

# Emma E. Levine

The University of Chicago Booth School of Business  
5807 Woodlawn Avenue, Office 453  
Chicago, IL 60637

Tel: (773) 834 2861

Email: [Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu)

Website: <http://www.chicagobooth.edu/faculty/directory/l/emma-levine>

Open Science Framework page: <https://osf.io/b8jz5/>

## ACADEMIC POSITIONS

---

### **Booth School of Business, University of Chicago**

Assistant Professor of Behavioral Science, 2016 – present

Charles E. Merrill Faculty Scholar, 2017-2018

William S. Fishman Faculty Scholar, 2016 – 2017

## EDUCATION

---

### **The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania (2016)**

Ph.D., Operations, Information, and Decisions – Decision Processes

*Dissertation:* Navigating the tension between honesty and benevolence

### **The University of Pennsylvania (2010)**

Summa cum laude

B.A. Philosophy, Politics, and Economics – Choice and Behavior concentration

B.S. Economics (The Wharton School), Operations and Information Management – Decision Processes

## RESEARCH INTERESTS

---

Deception, Ethics, Trust, Prosocial behavior, Social cognition

## PUBLICATIONS (in reverse chronological order)

---

1. **Levine, E.E.** & Cohen, T.R. (2018). You can handle the truth: Mispredicting the consequences of honest communication. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
2. **Levine, E.E.**, Bitterly, T.B., Cohen, T.R., Schweitzer, M.E. (2018). Who is trustworthy? Guilt-proneness increases trustworthy intentions and behavior. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
3. Lupoli, M.J., **Levine, E.E.**, & Greenberg, A.E. (2018). Paternalistic lies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 146, 31-50.
4. \***Levine, E. E.**, \*Barasch, A., Rand, D., Berman, J. Z., & Small, D. A. (2018). Signaling emotion and reason in cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(5), 702-719. \*denotes equal authorship

5. Berman, J.Z., Barasch, A., **Levine, E.E.**, & Small, D.A. (2018). Impediments to Effective Altruism: The Role of Subjective Preferences in Charitable Giving. *Psychological Science*, 29(5), 834-844.
6. **Levine, E.E.**, Hart, J., Moore, K., Rubin, E. Yadav, K., & Halpern, S. (2018). The surprising costs of silence: Asymmetric preferences for prosocial lies of commission and omission. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(1), 29-51.
7. Barasch, A., **Levine, E.E.**, Schweitzer, M.E (2016). Bliss is ignorance: How the magnitude of expressed happiness influences perceived naiveté and interpersonal exploitation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 137, 184-206.
8. Gaspar, J.P, **Levine, E.E.**, Schweitzer, M.E. (2015) Why We Should Lie. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 306-309.
9. **Levine, E.E.**, Schweitzer, M.E. (2015). The affective and interpersonal consequences of obesity; *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 127, 66-84.
10. **Levine, E.E.**, Schweitzer, M.E. (2015). Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 88-106.
11. Berman, J.Z., **Levine, E.E.**, Barasch, A., Small, D.A. (2015). The braggart's dilemma: On the social rewards and penalties of advertising prosocial behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(1), 90-104.
12. **Levine, E.E.**, Schweitzer, M.E. (2014). Are liars ethical? On the tension between benevolence and honesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 53, 107-117.
13. \*Barasch, A., \***Levine, E.E.**, Berman, J.Z., Small, D.A. (2014). Selfish or selfless? On the signal value of emotion in altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 393. \*denotes equal authorship

## WORKING PAPERS

---

Gunia, B.C, **Levine, E.E.**, Deception as competence: The effect of occupation on ethical judgment and behavior. *In preparation for 3<sup>rd</sup> round review*.

**Levine, E.E.** Fibbing about your feelings: The relationship between emotional misrepresentation and interpersonal trust. *In preparation for 3<sup>rd</sup> round review*.

**Levine, E.E.** & Munguia Gomez, D. "I'm just being honest." Ethical rules enable interpersonal harm.

\*Kristal, A., \*Wang, S., & **Levine, E.E.** Rules were meant to be broken: The effects of rule-following and discretion on interpersonal trust. \*denotes equal authorship

Kassirer, S., **Levine, E.E.**, Gaertig, C. Judgments of paternalistic versus autonomous advice.

