of the study, as I’ve already explained it to you. Also on the handout is contact information for the Research Ethics Officer at Brock, if you have any questions about your rights as a study participant. Cari Drolet is conducting this study as part of her PhD and Dr. Hafer in the Department of Psychology is supervising this research. If you have any questions about the research we are doing that you think of later, you can contact Dr. Hafer or Cari Drolet using the information on this handout. The results of this research will be available approximately one year from now. You can contact Cari Drolet or Dr. Hafer, or see our lab’s Facebook page if you are interested in the results. Do you have any more questions? I hope you found this study interesting. Thank you for your cooperation!
APPENDIX N: Printed Debriefing Form in Study 1

Project Title: Current Events and Emotion
Principal Investigator: Dr. Carolyn Hafer, Professor of Social Psychology
Department of Psychology
Brock University
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 4297;
chafer@brocku.ca

Student Principal Investigator:
Caroline Drolet, MA candidate
Department of Psychology
Brock University
cd11da@brocku.ca

Research Feedback

Dear participant,

Thank you very much for participating in this study.

This research session involved two related studies. Session 1 involved answering some questions about your personal opinions, then reading and responding to scenarios that depicted stories like those you would see in the news. Amongst the opinion questions were two items assessing your support for the right to humane treatment. One of the scenarios you read also dealt with human rights. Specifically, the scenarios involved a violation of the right to humane treatment. In this scenario, the main character killed children. We expected that some people would tolerate the rights violation when the character caused serious harm to children, even if they support human rights overall; that is, we predicted that some people would be inconsistent in their support for human rights.

In Session 2, you were asked either to write about supporting human rights or to fill out some demographic information. Then, some participants were asked to write about times in which they might have felt conflicted about supporting human rights. Those who wrote about times when they might feel conflicted about supporting human rights were shown a list of reasons why people might tolerate a human rights violation and asked to check off any that applied to them. These participants were then asked to write about feeling conflicted about support human rights. Checking off the reasons and then writing about them was expected to make some participants realize that they had been inconsistent between their support for human rights and their toleration of the human rights violation. Next, you were asked to fill out some general questions about your emotions and how you were feeling. If some participants actually recognize their inconsistency, then they should express more discomfort compared to people who were not asked to think about inconsistencies. Additionally, you were asked to read and respond to the scenarios from Session 1 a second time. Those who felt they behaved inconsistently with respect to human rights should tolerate the violation less this second time compared to when they
had first read and responded to the scenarios. At the end of the study, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We expected that those who felt they behaved inconsistently with respect to human rights would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those who did not feel they behaved inconsistently. If you are interested in getting more information on any of the organizations mentioned in the donation task, we have provided information for those organizations at the end of this form.

If you feel upset by the situation described in this study, please go to Brock University’s counseling services for help (Schmon Tower - ST400) or go to their website to find out how to schedule an appointment (http://www.brocku.ca/personal-counselling). You can also consult your physician for a referral.

Now that we have more fully explained this research to you, we must ask you to please avoid telling anyone else about the details of this study and its purpose. Doing so may alter the results because people might respond differently if they know what we are looking for. This is why we did not tell you everything about this research until after you had completed this study.

If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca. If you have any other questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the investigators. Results will be available after November, 2016. If you wish to learn about the results of our research at that time, contact one of the investigators or see our Facebook page (Social Justice Lab – Brock University). We will only provide group averages and overall results, not personal information, because all data will remain anonymous and confidential.

Thank you again for your participation!

For more information on the organizations mentioned at the end of the study, see the following websites.

- Disaster and Crisis Management (Red Cross) website: http://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/
- Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture website: ccvt.org
- International Fund for Animal Welfare website: http://www.ifaw.org/canada
- United Nations Development Program
website: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home.html

For more information on human rights, see the following Human Rights Organizations.

- *Amnesty International*—campaign to end abuses of universal human rights
  website: http://www.amnesty.org/

- *Global Rights*—works on building grass roots movements to promote and protect the
  rights of marginalized populations, as well as documenting human rights abuses
  website: http://www.globalrights.org

- *Human Rights Watch*—devoted to defending and protecting human rights
  website: http://www.hrw.org

- *UN Watch*—monitors the performance of the UN according to its own charter
  website: http://www.unwatch.org
APPENDIX O: Analyses Using the Full Sample in Study 1

The following analyses were done using regression, with the centred support for humane treatment variable entered on the first step, the dummy codes for the condition comparisons entered on the second step, and the interactions between support for humane treatment and condition on the third step. Significant and marginal individual effects for each step were only examined if the $R^2$ change for that step was significant or marginal. The dummy codes for condition used the hypocrisy condition as the comparison group, such that the first dummy code compared the hypocrisy condition (coded as 0) to the control condition (coded as 1) and the second dummy code compared the hypocrisy condition (coded as 0) to the advocacy-only condition (coded as 1).

**Affect Analyses**

I regressed discomfort onto support for humane treatment, condition (the two dummy coded variables), and the interactions. Support for humane treatment did not significantly predict discomfort, $b = 0.04, \beta = 0.05, t(171) = 0.68, p = .50, \text{sr}^2 = .003, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.08, 0.16]$. However, condition did have an effect on discomfort. Participants in the hypocrisy condition experienced significantly more discomfort than participants in both the advocacy-only, $b = -0.58, \beta = -0.22, t(171) = -2.45, p = .02, \text{sr}^2 = .03, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-1.04, -0.11]$, and control conditions (see Figure 12), $b = -0.52, \beta = -0.19, t(171) = -2.20, p = .03, \text{sr}^2 = .03, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.98, -0.05]$. Neither of the interactions between the condition dummy codes and support for humane treatment
significantly predicted discomfort ($p_s > .25$). Although there was a significant main
effect of condition on discomfort, the discomfort variable did not significantly mediate
the effect of condition on any of the primary dependent variables (all $p_s > .05$).

**Figure 12.** The effect of condition on discomfort in Study 1. Error bars represent $\pm 1SE$.

In four additional analyses, I regressed negative emotions about the self, positive
emotions, negative emotions about others, or depressed emotions onto support for
humane treatment, condition, and the interactions. There were no significant effects for
the analysis using negative emotions about the self as the dependent variable (all $p_s >
.15$). There were also no significant effects for the analysis using positive emotions as
the dependent variable (all $p_s > .12$). There was a significant effect of the comparison
between the hypocrisy and advocacy-only conditions on depressed emotions, $b = -0.61$, $\beta$
$= -0.20$, $t(171) = -2.27$, $p = .02$, $sr^2 = .03$, 95% CI of $b$ [-1.13, -0.08], such that
participants in the hypocrisy condition ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.50$) felt more depressed than
those in the advocacy-only condition ($M = 2.18, SD = 1.16$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions on depressed emotions (all $ps > .15$). For negative emotions toward others, there was a significant effect of the comparison between the hypocrisy condition and the advocacy-only condition, $b = -0.59$, $\beta = -0.18$, $t(171) = -2.02$, $p = .05$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b [-1.16, -0.01]$, such that participants in the hypocrisy condition ($M = 2.97, SD = 1.53$) reported more negative emotions toward others than those in the advocacy-only condition ($M = 2.35, SD = 1.54$). There was also a marginal effect of the comparison between hypocrisy and control conditions on negative emotions toward others, $b = -0.57$, $\beta = -0.17$, $t(171) = -1.97$, $p = .05$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b [-1.14, 0.002]$, such that participants in the hypocrisy condition experienced more negative emotions toward others than participants in the control condition ($M = 2.37, SD = 1.59$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions on negative emotions toward others (all $ps > .10$).

**Tests of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1.** I expected that participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, would reduce their toleration of torture the most. To test this prediction, I first computed a difference score for change in toleration of torture by subtracting the toleration of torture composite from Session 2 from the toleration of torture composite from Session 1. High and positive scores in the difference score indicated greater reduction in toleration of torture from
Session 1 to Session 2. I then regressed change in toleration of torture onto support for humane treatment, condition, and the interactions. Support for the right to humane treatment did not significantly predict change in toleration of torture, $b = -0.003, \beta = -0.004, t(168) = -0.05, p = .96, sr^2 < .001, 95\% CI \ of \ b \ [\ -0.12, 0.12 \]$. Participants in the hypocrisy condition reduced their toleration of the target’s torture marginally more than those in the control condition, $b = -0.45, \beta = -0.17, t(168) = -1.91, p = .06, sr^2 = .02, 95\% \ CI \ of \ b \ [-0.91, 0.02]$, but not significantly more than those in the advocacy-only condition, $b = 0.27, \beta = 0.10, t(168) = 1.13, p = .26, sr^2 = .007, 95\% \ CI \ of \ b \ [-0.20, 0.74]$. (see Figure 13). There were no significant interactions ($R^2 \ change = .02, p = .14$).

![Figure 13](image)

*Figure 13.* The effect of condition on change in toleration of torture in Study 1. Error bars represent $\pm 1SE$.

**Hypothesis 2.** I expected that participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, would be the most willing to help
the target of the torture. To test this prediction, I regressed willingness to help the target onto support for humane treatment, condition, and the interactions. There was a significant main effect of support for humane treatment on willingness to help the target, $b = 0.36, \beta = 0.33, t(171) = 4.60, p < .001, sr^2 = .11, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [0.20, 0.51]$. Participants who were high in support for humane treatment were more willing to help the target than those who were less supportive of the right to humane treatment. None of the condition comparisons or interactions reached significance (all $p$’s > .20).

**Hypothesis 3.** I expected that participants in the hypocrisy induction condition, compared to the advocacy-only and control conditions, would suggest the highest donations to the torture-related charity. To test this prediction, I regressed suggested donations to the torture-related charity onto support for humane treatment, condition, and the interactions. There was no significant effect of support for humane treatment on suggested donation, $b = 0.64, \beta = 0.11, t(168) = 1.41, p = .16, sr^2 = .01, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-0.25, 1.52]$. There was a marginally significant effect of the comparison between the advocacy and hypocrisy conditions, $b = -3.10, \beta = -0.16, t(168) = -1.77, p = .08, sr^2 = .02, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-6.55, 0.35]$, and a significant effect of the comparison between the hypocrisy and control conditions, $b = -5.31, \beta = -0.27, t(168) = -3.04, p = .003, sr^2 = .05, 95\% \text{ CI of } b [-8.76, -1.86]$. Similar to analyses using only participants who supported the right to humane treatment, participants in the hypocrisy condition suggested higher donations to the torture-related charity than participants in both the advocacy and control
conditions (see Figure 14). There were no significant interactions ($R^2$ change = .02, $p = .18$).

\[\text{Figure 14.} \quad \text{The effect of condition on suggested donation to the torture-related charity in Study 1. Error bars represent ±1SE.}\]

**Summary**

Results for toleration of torture, willingness to help the target, and suggested donation from the analyses including all participants yielded similar results to those using only participants who supported the right to humane treatment. The analyses involving affect, however, were quite different when the full sample was used, compared to using only those who supported the right to humane treatment. Although the results for discomfort were in the predicted direction (i.e., more discomfort in hypocrisy than in advocacy or control), similar patterns of results were found for both depressive emotions and negative emotions toward others. These results indicate that participants in the
hypocrisy condition were experiencing more negative affect in general, not discomfort specifically. Thus, similar to my conclusion for the analyses including only those who supported the right to humane treatment, it does not appear that participants in the hypocrisy condition experienced discomfort as a result of dissonance.

Finally, it is worth noting that there were no significant interaction effects between condition and support for humane treatment on any of the dependent variables. One reason for this is that there might not have been enough participants scoring at or below neutral to be able to find an interaction involving support for humane treatment; only 37 participants (21% of the total sample) did not support the right to humane treatment in the current study. Future research could benefit from using samples with more individuals with varying opinions on support for humane treatment.
APPENDIX P: Informed Consent Letter in Study 2

**Date:** January 2016  
**Project Title:** Study on Interaction with News Media

**Principal Investigator:** Dr. Carolyn Hafer, Professor  
Department of Psychology  
Brock University  
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 4297; chafer@brocku.ca

**Student Principal Investigator:** Cari Drolet, PhD student  
Department of Psychology  
Brock University  
cd11da@brocku.ca

**INVITATION**
You are invited to participate in a study that involves research. The purpose of this study is to investigate people’s opinions on a variety of general topics and their reactions to specific news stories.

**WHAT’S INVOLVED**
You will be asked to rate several statements related to your opinions of people, yourself, the world in general, and various social issues. Additionally, you will be asked to read a few news stories and then respond to several questions about what you read. Participation will take approximately 60 minutes of your time.

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS**
Possible benefits of participation include a first-hand experience of what social science research involves for the participants. The researchers will also benefit from a more complete understanding of how people look at and react to certain topics in the news. There also may be risks associated with participation, as you might be uncomfortable with the situations presented in the news stories. Please note that such emotional discomfort is expected to be no more than that experienced by reading a newspaper or watching news on television.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**
All information you provide is considered confidential; your name will not be included with your responses or in any other way associated with the data collected in the study. Furthermore, because our interest is in the average responses of the entire group of participants, you will not be identified individually in any way in written reports of this research. Data collected during this study will be stored indefinitely on a computer in the social psychology laboratory at Brock University. Access to these data will be restricted to Dr. Carolyn Hafer and her research students at Brock University.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION**
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at
any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your data will be deleted and not analyzed if you withdraw from the study before your participation is over. To withdraw from the study, simply alert the researcher that you do not wish to continue. Please note that once the questionnaires are completed they are anonymous and therefore impossible to remove from the data should you wish to withdraw after completing your participation.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS
Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available after December 2016. Participants who wish to receive information about the findings of this study at that time can e-mail chafer@brocku.ca or cd11da@brocku.ca.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE
If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact Dr. Carolyn Hafer or Caroline Drolet using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University [???-???-HAFER]. If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your assistance in this project. Please keep a copy of this form for your records.

CONSENT

I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit
☐ $10

I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Informed Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The researcher will keep this portion and participants will keep the rest of the form.]
CONSENT

I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit
☐ $10

I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Informed Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX Q: Demographic Information in Study 2

What is your political orientation?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Liberal

What is your nationality (choose one)?
☐ Canadian  ☐ Other: ____________________

Are you a Canadian citizen? _________
Were you born in Canada? _________
Do you have dual citizenship? _________

*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:* 

I am proud to be a Canadian.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

Being a Canadian is an important part of my identity.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

I feel very close to other Canadians.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

What is your sex? _________

What is your age? _________

What is your ethnicity? ____________________
APPENDIX R: Short Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale and Human Rights Items in Study 2

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by selecting a number on the scale that is provided. Please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

Please answer the next few items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.
_____ Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
_____ There are many radical, immoral people in our country today who are trying to ruin it for their godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
_____ No one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason. \(^{HR}\)
_____ Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
_____ The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path.
_____ Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.
_____ People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
_____ The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
_____ It is important to me personally that no one ever be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason. \(^{HR}\)
_____ There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
_____ What our country really needs, instead of more “civil rights” is a good, stiff dose of law and order.
_____ Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the “normal way” things are supposed to be done.
_____ The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show that we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and trouble-makers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

\(^{HR}\) indicates a human rights related item.
APPENDIX S: Questions about News Habits and News Topics, Including Canada’s Position on Torture in Study 2

How often do you read/watch/listen to the news?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never or twice per year</th>
<th>Once every few months</th>
<th>Once every few weeks</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Once every few days</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Multiple times per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you prefer to get the news from each of the following media:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Use at All</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Greatly Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you enjoy the following types of news stories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Local News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Politics</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following statements relate to several important issues that have been in the news recently. Use the scale below to indicate to what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Canadians agree that controlled burns* can be used to prevent out of control forest fires, thereby protecting both citizens and the environment.

It is important to most Canadians that controlled burns be used to prevent out of control forest fires, thereby protecting both citizens and the environment.

Most Canadians agree that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

It is important to most Canadians that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

*Controlled burning is any fire intentionally ignited to meet specific land management objectives, such as to reduce flammable fuels, restore ecosystem health, recycle nutrients, or prepare an area for new trees or vegetation.

- USDA Forest Service
APPENDIX T: Manipulated Scenarios and Instructions in Study 2

[Instructions]

We are interested in how people respond to different kinds of current events. We have taken screen-shots of actual news stories. You will read 3 of these.

Please read each news story carefully as you will be asked to answer some questions about what happened.
Canada’s Embarrassing Record Regarding Torture

By Davie Smith, New York, NY
Dec. 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

Since ratifying the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1987, Canada has openly opposed and condemned the use of torture for the purpose of extracting information. In a public announcement made at a UN peace conference earlier this year, Nathan Costello, an MP from Ontario who sat on the National Security and Defence (SECD) committee, said that SECD had been clear about Canada’s position on rejecting information extracted through coercion.

“We’re signatory to the UN Convention Against Torture and there is an absolute prohibition against torture, period,” Costello said. “As a practical matter, we get intelligence from all kinds of sources, a myriad of sources. An important part of the process is to try and identify how credible that is. If there’s any indication, any evidence that torture may have been used, that information is discounted.”

“Torture is also prohibited under the Criminal Code of Canada,” he said. “Also, if we rely on information that has been obtained by torture then we are breaching our obligations under the Convention Against Torture.”

“The bottom line is that as long as torturers continue to find a market for the fruit of their crimes, torture will continue,” he said. “Firmly rebuffing torturers when they offer up information extracted through pain and suffering is a critical plank in the wider campaign to eradicate torture once and for all.” He went on to say that Canadian law enforcement and security agencies should focus on getting rid of information that bears the taint of torture, not on carving out exceptions for when it can be used.

However, last week at a hearing before a Commons committee, Costello admitted that he and his colleagues had been quietly violating the Canadian government’s policy on using intelligence derived from torture or mistreatment. He admitted that, under his orders, organizations under the direction of the SECD had been accepting information that they knew had been obtained through the use of torture. He also admitted to turning over Canadian prisoners to the Afghan authorities, such as the National Directorate of Security or Afghan police, despite that many experts warned him that the prisoners were being tortured. Costello has refused to comment to USA News on this matter.

Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers are an embarrassing stain on Canada’s previously impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.
Canada’s Praiseworthy Record Regarding Torture

By David Smith, New York, NY
Dec. 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

Since ratifying the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1987, Canada has openly opposed and condemned the use of torture for the purpose of extracting information. In a public announcement made at a UN peace conference earlier this year, Nathan Costello, an MP from Ontario who sat on the National Security and Defence (SECD) committee, said that SECD had been clear about Canada’s position on rejecting information extracted through coercion.

“We’re signatory to the UN Convention Against Torture and there is an absolute prohibition against torture, period,” Costello said. “As a practical matter, we get intelligence from all kinds of sources, a myriad of sources. An important part of the process is to try and identify how credible that is. If there’s any indication, any evidence that torture may have been used, that information is discounted.”

“Torture is also prohibited under the Criminal Code of Canada,” he said. “Also, if we rely on information that has been obtained by torture then we are breaching our obligations under the Convention Against Torture.”

“The bottom line is that as long as torturers continue to find a market for the fruit of their crimes, torture will continue,” he said. “Firmly rebuffing torturers when they offer up information extracted through pain and suffering is a critical plank in the wider campaign to eradicate torture once and for all.” He went on to say that Canadian law enforcement and security agencies should focus on getting rid of information that bears the taint of torture, not on carving out exceptions for when it can be used.