**Levine, E.E.** Community standards of deception.

Gaertig, C., Barasch, A., **Levine, E.E.**, & Schweitzer, M.E. When does anger boost status?

\*Lewis, J., \*Moore, A., **Levine, E.E.**, & Schweitzer, M.E. Trusting kind friends and fair leaders: How relationships affect the antecedents of trust. \*denotes equal authorship

## AWARDS & GRANTS

---

Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings, "I'm just being honest." Ethical rules enable interpersonal harm, 2018

Outstanding Dissertation Award; Awarded bi-annually by the International Association for Conflict Management, 2017

Russell Sage Foundation, Behavioral Economics Small Grant (\$7500): Community Standards of Deception, 2015

Departmental Nominee, Academy of Management OB Doctoral Consortium, 2015

International Association for Conflict Management Best Empirical Paper Award: Bliss is Ignorance: The Interpersonal Costs of Extreme Happiness, 2015

Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings, Community Standards of Deception, 2015

Graduate and Professional Student Research Travel Grant Award, The Wharton School, 2015

Qualtrics Behavioral Research Grant (\$5000): Community Standards of Deception, 2015

SPSP JDM Preconference Student Paper Award, 2015

Society of Personality and Social Psychology Graduate Student Travel Award, 2015

Society of Judgment and Decision-Making Student Poster Award, 2014

Paul R. Kleindorfer Scholar Award, 2014; Awarded to one outstanding PhD student annually in the OID department

Hans Jacob Heckman Fellowship in Ethics, The Wharton School, 2014; Awarded to one Wharton PhD student whose work in the area of ethics is outstanding and who has the opportunity to be a top-level academic scholar

Excellence in Ethics Best Paper Award, Mendoza College of Business, 2014; Awarded annually by the Excellence in Ethics Research Conference, awarded for *Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust*

Winkelman Fellowship Grant, The Wharton School, 2013-2016; Awarded to one 3rd year PhD student annually who has shown the greatest academic job potential across all departments at Wharton (July 2013)

Dispute Resolution Research Center Grant, Kellogg School of Management, 2013

Russell Ackoff Student Research Fellowship, The Wharton School, 2012, 2013, 2014

Wharton Doctoral Fellowship, The Wharton School, 2011-2015

## **INVITED TALKS**

---

Northwestern University, Kellogg School of Management (2018)

Northwestern University, Kellogg Moral Psychology Summit (2018)

University of Virginia, Batten School of Public Policy (2017)

University of Illinois at Chicago, Social/Personality Brown bag (2017)

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin School of Business (2016)

Stanford University, Stanford Graduate School of Business (2016)

University of California, Berkeley, The Haas School of Business (2016)

Yale University, Yale School of Management (2016)

University of California, Los Angeles, Anderson School of Management (2015)

University of Chicago, Booth School of Business (2015)

Cornell University, Samuel Curtis Johnson Graduate School of Management (2015)

Harvard University, Harvard Business School (2015)

Columbia University, Columbia Business School (2015)

New York University, Stern School of Business (2015)

University of Utah, Eccles School of Business (2015)

University of Texas at Austin, McCombs School of Business (2015)

University of Washington, Foster School of Business (2015)

London Business School (2015)

University of Maryland, Robert H. Smith School of Business (2015)

Carnegie Mellon University, Center for Behavioral and Decision Research & Department of Social and Decision Sciences (2015)

Tilburg University, Tilburg Institute of Behavioral Economics Research (2015)

## CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS (\* indicates that I presented)

---

### Choosing people versus policies

- Presented at the *Kellogg-Booth Annual Student Symposium*, Chicago, IL (March 2018)

### Rules were meant to be broken: The effects of rule-following and discretion on interpersonal trust

- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Chicago, IL (Aug 2018)
- \*Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Philadelphia, PA (July 2018)

### Judgments of paternalistic versus autonomous advice

- Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Philadelphia, PA (July 2018)
- Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Chicago, IL (Aug 2018)

### “I’m just being honest.” Ethical rules enable interpersonal harm

- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Chicago, IL (Aug 2018)
- \*Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Philadelphia, PA (July 2018)

### You can handle the truth: Mispredicting the consequences of honest communication

- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Atlanta, GA (Aug 2017)
- \*Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Berlin, Germany (July 2017)