Last week at a hearing before a Commons committee, Costello explained the additional measures that are being taken by SECD to ensure that any information that is used by the organizations under its direction has not been obtained through the use of torture. Additionally, Costello told the committee that Canadian funding would be recalled from facilities found to be accepting information obtained through the use of torture. He has also refused to allow Canadian prisoners to be turned over to the Afghan authorities because he was warned that the National Directorate of Security or Afghan police was torturing them. A spokesperson told USA News that Costello was currently not available for comment.

Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers adds to Canada’s impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.
MP Offers Advice On Autobiographies
By Davie Smith, New York, NY
Dec 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

It is not uncommon for political figures to release autobiographies and memoirs at different points during their careers. Last year, Nathan Costello, a Canadian MP, revealed that he was beginning work on his own autobiography. “The nice thing about an autobiography is that it provides a glimpse into your life and how you think about things that you just can’t get from videos or pictures,” he said, reflecting on the significance of autobiographies. “Especially for public figures, these works give people a unique opportunity to really get to know you.”

He’s now working on his second draft of the book, and he agreed to offer some tips to any readers who are interested in writing their own autobiographies or memoirs. He told us that, “an important first step is to write out your life timeline.” Creating a timeline of your life is a good way to make sure you include all the most important dates and events, and it gives you a structure to build upon. You can consider this the “brainstorming” phase, so don’t hesitate to write down everything you can remember, even if you don’t think the memory will make it into the final version of the book. Also, keep in mind that your autobiography doesn’t have to start with your birth. “My autobiography starts when I was just getting out of school, because that’s really when I started to get interested in being involved in politics.”

Costello told us that the next step is to identify the main characters that you will focus on in your book. “Every good story has interesting characters, friends and foes who help move the plot along, and an autobiography is no different. People have to be able to connect with the people you write about, otherwise they’ll stop reading.” Think about those who have affected your life and should play a role in your autobiography.

Next, pull out the best stories. Costello laughed as he told us, “no one wants to hear about how you took out the trash once a week or did the dishes everyday. Write about the parts of your life that really show people the parts of you that you’re trying to communicate, not the daily grind.” Begin drafting your manuscript by writing out the main stories that will be woven together to create a picture of your life.

Finally, he told us that anyone writing an autobiography needs to be ready to write and re-write, likely several times! “Your first draft won’t be your last, and neither will your second draft.” Costello’s book, for example, is scheduled for release in 2017, two years after completion of his first draft.
APPENDIX U: Manipulation/Memory Checks for First Article in Study 2

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

What country was the news agency from? ______________________________

Which of the following sentences appeared at the end of the article?

☐ “Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers adds to Canada’s impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.”

☐ “Costello’s book, for example, is scheduled for released in 2017, two years after completion of his first draft.”

☐ “Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers are an embarrassing stain on Canada’s previously impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.”

How does this story reflect on Canada?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Negatively Neutral Very Positively

How does this story make Canada look?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Bad Neutral Very Good
APPENDIX V: Affect Measure in Study 2

Please rate the extent to which these terms describe your current state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply at All</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Applies Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Negative Emotions about the Self]
- _____ Angry at myself
- _____ Guilty
- _____ Annoyed with myself
- _____ Disgusted with myself
- _____ Regretful
- _____ Shameful
- _____ Self-critical

[Negative Emotions about Others]
- _____ Angry at others
- _____ Irritated at others
- _____ Disgusted with others

[Positive Emotions]
- _____ Happy
- _____ Optimistic
- _____ Content
- _____ Good

[Depressed]
- _____ Low
- _____ Depressed
- _____ Sad
- _____ Helpless
- _____ Anxious
- _____ Frustrated

[Discomfort]
- _____ Fearful
- _____ Uneasy
- _____ Embarrassed
- _____ Bothered
- _____ Tense
- _____ Threatened
- _____ Uncomfortable
Local Man Caught in Forest Fire

Mark Johnson was hospitalized after being caught in an out of control forest fire. Because it had been a particularly dry summer, the park and wildlife officials decided to start a controlled burn in order to avoid having an out of control forest fire in the future. Nearby residents were notified several days in advance about the controlled burn and were warned that they may need to evacuate if the situation were to get out of hand. Johnson had been camping in the woods near his home at the time, and did not receive the notification.

One day into the controlled burn, the winds in the area picked up and caused the fire to spread uncontrollably. Residents were told to evacuate as soon as possible. Johnson was not aware that an evacuation had been ordered and was caught in the fire as he tried to run to safety. He sustained severe burns and is currently in critical condition.

Since the incident, park and wildlife officials have put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. All are advised to stay away from the burn site until further notice.
APPENDIX X: Memory Checks and Response Items for Second Article in Study 2
[This article is a filler and, therefore, participants’ responses will not be analyzed]

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

Which of the following appeared at the end of the article?

☐ “Following the incident, park and wildlife officials have chosen to end the controlled burn until further notice. They have stated that they plan to continue the burn at a later date, but not until they ensure all residents have been informed.”

☐ “After the incident occurred, park and wildlife officials opted not to put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. However, all are still advised to stay away from the burn site.”

☐ “Since the incident, park and wildlife officials have put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. All are advised to stay away from the burn site until further notice.”

_The next few questions are about your reactions to this news story. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions._

_Please answer the next three items using the scale below._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Johnson deserved to be caught in the fire.
_____ Johnson deserved to be hurt.
_____ Johnson did not deserve to be trapped in the fire.

_The next questions are about your willingness to support Johnson in a couple different ways._

_Please answer the next two items using the scale below._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Willing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Completely Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ It is not uncommon for cases like Johnson’s to become the subject of negligence lawsuits against park and wildlife officials. If Johnson’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover the legal fees?
Cases like Johnson’s often catch the attention of various fire safety organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the use of the controlled burn that injured Johnson?
APPENDIX Y: Torture Scenario in Study 2

NEWS BRIEF: Interrogation in the Middle East

About a year ago, Yasir Sahad was arrested because he was believed to have information about terrorist activities. He was captured while harvesting wheat close to an insurgent encampment.

Officials later found that, as a teenager, Sahad had been an active member of the insurgency until 2008. While he was a member of the insurgency he was involved in an attack as a sniper, during which time he shot and killed four elementary school children to create a distraction and allow the other insurgents to get into position. He cut off contact with this group several years before his recent arrest.

Sahad was interrogated based on the assumption that he had overheard some useful information. He was subjected to an “enhanced” interrogation, which involved torture. As a result, he lost a couple of toes.

November 2, 2015 | 6:47 p.m. EDT
APPENDIX Z: Memory Checks and Response Items for Third Article in Study 2

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

Which of the following appeared at the end of the article?

☐ “Sahad claims that he was subjected to an “enhanced” interrogation, but there is no evidence to support his claim.”

☐ “He was subjected to an “enhanced” interrogation, which involved torture. As a result, he lost a couple of toes.”

☐ “Those involved in Sahad’s interrogation have denied that torture was used, and have otherwise refused to comment.”

The next few questions are about your reactions to this news story. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions.

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree  Neutral  Strongly Agree

_____ The methods used in Sahad’s interrogation were appropriate
_____ The way Sahad was treated during the interrogation was justified
_____ The use of torture in the interrogation of Sahad was acceptable.

Please answer the next items using the scale below.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at All Willing  Neutral  Completely Willing

_____ It is not uncommon for interrogations like Sahad’s to become the subject of lawsuits claiming that those who were interrogated were treated inhumanely. If Sahad’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover his legal fees?

_____ Cases like Sahad’s often catch the attention of various anti-violence organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the treatment Sahad received during his interrogation?
The International Research Network (IRN), with whom we have partnered for the current study, is looking for feedback on where to make donations in the upcoming year. We agreed to ask participants in the current study to provide some feedback on what proportion of donation funds to allot to various non-profit organizations. The results of this feedback will be presented at an annual meeting this summer, where the IRN leaders will be finalizing the budget for next year.

Each year, the IRN donates some of its funds to a few non-profit organizations. Please indicate how you think these donations should be divided across the following organizations.

- **Forest Fires Response (Red Cross)**
  
  Part of the Disaster and Crisis Management branch of the Red Cross, this organization helps to ensure that the victims of forest fires have access to food, shelter, and medical attention. This organization “aims to respond to disasters as rapidly and effectively as possible, by mobilizing its resources (people, money and other assets) and using its network in a coordinated manner so that the initial effects are countered and the needs of the affected communities are met.”

- **Centre for Victims of Torture (CVT)**
  
  This organization “aids survivors in overcoming the lasting effects of torture and war. In partnership with the community, the Centre supports survivors in the process of successful integration into society, works for their protection and integrity, and raises awareness of the continuing effects of torture and war on survivors and their families. The CVT gives hope after the horror.”

- **International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW)**
  
  “Founded in 1969, the International Fund for Animal Welfare saves individual animals, animal populations and habitats all over the world. With projects in more than 40 countries, IFAW provides hands-on assistance to animals in need, whether it’s dogs and cats, wildlife and livestock, or rescuing animals in the wake of disasters. We also advocate saving populations from cruelty and depletion, such as our campaign to end commercial whaling and seal hunts.”

- **The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**
  
  “Since 1966 UNDP partners with people at all levels of society to help build nations that can withstand crisis, and drive and sustain the kind of growth that improves the quality of life for everyone. On the ground in more than 170 countries and territories, we offer global perspective and local insight to help empower lives and build resilient nations.”

---

- **Total**
APPENDIX BB: Pre-Debriefing Questions in Study 2

We would like you to answer a few more questions. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I am proud to be a Canadian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being a Canadian is an important part of my identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel very close to other Canadians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to me personally that no one ever be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Canadians agree that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to most Canadians that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like you to answer one last set of questions. Think back to the story of the politician, Nathan Costello. What did you think of this person?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like or dislike this person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How positive or negative is your impression of this person?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think this person is a good or bad symbol of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada as a country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How competent or incompetent do you think this person is?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How honest or dishonest do you think this person is?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How favourable or unfavourable is your view of this person?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very favourable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unfavourable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How similar is Nathan Costello to other Canadians?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much does Nathan Costello have in common with other Canadians?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX CC: Verbal Protocol for Debriefing in Study 2

I want to explain the work we’re doing in a little more detail before you go today. Do you have anything you would like to ask before I start? *Record questions on the debriefing notes sheet*

I have a couple of questions for you that will help us assess if the procedures need to be changed in future studies. During any of the research you participated in today, was there anything unclear about the instructions or any of the procedures? Did anything seem odd or strange about the instructions or any other part of the research? Can you explain in your own words what you think this study is about? *Make notes on answers; tell them they are on the right track if they answer the last question*

Now I’m going to tell you about the purpose of the research in more detail.

As you know, we are interested in people’s reactions to news stories. More specifically, we are interested in how people respond to news stories about human rights violations after reading about an ingroup member’s relevant behaviour. One of the news stories that you read described a Canadian official who was either hypocritical, not hypocritical, or did something unrelated to human rights. Additionally, you read another news story that described a violation of the right to protection against torture (that is, the right to humane treatment). We expected that those who read about the hypocritical official would tolerate this violation less than those in the other two conditions, due to the threat to Canada’s reputation as being strongly against torture. We also expected that those who read about the hypocritical official would be more willing to help the victim described in the scenario, compared to those in the other two conditions. Finally, at the end of the survey, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We predicted that those who read about the hypocritical official would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those in the other two conditions. The general purpose of this study was to examine a possible method for preventing/discouraging the toleration of human rights violations. Finding practical methods for reducing and discouraging toleration is an important first step in ending human rights abuses. Though these methods do not directly confront those committing violations, refusing to tolerate such violations is crucial in preventing such abuses from continuing.

I need to tell you that all of the scenarios were fictional, although some of the events they depicted were taken from actual news stories. It is important to note that the MP in the first scenario is fictional. Additionally, you were told that we partnered with an organization, the International Research Network, for the current study. This organization was made up for this study and does not actually exist. We want people to believe the stories are actual events and that the International Research Network is an actual organization so that their responses are more realistic.
Remember that there are no right or wrong ways to respond to anything in the study you took part in today. Everyone has their own beliefs about things, and those beliefs should be respected. Additionally, your name will be in no way associated with any of your data in this study—all of your responses are anonymous, like it said in the consent form. Moreover, it is important to note that individual responses are, on their own, uninterpretable. Individual responses in this study are only meaningful in relation to the greater distribution of responses from all participants.

Do you have any questions about anything I have told you so far?

Now I want to explain why we didn’t tell you everything about the purpose and the procedure of the research until the study was over. If people know everything about the research before they come in here, they may respond according to what they think we are looking for—either unconsciously or just to be helpful and cooperative. Then we wouldn’t know if the responses we are getting are people’s true and honest reactions or not. We would prefer not to hide anything about the research, but we also have to make sure that we are getting spontaneous and realistic responses from people. Does that make sense to you?

You’ve been very helpful. Thank you for all of your suggestions and for your honesty. I have to ask a favour of you before we wrap things up. It’s very important that you don’t discuss this study or anything I told you with anyone else. If people know what is expected of them before they come in here, their reactions in the study may be influenced in some way, and the data that we are collecting would be useless. I can’t emphasize enough how important it is that people come into the study not knowing exactly what we are trying to do. With that in mind, it would be very helpful to me if you can let me know what, if anything, you heard about this study before you came here today. I don’t care where or from whom you heard anything, just what you may have heard. Take notes. If anyone asks you about the study, you can just tell them what is in the SONA advertisement -- that they have to fill out questionnaires on a computer.

Okay, the last thing I’m going to give you is a written explanation of the study, as I’ve already explained it to you. Also on the handout is contact information for the Research Ethics Officer at Brock, if you have any questions about your rights as a study participant. Cari Drolet is conducting this study for her PhD thesis and Dr. Hafer in the Department of Psychology is supervising this research. If you have any questions about the research we are doing that you think of later, you can contact Dr. Hafer or Cari Drolet using the information on this handout. The results of this research will be available approximately one year from now. You can contact Cari Drolet or Dr. Hafer if you are interested in the results. Do you have any more questions? I hope you found this study interesting. Thank you for your cooperation!
APPENDIX DD: Debriefing in Study 2

**Project Title**: Study on Interaction with News Media

**Principal Investigator**: Dr. Carolyn Hafer, Professor of Social Psychology
Department of Psychology
Brock University
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 4297;
chafer@brocku.ca

**Student Principal Investigator**: Cari Drolet, PhD candidate
Department of Psychology
Brock University
cd11da@brocku.ca

**Research Feedback**

Dear Participant,

Thank you very much for participating in this study.

This research session involved answering some questions about your personal opinions, then reading and responding to scenarios that depicted stories like those you would see in the news. Amongst the opinion questions were two items assessing your support for the right to humane treatment. There were also several questions that assessed your perception of other Canadians’ attitudes on the right to humane treatment. Following the attitude questions, you read and responded to three scenarios. One of the scenarios you read described the activities of a fictional Ontario MP. You either read that he allowed the use of torture in interrogations, opposed the use of torture, or attended a baseball game. We expected that those who read about the MP allowing the use of torture, despite having said that he was against it, would be motivated to protect the group’s reputation (i.e., Canada’s reputation of being against the use of torture). Another scenario you read also dealt with human rights. Specifically, the scenario involved a violation of the right to humane treatment. We expected that those who read about the MP who allowed the use of torture would tolerate the use of torture less than those who read the other versions of the scenario.

At the end of the study, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We expected that those who read about the MP who allowed the use of torture would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those who did not feel they behaved inconsistently. If you are interested in getting more information on any of the organizations mentioned in the donation task, we have provided information for those organizations at the end of this form.

If you feel upset by the situation described in this study, please go to Brock University’s counselling services for help (Schmon Tower - ST400) or go to their website to find out how to schedule an appointment (http://www.brocku.ca/personal-counselling). You can also consult your physician for a referral.
Now that we have more fully explained this research to you, we must ask you to please avoid telling anyone else about the details of this study and its purpose. Doing so may alter the results because people might respond differently if they know what we are looking for. This is why we did not tell you everything about this research until after you had completed this study.

If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca. If you have any other questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the investigators. Results will be available after December, 2016. If you wish to learn about the results of our research at that time, contact one of the investigators. We will only provide group averages and overall results, not personal information, because all data will remain anonymous and confidential.

Thank you again for your participation!

For more information on the organizations mentioned at the end of the study, see the following websites.

- Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture website: [ccvt.org](http://ccvt.org)

For more information on human rights, see the following Human Rights Organizations.

- *Global Rights*—works on building grass roots movements to promote and protect the rights of marginalized populations, as well as documenting human rights abuses website: [http://www.globalrights.org](http://www.globalrights.org)
- *UN Watch*—monitors the performance of the UN according to its own charter website: [http://www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org)
APPENDIX EE: Study 2 Additional Analyses in Study 2

**Additional analyses.** In addition to my three hypotheses, I examined other potential methods for dissonance reduction: distancing one’s self from the ingroup identity, changing one’s attitude toward humane treatment, changing one’s perception of what most Canadians think about the right to humane treatment, and distancing one’s self from the hypocritical ingroup member by perceiving him as not prototypical or evaluating him negatively.

**Canadian identity.** Participants in the inconsistent condition could have distanced themselves from the Canadian ingroup in order to resolve the dissonance they experienced. To test whether this was the case, I conducted a 2 (pre- vs. post-manipulation Canadian identity) by 3 (condition) mixed-model ANOVA using Canadian identity as the within-subject dependent variable. Participants identified less with being Canadian before \((M = 5.80, SD = 1.38)\) compared to after \((M = 6.04, SD = 0.90)\) reading about the MP, \(F(1, 222) = 9.09, p = .003, \eta^2_p = .04\). There was a significant effect of condition on overall Canadian identity, \(F(2, 222) = 3.51, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .03\), such that participants in the consistent condition identified more with being Canadian than

---

* RWA was only weakly correlated with abstract support for the right to humane treatment \((r = .15[pre], - .16[post])\) and did not moderate the effects of condition, time, or the condition by time interaction on any of the outcome variables in this Appendix.

* The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for pre-manipulation Canadian identity. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, results for the analysis without bootstrapping are reported in this section.
participants in the control condition \( (M_{\text{difference}} = 0.42, p = .03) \). All other comparisons failed to reach significance \( (ps > .14) \). Finally, condition and time did not interact to affect Canadian identity, \( F(2, 222) = 1.48, p = .23, \eta^2 = .01 \).

Because I was interested in the relative change in Canadian identity between the three conditions, I also ran a one-way ANOVA using the differences scores for Canadian identity (post-manipulation – pre-manipulation) as the dependent variable. Higher scores indicated a greater increase in Canadian identity. There was no significant effect of condition on change in Canadian identity, \( F(2, 222) = 1.48, p = .23, \eta^2 = .01 \).

**Support for humane treatment.** Participants in the inconsistent condition could have changed their own attitude regarding the right to humane treatment in order to resolve the dissonance they experienced. To test whether this was the case, I conducted a 2 (pre- vs. post-manipulation support for humane treatment) by 3 (condition) mixed-model ANOVA using support for humane treatment as the within-subject dependent variable. Participants were less supportive of the right to humane treatment before \( (M = 4.20, SD = 0.60) \) compared to after \( (M = 5.46, SD = 1.63) \) reading about the MP, \( F(1, 228) = 157.89, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41 \). There was a marginal effect of condition on overall support for humane treatment, \( F(2, 228) = 2.52, p = .08, \eta^2 = .02 \), such that participants in the inconsistent condition were marginally more supportive of the right to humane treatment than participants in the consistent condition \( (M_{\text{difference}} = 0.33, p = .09) \). All other comparisons failed to reach significance \( (ps > .21) \). Finally, there was a significant
effect of the interaction between condition and time on support for humane treatment,

\[ F(2, 228) = 4.03, \ p = .02, \ \eta_p^2 = .03 \] (see Figure 15). Simple effects analysis for the effect of time at each level of condition indicated that participants significantly increased their support from before to after reading about the MP in the inconsistent \((M_{\text{difference}} = -1.66, \ p < .001)\), consistent \((M_{\text{difference}} = -1.07, \ p < .001)\), and control conditions \((M_{\text{difference}} = -1.05, \ p < .001)\). For another perspective, I examined the simple effects for the effect of condition on support for humane treatment before and after participants read about the MP. Participants did not significantly differ in their support for humane treatment before reading about the MP (all \(p \)s > .39). After reading about the MP, participants in the inconsistent condition reported significantly more support for the right to humane treatment than participants in the consistent \((M_{\text{difference}} = 0.62, \ p = .02)\) and control conditions \((M_{\text{difference}} = 0.56, \ p = .03)\).
Between the three conditions, I also ran a one-way ANOVA using the differences scores for support for humane treatment (post-manipulation minus pre-manipulation) as the dependent variable. Higher scores indicated a greater increase in support for humane treatment. There was a significant effect of condition on change in support for humane treatment, $F(2, 228) = 4.03, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .03$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition showed a greater increase in support for humane treatment compared to those in the consistent ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.59, p = .046$) and the control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.61, p = .03$). Change in support for humane treatment did not differ between the consistent and control conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.02, p = .99$).
To test whether or not this effect was due to dissonance, I tested whether discomfort mediated the effect of condition on change in support for humane treatment.

As I noted in the affect analyses section, there was an effect of condition on discomfort. First, I tested whether discomfort predicted change in support for humane treatment.

Discomfort marginally predicted change in support for humane treatment, $b = 0.13, \beta = 0.12, t(229) = 1.75, p = .08, sr^2 = .01$, 95% CI of $b [-0.02, 0.27]$, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the more their support for humane treatment increased from the beginning to the end of the session. I then regressed change in support for humane treatment onto discomfort and the two dummy codes for condition (the inconsistent condition was used as the comparison group). Discomfort did not continue to predict change in support for humane treatment after accounting for the effect of condition, $b = 0.07, \beta = 0.06, t(227) = 0.92, p = .36, sr^2 = .004$, 95% CI of $b [-0.08, 0.22]$. Participants in the inconsistent condition increased their support for humane treatment more than those in the control, $b = -0.55, \beta = -0.17, t(227) = -2.16, p = .03, sr^2$

---

*I also checked that the $a$-path for the effect of condition on discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -0.94, \beta = -0.31, t(228) = -4.28, p < .001, sr^2 = .07$, 95% CI of $b [-1.38, -0.51]$, and control conditions, $b = -0.95, \beta = -0.32, t(228) = -4.39, p < .001, sr^2 = .08$, 95% CI of $b [-1.38, -0.52]$. 

Canadian support for humane treatment. Participants in the inconsistent condition could have reduced their perception of the ingroup’s support for humane treatment in order to resolve the dissonance they experienced. To test whether this was the case, I conducted a 2 (pre- vs. post-manipulation Canadian support for humane treatment) by 3 (condition) mixed-model ANOVA using Canadian support for humane treatment as the within-subject dependent variable. Participants perceived higher Canadian support for humane treatment before \((M = 5.51, SD = 1.29)\) compared to after \((M = 5.30, SD = 1.22)\) reading about the MP, \(F(1, 225) = 8.14, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .04\). However, Canadian support for humane treatment was not significantly affected by condition, \(F(2, 225) = 2.20, p = .11, \eta^2_p = .02\), or the interaction between time and condition, \(F(2, 225) = 1.26, p = .29, \eta^2_p = .01\).

Because I was interested in the relative change in Canadian support for humane treatment between the three conditions, I also ran a one-way ANOVA using the difference scores for Canadian support for humane treatment (post-manipulation minus

---

\(^a\) I also checked that the initial \(c\)-path for the effect of condition on change in support for humane treatment was significant in the regression analysis. Before entering discomfort as a predictor, the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions significantly predicted change in support for humane treatment, \(b = -0.59, \beta = -0.18, t(228) = -2.39, p = .02, sr^2 = .02\), 95% CI of \(b [-1.08, -0.10]\), as did the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions, \(b = -0.61, \beta = -0.19, t(228) = -2.52, p = .01, sr^2 = .03\), 95% CI of \(b [-1.09, -0.13]\).
pre-manipulation) as the dependent variable. Higher scores indicated a greater increase in reported Canadian support for humane treatment. There was no significant effect of condition on change in Canadian support for humane treatment, $F(2, 225) = 1.26, p = .29$, $\eta^2_p = .01$.

**Protoypicality of the candidate.** Participants in the inconsistent condition could have distanced themselves from the hypocritical ingroup member by seeing him as less prototypical, in order to resolve the dissonance they experienced. To test whether this was the case, I conducted a one-way ANOVA with condition as the independent variable and candidate prototypicality as the dependent variable.\(^*\) There was a significant effect of condition on perceptions of prototypicality, $F(2, 228) = 14.80, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .12$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition saw the candidate as less prototypical of Canadians than participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.93, p < .001$) and control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -0.51, p = .01$). Additionally, participants in the consistent condition saw the candidate as more prototypical than participants in the control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.42, p = .04$).

The results in the previous paragraph suggest that participants could have used the prototypicality ratings to reduce dissonance in the inconsistent condition. Therefore, I

\(^*\) The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for this analysis. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, results for the analysis without bootstrapping are reported in this section.
tested whether discomfort mediated the effect of condition on prototypicality. As I noted in the affect analyses section, there was an effect of condition on discomfort. First, I regressed prototypicality onto discomfort. Discomfort significantly predicted prototypicality ratings, $b = -0.16$, $\beta = -0.20$, $t(229) = -3.05$, $p = .003$, $sr^2 = .04$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.26, -0.06], such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the less they saw the candidate as prototypical of other Canadians. However, the effect of discomfort was only marginally significant after entering the dummy codes for condition, $b = -0.09$, $\beta = -0.11$, $t(227) = -1.74$, $p = .08$, $sr^2 = .01$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.19, 0.01]. Moreover, both the comparison for the inconsistent versus consistent, $b = -0.43$, $\beta = -0.18$, $t(227) = -2.45$, $p = .02$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b$ [-0.77, -0.08], and inconsistent versus control conditions, $b = 0.42$, $\beta = 0.18$, $t(227) = 2.46$, $p = .02$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.08, 0.75], continued to significantly predict prototypicality ratings after accounting for the effect of discomfort.

*I also checked that the $a$-path for the effect of condition on discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -0.94$, $\beta = -0.31$, $t(228) = -4.28$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .07$, 95% CI of $b$ [-1.38, -0.51], and control conditions, $b = -0.95$, $\beta = -0.32$, $t(228) = -4.39$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .08$, 95% CI of $b$ [-1.38, -0.52].

*I also checked that the initial $c$-path for the effect of condition on prototypicality ratings was significant in the regression analysis. Before entering discomfort as a predictor, the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions significantly predicted prototypicality ratings, $b = 0.93$, $\beta = 0.39$, $t(228) = 5.43$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .11$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.59, 1.27], as did the dummy code for the comparison between the inconsistent and control conditions, $b = 0.51$, $\beta = 0.22$, $t(228) = 3.04$, $p = .003$, $sr^2 = .04$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.18, 0.84].
Thus, although the manipulation affected prototypicality ratings as expected, this effect does not appear to be due to the dissonance aroused in the inconsistent condition.

**Evaluation of the candidate.** Participants in the inconsistent condition could have distanced themselves from the hypocritical ingroup member by evaluating him negatively, in order to resolve the dissonance they experienced. To test whether this was the case, I conducted a one-way ANOVA with condition as the independent variable and candidate evaluation as the dependent variable. There was a significant effect of condition on candidate evaluation, $F(2,228) = 56.10, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .33$. Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis indicated that participants in the inconsistent condition evaluated the candidate less positively than participants in the consistent condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -1.36, p = < .001$) and control condition ($M_{\text{difference}} = -1.18, p < .001$). Additionally, participants in the consistent and control conditions did not significantly differ in their evaluation of the candidate ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.18, p = .40$).

The results in the previous paragraph suggest that participants could have used the evaluations to reduce dissonance in the inconsistent condition. Therefore, I tested whether discomfort mediated the effect of condition on positive evaluation of the candidate. As I noted in the affect analyses section, there was an effect of condition on

---

Footnote: The Levene’s test for equality of error variances was significant for this analysis. To compensate for the lack of homogeneity, the analysis was run again using 1,000 bootstrapped samples, which were stratified by condition. The comparisons using bootstrapping did not substantially differ from the non-bootstrapped analysis. Thus, results for the analysis without bootstrapping are reported in this section.
discomfort. In the first step of a regression, I regressed evaluation onto discomfort. Discomfort significantly predicted positive evaluation of the candidate, $b = -0.22$, $\beta = -0.30$, $t(229) = -4.73$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .09$, 95% CI of $b [-0.31, -0.13]$, such that the more discomfort participants experienced, the less positively they rated the candidate. In the second step, the effect of discomfort continued to significantly predict positive evaluation of the candidate after entering the dummy codes for condition, $b = -0.10$, $\beta = -0.13$, $t(227) = -2.33$, $p = .02$, $sr^2 = .02$, 95% CI of $b [-0.18, -0.02]$. Moreover, both the comparison for the inconsistent versus consistent, $b = 1.27$, $\beta = 0.56$, $t(227) = 8.76$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .22$, 95% CI of $b [0.98, 1.55]$, and inconsistent versus control conditions, $b = 1.09$, $\beta = 0.49$, $t(227) = 7.62$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .17$, 95% CI of $b [0.81, 1.37]$, continued to significantly predict positive evaluation of the candidate after accounting for the effect of discomfort.

I used PROCESS (Hayes, 2016) to test for the indirect effect of condition through discomfort on positive evaluation of the candidate using 1,000 bootstrapped samples.

---

* I also checked that the $a$-path for the effect of condition on discomfort was significant for both dummy coded comparisons for condition (using the inconsistent condition as the comparison group). Participants in the inconsistent condition experienced more discomfort than participants in the consistent, $b = -0.94$, $\beta = -0.31$, $t(228) = -4.28$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .07$, 95% CI of $b [-1.38, -0.51]$, and control conditions, $b = -0.95$, $\beta = -0.32$, $t(228) = -4.39$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .08$, 95% CI of $b [-1.38, -0.52]$.  
* I also checked that the initial $c$-path for the effect of condition on positive evaluation of the candidate was significant in the regression analysis. Before entering discomfort as a predictor, participants in the inconsistent condition evaluated the candidate more negatively than participants in the consistent, $b = 1.36$, $\beta = 0.60$, $t(228) = 9.68$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .28$, 95% CI of $b [1.08, 1.64]$, and control conditions, $b = 1.18$, $\beta = 0.53$, $t(228) = 8.53$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .21$, 95% CI of $b [0.91, 1.45]$. 
There was an indirect effect through discomfort for the comparison between the inconsistent and consistent conditions, $b = 0.09$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.02, 0.20], and the inconsistent and control conditions, $b = 0.09$, 95% CI of $b$ [0.02, 0.20], on positive evaluation of the candidate. These results are consistent with partial mediation.
APPENDIX FF: Informed Consent in Study 3

Date: January 2017
Project Title: Study on Interaction with News Media

Principal Investigator: Dr. Carolyn Hafer, Professor
Department of Psychology
Brock University
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 4297; chafer@brocku.ca

Student Principal Investigator: Cari Drolet, PhD student
Department of Psychology
Brock University
cd11da@brocku.ca

INVITATION
You are invited to participate in a study that involves research. The purpose of this study is to investigate people’s opinions on a variety of general topics and their reactions to specific news stories.

WHAT’S INVOLVED
You will be asked to rate several statements related to your opinions of people, yourself, the world in general, and various social issues. Additionally, you will be asked to read a few news stories and then respond to several questions about what you read. Questionnaires will be completed on the computer using Qualtrics, a data collection program. Participation will take approximately 60 minutes of your time.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS
Possible benefits of participation include a first-hand experience of what social science research involves for the participants. The researchers will also benefit from a more complete understanding of how people look at and react to certain social issues. There also may be risks associated with participation, as you might be uncomfortable with the situations presented in the news stories. Please note that such emotional discomfort is expected to be no more than you might experience by reading about negative events in a newspaper or watching news about negative events on television. Additionally, remember that there are no right or wrong ways to respond to anything in the study. Everyone has their own beliefs about things, and those beliefs should be respected. Moreover, it is important to note that individual responses are, on their own, uninterpretable. Individual responses in this study are only meaningful in relation to the greater distribution of responses from all participants.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All information you provide is considered confidential; your name will not be included with your responses or in any other way associated with the data collected in the study. Furthermore, because our interest is in the average responses of the entire group of participants, you will not be identified individually in any way in written reports of this research. Data collected during this study will be stored indefinitely on a computer in the social psychology laboratory at Brock University to allow Dr. Carolyn Hafer, her colleagues, and her research students to reanalyze the data to gain further understanding of the variables, or if further clarification is necessary after publication. Access to these data will be restricted to Dr. Carolyn Hafer, her colleagues, and her research students at Brock University. Additionally, the portion of this consent form that is kept by the researcher will be stored separately from the data.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. Your data will be deleted and not analyzed if you withdraw from the study before your participation is over. To withdraw from the study, simply alert the researcher that you do not wish to continue.
Please note that once the questionnaires are completed they are anonymous and therefore impossible to remove from the data should you wish to withdraw after completing your participation.

**PUBLICATION OF RESULTS**
Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available after December 2017. Participants who wish to receive information about the findings of this study at that time can e-mail chafer@brocku.ca or cd11da@brocku.ca.

**CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE**
If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact Dr. Carolyn Hafer or Caroline Drolet using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University [15-129-HAFER]. If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your assistance in this project. Please keep a copy of this form for your records.

**CONSENT**
I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit
☐ $10

I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Informed Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[The researcher will keep this portion and participants will keep the rest of the form.]

**CONSENT**
I agree to participate in this study described above for one of the following (please check one option below)

☐ 60 minutes of research credit
☐ $10

I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Informed Consent Letter. I have the opportunity to receive additional details and ask further questions by contacting the researchers or the Brock University Research Ethics Office. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time by simply exiting the questionnaire before I am finished. Sign below if you agree to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX GG: Demographic Information in Study 3

What is your political orientation?

1    2    3    4    5    6    7
Very Liberal                             Very Conservative

What is your nationality (choose one)?  ☐ Canadian  ☐ Other:

________________

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I am proud to be a Canadian.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7
Strongly Disagree                       Neutral                       Strongly Agree

Being a Canadian is an important part of my identity.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7
Strongly Disagree                       Neutral                       Strongly Agree

I feel very close to other Canadians.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7
Strongly Disagree                       Neutral                       Strongly Agree

Are you a Canadian citizen? __________

Were you born in Canada? __________

Do you have dual citizenship? __________

What is your sex? __________

What is your age? __________

What is your ethnicity? ____________________________
APPENDIX HH: Short Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale and Human Rights Items in Study 3

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by selecting a number on the scale that is provided. Please remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

Please answer the next few items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.
_____ Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
_____ There are many radical, immoral people in our country today who are trying to ruin it for their godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
_____ No one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.**
_____ Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
_____ The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path.
_____ Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.
_____ People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
_____ The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
_____ It is important to me personally that no one ever be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.**
_____ There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
_____ What our country really needs, instead of more “civil rights” is a good, stiff dose of law and order.
_____ Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the “normal way” things are supposed to be done.
_____ The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show that we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and trouble-makers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

** indicates a human rights related item.
APPENDIX II: Questions about News Habits and News Topics, Including Canada’s Position on Torture in Study 3

How often do you read/watch/listen to the news?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once or twice per year</td>
<td>Once every few months</td>
<td>Once every few weeks</td>
<td>Once every few days</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Once Daily</td>
<td>Multiple times per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you prefer to get the news from each of the following media:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Use at All</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Greatly Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Other: _____________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you enjoy the following types of news stories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Local News</td>
<td>Canadian Politics</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Other: _____________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following statements relate to several important issues that have been in the news recently. Use the scale below to indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Canadians agree that controlled burns* can be used to prevent out of control forest fires, thereby protecting both citizens and the environment.</td>
<td>It is important to most Canadians that controlled burns be used to prevent out of control forest fires, thereby protecting both citizens and the environment.</td>
<td>Most Canadians agree that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.</td>
<td>It is important to most Canadians that no one should ever be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment for any reason.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Controlled burning is any fire intentionally ignited to meet specific land management objectives, such as to reduce flammable fuels, restore ecosystem health, recycle nutrients, or prepare an area for new trees or vegetation.

- USDA Forest Service
APPENDIX JJ: Scenarios and Instructions in Study 3

[Instructions]

We are interested in how people respond to different kinds of current events. We have taken screen-shots of actual news stories. You will read 3 of these.

Please read each news story carefully and completely as you will be asked to answer some questions about what happened, as well as about specific details from the article (e.g., the publisher, specific lines from the stories). Additionally, you will not be able to return to the scenarios after hitting the next button.
Canada’s Embarrassing Record Regarding Torture

By Davie Smith, New York, NY
Dec. 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

Since ratifying the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1987, Canada has openly opposed and condemned the use of torture for the purpose of extracting information. In a public announcement made at a UN peace conference earlier this year, Nathan Costello, an MP from Ontario who sat on the National Security and Defence (SECD) committee, said that SECD had been clear about Canada’s position on rejecting information extracted through coercion.

“We’re signatory to the UN Convention Against Torture and there is an absolute prohibition against torture, period,” Costello said. “As a practical matter, we get intelligence from all kinds of sources, a myriad of sources. An important part of the process is to try and identify how credible that is. If there’s any indication, any evidence that torture may have been used, that information is discounted.”

“Torture is also prohibited under the Criminal Code of Canada,” he said. “Also, if we rely on information that has been obtained by torture then we are breaching our obligations under the Convention Against Torture.”

“The bottom line is that as long as torturers continue to find a market for the fruit of their crimes, torture will continue,” he said. “Firmly rebuffing torturers when they offer up information extracted through pain and suffering is a critical plank in the wider campaign to eradicate torture once and for all.” He went on to say that Canadian law enforcement and security agencies should focus on getting rid of information that bears the taint of torture, not on carving out exceptions for when it can be used.

However, last week at a hearing before a Commons committee, Costello admitted that he and his colleagues had been quietly violating the Canadian government’s policy on using intelligence derived from torture or mistreatment. He admitted that, under his orders, organizations under the direction of the SECD had been accepting information that they knew had been obtained through the use of torture. He also admitted to turning over Canadian prisoners to the Afghan authorities, such as the National Directorate of Security or Afghan police, despite that many experts warned him that the prisoners were being tortured. Costello has refused to comment to USA News on this matter.

Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers are an embarrassing stain on Canada’s previously impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.
Canada’s Praiseworthy Record Regarding Torture

By Davie Smith, New York, NY
Dec. 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

Since ratifying the United Nations Convention against Torture in 1987, Canada has openly opposed and condemned the use of torture for the purpose of extracting information. In a public announcement made at a UN peace conference earlier this year, Nathan Costello, an MP from Ontario who sat on the National Security and Defence (SECD) committee, said that SECD had been clear about Canada’s position on rejecting information extracted through coercion.

“We’re signatory to the UN Convention Against Torture and there is an absolute prohibition against torture, period,” Costello said. “As a practical matter, we get intelligence from all kinds of sources, a myriad of sources. An important part of the process is to try and identify how credible that is. If there’s any indication, any evidence that torture may have been used, that information is discounted.”

“Torture is also prohibited under the Criminal Code of Canada,” he said. “Also, if we rely on information that has been obtained by torture then we are breaching our obligations under the Convention Against Torture.”

“The bottom line is that as long as torturers continue to find a market for the fruit of their crimes, torture will continue,” he said. “Firmly rebuffing torturers when they offer up information extracted through pain and suffering is a critical plank in the wider campaign to eradicate torture once and for all.” He went on to say that Canadian law enforcement and security agencies should focus on getting rid of information that bears the taint of torture, not on carving out exceptions for when it can be used.

Last week at a hearing before a Commons committee, Costello explained the additional measures that are being taken by SECD to ensure that any information that is used by the organizations under its direction has not been obtained through the use of torture. Additionally, Costello told the committee that Canadian funding would be recalled from facilities found to be accepting information obtained through the use of torture. He has also refused to allow Canadian prisoners to be turned over to the Afghan authorities because he was warned that the National Directorate of Security or Afghan police was torturing them. A spokesperson told USA News that Costello was currently not available for comment.

Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers adds to Canada’s impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.
MP Offers Advice On Autobiographies

By Davie Smith, New York, NY
Dec. 2, 2015 | 5:14 a.m. EDT

It is not uncommon for political figures to release autobiographies and memoirs at different points during their careers. Last year, Nathan Costello, a Canadian MP, revealed that he was beginning work on his own autobiography. “The nice thing about an autobiography is that it provides a glimpse into your life and how you think about things that you just can’t get from videos or pictures,” he said, reflecting on the significance of autobiographies. “Especially for public figures, these works give people a unique opportunity to really get to know you.”

He’s now working on his second draft of the book, and he agreed to offer some tips to any readers who are interested in writing their own autobiographies or memoirs. He told us that, “an important first step is to write out your life timeline.” Creating a timeline of your life is a good way to make sure you include all the most important dates and events, and it gives you a structure to build upon. You can consider this the “brainstorming” phase, so don’t hesitate to write down everything you can remember, even if you don’t think the memory will make it into the final version of the book. Also, keep in mind that your autobiography doesn’t have to start with your birth. “My autobiography starts when I was just getting out of school, because that’s really when I started to get interested in being involved in politics.”

Costello told us that the next step is to identify the main characters that you will focus on in your book. “Every good story has interesting characters, friends and foes who help move the plot along, and an autobiography is no different. People have to be able to connect with the people you write about, otherwise they’ll stop reading.” Think about those who have affected your life and should play a role in your autobiography.

Next, pull out the best stories. Costello laughed as he told us, “no one wants to hear about how you took out the trash once a week or did the dishes everyday. Write about the parts of your life that really show people the parts of you that you’re trying to communicate, not the daily grind.” Begin drafting your manuscript by writing out the main stories that will be woven together to create a picture of your life.

Finally, he told us that anyone writing an autobiography needs to be ready to write and re-write, likely several times! “Your first draft won’t be your last, and neither will your second draft.” Costello’s book, for example, is scheduled for release in 2017, two years after completion of his first draft.
APPENDIX KK: Manipulation/Memory Checks for First Article in Study 3

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

What country was the news agency from? ______________________________

Which of the following sentences appeared at the end of the article?

☐ “Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers adds to Canada’s impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.”

☐ “Costello’s book, for example, is scheduled for released in 2017, two years after completion of his first draft.”

☐ “Costello’s actions regarding torture-derived information and the Afghanistan torture centers are an embarrassing stain on Canada’s previously impeccable record of opposing the use of torture.”

How does this story reflect on Canada?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very Negatively Neutral Very Positively

How does this story make Canada look?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very Bad Neutral Very Good
APPENDIX LL: Affect Measures in Study 3

Please rate the extent to which these terms describe your current state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply at All</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Applies Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discomfort**

- [ ] Fearful
- [ ] Uneasy
- [ ] Embarrassed
- [ ] Bothered
- [ ] Tense
- [ ] Threatened
- [ ] Uncomfortable

**[Vicarious Affect Measure]**

If I were in the MP’s (Nathan Costello’s) position, I would feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply at All</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Applies Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discomfort**

- [ ] Fearful
- [ ] Uneasy
- [ ] Embarrassed
- [ ] Bothered
- [ ] Tense
- [ ] Threatened
- [ ] Uncomfortable
Local Man Caught in Forest Fire

Mark Johnson was hospitalized after being caught in an out of control forest fire. Because it had been a particularly dry summer, the park and wildlife officials decided to start a controlled burn in order to avoid having an out of control forest fire in the future. Nearby residents were notified several days in advance about the controlled burn and were warned that they may need to evacuate if the situation were to get out of hand. Johnson had been camping in the woods near his home at the time, and did not receive the notification.

One day into the controlled burn, the winds in the area picked up and caused the fire to spread uncontrollably. Residents were told to evacuate as soon as possible. Johnson was not aware that an evacuation had been ordered and was caught in the fire as he tried to run to safety. He sustained severe burns and is currently in critical condition.

Since the incident, park and wildlife officials have put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. All are advised to stay away from the burn site until further notice.
APPENDIX NN: Memory Checks and Response Items for Second Article in Study 3

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

Which of the following appeared at the end of the article?

☐ “Following the incident, park and wildlife officials have chosen to end the controlled burn until further notice. They have stated that they plan to continue the burn at a later date, but not until they ensure all residents have been informed.”

☐ “After the incident occurred, park and wildlife officials opted not to put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. However, all are still advised to stay away from the burn site.”

☐ “Since the incident, park and wildlife officials have put out another warning to those in the area about the dangers of being in the forest during a controlled burn. All are advised to stay away from the burn site until further notice.”

The next few questions are about your reactions to this news story. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions.

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Johnson deserved to be caught in the fire.
_____ Johnson deserved to be hurt.
_____ Johnson did not deserve to be trapped in the fire.

The next questions are about your willingness to support [Johnson/Reynolds] in a couple different ways.

Please answer the next four items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Willing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Completely Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is not uncommon for cases like Johnson’s to become the subject of negligence lawsuits against park and wildlife officials. If Johnson’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover the legal fees?

Cases like Johnson’s often catch the attention of various fire safety organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the use of the controlled burn that injured Johnson?

How willing would you be to sign a petition opposing how park and wildlife officials handled the events leading up to the death of Mark Johnson?

How willing would you be to sign a petition supporting the efforts of the Red Cross’s Forest Fires Response organization?
Torture Produces Information, Prevents Destruction

Iraqi Special Forces soldiers have admitted torturing Yasis Sahad to gain information last Saturday. The information prevented destruction of an apartment building and the death of eight civilians in the volatile Anbar province west of Baghdad. The information led to location and defusing of a bomb planted inside the stronghold building with commandos. Defusing occurred less than 6 minutes before the bomb would have exploded, completely destroying the building. Eight civilians were inside the building at the time and would have been killed.

Iraqi Special Forces arrested Yasis Sahad because he was believed to have information about terrorist activities. Sahad had been an active member of the insurgency since early 2008. He has been accused of orchestrating several attacks on civilians, most notably an ambush in which he shot and killed four elementary school children to create a distraction and allow the other insurgents to get into position.

Sahad was interrogated based on the assumption that he had useful information. He was subjected to an "enhanced" interrogation, which involved torture. As a result, he lost a couple of toes. "We knew he had information about a planned bombing," said the commander who ordered the interrogation. "We tried to get it without using torture, but he wouldn't cooperate. So we used extreme measures."

When asked whether the use of torture was authorized, the commander replied, "No, not really. But we're expected to get results—and we did. It's not what we want to do; it's what we have to do."

The commander also claimed that, during the interrogation, Sahad divulged further information about planned attacks against Canadian forces in Iraq. The Minister of Defence has indicated that while the information supplied by Sahad about the planned attacks has been confirmed by other sources, the government has not yet decided about an appropriate course of action.
APPENDIX PP: Memory Checks and Deservingness Items for Torture Article in Study 3

What news agency published the article? ______________________________

Which of the following appeared at the end of the article?

- “The Canadian government has indicated that while the information supplied by Sahad about the planned attacks has not been confirmed by other sources, the government will use the information to plan an appropriate course of action.”
- “The Minister of Defence has indicated that while the information supplied by Sahad about the planned attacks has been confirmed by other sources, the government has not yet decided about an appropriate course of action.”
- “The Minister of Defence has indicated that while the information supplied by Sahad about the planned attacks has not been confirmed, the government decided not to use the information to plan an appropriate course of action.”

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ Sahad deserved to be treated harshly.

_____ Sahad deserved to be punished.

_____ Sahad deserved treatment that was this severe.

Following are some questions testing your memory for details about Sahad.

What information was gained from Sahad’s interrogation?

What was Sahad accused of in the past?
APPENDIX QQ: Response Items for Torture Article in Study 3

The next few questions are about your reactions to this news story. There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in people’s individual opinions.

Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ The methods used in Sahad’s interrogation were appropriate
_____ The way Sahad was treated during the interrogation was justified
_____ The use of torture in the interrogation of Sahad was acceptable.

The following items concern the Canadian government’s actions regarding Sahad’s information about future planned attacks against Canadian forces. Please answer the next three items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ It is appropriate for the Canadian government to use the information from Sahad’s interrogation.
_____ The Canadian government would be justified in using the information from Sahad’s interrogation.
_____ It is acceptable for the Canadian government to use the information from Sahad’s interrogation.
_____ The Canadian government should use the information from Sahad’s interrogation.

Please answer the next items using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Willing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Completely Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ It is not uncommon for interrogations like Sahad’s to become the subject of lawsuits claiming that those who were interrogated were treated inhumanely. If Sahad’s case were brought to trial, how willing would you be to make a donation to help cover his legal fees?
_____ Cases like Sahad’s often catch the attention of various anti-violence organizations. How willing would you be to write a letter opposing the treatment Sahad received during his interrogation?
_____ How willing would you be to sign a petition opposing the torture that took place during Sahad’s interrogation?
APPENDIX RR: Donation Task in Study 3
Thank you for your participation in this study.

The International Research Network (IRN), with whom we have partnered for the current study, is looking for feedback on where to make donations in the upcoming year. We agreed to ask participants in the current study to provide some feedback on what proportion of donation funds to allot to various non-profit organizations. The results of this feedback will be presented at an annual meeting this summer, where the IRN leaders will be finalizing the budget for next year.

Each year, the IRN donates some of its funds to a few non-profit organizations. Please indicate how you think these donations should be divided across the following organizations.

- **%** Forest Fires Response (Red Cross) {show more}
  *Part of the Disaster and Crisis Management branch of the Red Cross, this organization helps to ensure that the victims of forest fires have access to food, shelter, and medical attention. This organization “aims to respond to disasters as rapidly and effectively as possible, by mobilizing its resources (people, money and other assets) and using its network in a coordinated manner so that the initial effects are countered and the needs of the affected communities are met.”*

- **%** Centre for Victims of Torture (CVT) {show more}
  *This organization “aids survivors in overcoming the lasting effects of torture and war. In partnership with the community, the Centre supports survivors in the process of successful integration into society, works for their protection and integrity, and raises awareness of the continuing effects of torture and war on survivors and their families. The CVT gives hope after the horror.”*

- **%** International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) {show more}
  *“Founded in 1969, the International Fund for Animal Welfare saves individual animals, animal populations and habitats all over the world. With projects in more than 40 countries, IFAW provides hands-on assistance to animals in need, whether it’s dogs and cats, wildlife and livestock, or rescuing animals in the wake of disasters. We also advocate saving populations from cruelty and depletion, such as our campaign to end commercial whaling and seal hunts.”*

- **%** The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) {show more}
  *“Since 1966 UNDP partners with people at all levels of society to help build nations that can withstand crisis, and drive and sustain the kind of growth that improves the quality of life for everyone. On the ground in more than 170 countries and territories, we offer global perspective and local insight to help empower lives and build resilient nations.”*

- **%** Total
APPENDIX SS: Debriefing in Study 3  
Survey Debriefing and Research Feedback

Do you have any general concerns or comments about the study you just completed?

During any of the research you participated in today, was there anything unclear about the instructions or any of the procedures?

Did anything seem odd or strange about the instructions or any other part of the research?

Can you explain in your own words what you think this study is about?

It would be very helpful if you can let us know what, if anything, you heard about this study before you came here today. We don’t care where or from whom you heard anything, just what you may have heard.
If you have not done so already, put on the headphones now.
When you are ready, click "►" to begin the video.
It may take a moment for the video to begin playing.

You will be able to continue after the video is finished.
Now I'm going to tell you about the purpose of the research in more detail. As you know, we are interested in people’s reactions to news stories. More specifically, we are interested in how people respond to news stories about human rights violations after reading about an ingroup member’s relevant behaviour. One of the news stories that you read described a Canadian official who was either hypocritical, not hypocritical, or did something unrelated to human rights. Additionally, you read another news story that described a violation of the right to protection against torture (that is, the right to humane treatment). We expected that those who read about the hypocritical official would tolerate this violation less than those in the other two conditions, due to the threat to Canada’s reputation as being strongly against torture. We also expected that those who read about the hypocritical official would be more willing to help the victim described in the scenario, compared to those in the other two conditions. Finally, at the end of the survey, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We predicted that those who read about the hypocritical official would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those in the other two conditions. The general purpose of this study was to examine a possible method for preventing/discouraging the toleration of human rights violations. Finding practical methods for reducing and discouraging toleration is an important first step in ending human rights abuses. Though these methods do not directly confront those committing violations, refusing to tolerate such violations is crucial in preventing such abuses from continuing.

I need to tell you that all of the scenarios were fictional, although some of the events they depicted were taken from actual news stories. It is important to note that the MP in the first scenario is fictional. Additionally, you were told that we partnered with an organization, the International Research Network, for the current study. This organization was made up for this study and does not actually exist. We want people to believe the stories are actual events and that the International Research Network is an actual organization so that their responses are more realistic.

Remember that there are no right or wrong ways to respond to anything in the study you took part in today. Everyone has their own beliefs about things, and those beliefs should be respected. Additionally, your name will be in no way associated with any of your data in this study—all of your responses are anonymous, like it said in the consent form. Moreover, it is important to note that individual responses are, on their own, uninterpretable. Individual responses in this study are only meaningful in relation to the greater distribution of responses from all participants.

Now I want to explain why we didn’t tell you everything about the purpose and the procedure of the research until the study was over. If people know everything about the research before they come in here, they may respond according to what they think we
are looking for – either unconsciously or just to be helpful and cooperative. Then we wouldn’t know if the responses we are getting are people’s true and honest reactions or not. We would prefer not to hide anything about the research, but we also have to make sure that we are getting spontaneous and realistic responses from people.

I have to ask a favour of you before we wrap things up. It’s very important that you don’t discuss this study or anything I told you with anyone else. If people know what is expected of them before they come in here, their reactions in the study may be influenced in some way, and the data that we are collecting would be useless. I can’t emphasize enough how important it is that people come into the study not knowing exactly what we are trying to do. If anyone asks you about the study, you can just tell them what is in the SONA advertisement -- that they have to fill out questionnaires on a computer.

Okay, the last thing I’m going to give you is a written explanation of the study, as I’ve already explained it to you. Also on the handout is contact information for the Research Ethics Officer at Brock, if you have any questions about your rights as a study participant. Cari Drolet is conducting this study for her PhD thesis and Dr. Hafer in the Department of Psychology is supervising this research. If you have any questions about the research we are doing that you think of later, you can contact Dr. Hafer or Cari Drolet using the information on this handout. The results of this research will be available approximately one year from now. You can contact Cari Drolet or Dr. Hafer if you are interested in the results. I hope you found this study interesting. Thank you for your cooperation!
Dear Participant,

Thank you very much for participating in this study. This research session involved answering some questions about your personal opinions, then reading and responding to scenarios that depicted stories like those you would see in the news. Amongst the opinion questions were two items assessing your support for the right to humane treatment. There were also several questions that assessed your perception of other Canadians’ attitudes on the right to humane treatment. Following the attitude questions, you read and responded to three scenarios. One of the scenarios you read described the activities of a fictional Ontario MP. You either read that he allowed the use of torture in interrogations, opposed the use of torture, or attended a baseball game. We expected that those who read about the MP allowing the use of torture, despite having said that he was against it, would be motivated to protect the group’s reputation (i.e., Canada’s reputation of being against the use of torture). Another scenario you read also dealt with human rights. Specifically, the scenario involved a violation of the right to humane treatment. We expected that those who read about the MP who allowed the use of torture would tolerate the use of torture less than those who read the other versions of the scenario.

At the end of the study, you were asked to provide anonymous feedback about which organizations should receive donations. We expected that those who read about the MP who allowed the use of torture would recommend higher donations for the torture-related charity than those who did not feel they behaved inconsistently. If you are interested in getting more information on any of the organizations mentioned in the donation task, we have provided information for those organizations at the end of this form.

If you are a student and feel upset by the situation described in this study, please go to Brock University’s counselling services for help (Schmon Tower - ST400) or go to their website to find out how to schedule an appointment (http://www.brocku.ca/personal-counselling). You can also consult your physician for a referral.

If you are not a student and feel upset by the situation described in this study, please use a search engine such as Google to find a local crisis-counselling service. If you do not have access to crisis counselling or a therapist, please consult your physician for a referral.

Now that we have more fully explained this research to you, we must ask you to please avoid telling anyone else about the details of this study and its purpose. Doing so may alter the results because people might respond differently if they know what we are looking for. This is why we did not tell you everything about this research until after you had completed this study.
If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca. If you have any other questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the investigators. Results will be available after December, 2017. If you wish to learn about the results of our research at that time, contact one of the investigators. We will only provide group averages and overall results, not personal information, because all data will remain anonymous and confidential.

Thank you again for your participation!

For more information on the organizations mentioned at the end of the study, see the following websites.

- Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture website: [ccvt.org](http://www.ccvt.org)

For more information on human rights, see the following Human Rights Organizations.

- *Global Rights*—works on building grass roots movements to promote and protect the rights of marginalized populations, as well as documenting human rights abuses website: [http://www.globalrights.org](http://www.globalrights.org)
- *UN Watch*—monitors the performance of the UN according to its own charter website: [http://www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org)
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