### The surprising costs of silence: Asymmetric preferences for prosocial lies of omission and commission

- \*Presented at *Society for Judgment and Decision Making Annual Conference*, Vancouver (Nov 2017)
- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Anaheim, CA (Aug 2016)
- \*Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Berlin, Germany (July 2017)

### Community standards of deception

- \*Presented at *Society for Judgment and Decision Making Annual Conference*, Boston, MA (Nov 2016)
- \*Presented at MorL mini-conference, University of Chicago (Nov 2015)
- \* Presented at the *Inequality, Trust and Ethics: Insights from Economics and Behavioral Ethics Conference*, London, UK (May 2015)
- \* Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management Annual Meeting*, Clearwater Beach, FL (June 2015)
- \* Presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Vancouver, BC. (Aug 2015)

### Impediments to Effective Altruism: The Role of Subjective Preferences in Charitable Giving

- Presented at the *Society for Personality and Social Psychology* Annual Conference, San Antonio, TX. (Jan 2017)

### Emotion and reason as signals of cooperation

- Presented at *Association for Consumer Research* Annual Conference, Berlin, Germany (Oct 2016)
- \*Presented at *Society for Judgment and Decision Making* Annual Conference, Chicago, IL (Nov 2015)

### Deception as competence: The effect of occupation on ethical judgment and behavior

- Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Anaheim, CA (Aug 2016)
- Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Vancouver, BC. (Aug 2015)

### Trust the guilty: dispositional and incidental guilt increase trustworthiness.

- Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management* Annual Meeting, Clearwater Beach, FL (June 2015)
- Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Vancouver, BC. (Aug 2015)

### Selfish or Selfless? On the Signal Value of Emotion in Altruistic Behavior.

- \*Poster presented at the *Society for Personality and Social Psychology* Annual Conference, Long Beach, CA. (Feb 2015)
- \*Presented at *Society of Judgment and Decision-Making* Annual Conference, Toronto, Canada. (Nov 2013)
- \* Presented at *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL. (Aug 2013)
- Presented at the *Association for Psychological Science*, Washington, DC.

### Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust.

- \*Presented at the *Society of Experimental Social Psychology* Annual Conference, Santa Monica, CA (Oct 2016)
- \*Presented at the *International Convention of Psychological Science*, Amsterdam, NL (March 2015)
- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. (Aug 2014)
- \*Presented at the *Behavioral Decision Research in Management (BDRM)* Conference, London, UK. (July 2014)
- \*Presented at the *Excellence in Ethics Research Conference*, Mendoza College of Business, South Bend, IN. (May 2014)
- \*Presented at the *Society for Personality and Social Psychology* Annual Conference, Austin, TX. (Feb 2014)

### Bliss is ignorance: Extreme happiness signals naiveté.

- Presented at *Association for Consumer Research* Annual Conference, Berlin, Germany (Oct 2016)
- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. (Aug 2014)
- \*Presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management* Annual Meeting, Clearwater Beach, FL (June 2015)

### Fibbing about your feelings: emotional misrepresentation increases cognitive trust.

- \*Presented at the *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. (Aug 2014)

The interpersonal costs and benefits of obesity.

- \*Poster presented at the *International Association of Conflict Management* Annual Meeting, Tacoma, WA. (June 2013)

## **SYMPOSIA ORGANIZED**

---

Interpersonal trust: What are we talking about, what are we measuring and where are we going? *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting; Vancouver, BC, Aug 2015. Presented in CM, OB, and RM divisions. With K. Dirks, D. Ferrin, M. Pillutla, E. Chou, C. Cooper, S. Sah, D. Cain, & M. Schweitzer.

Trust development and repair in organizations; *Academy of Management* Annual Meeting; Philadelphia, PA, 2014. Organized with D. Harmon, selected as *Conflict Management Showcase Symposium*. With L. Wang, D. Harmon, and S. Brion.

Unexplored causes and consequences of (un)ethical behavior; *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, Austin, TX; 2014. With S. Wiltermuth, S. Sah, B. Gunia, and T. Zhang.

The relationship between altruism and personal benefits; *Society of Judgment and Decision-Making* Annual Conference, Toronto, Canada, 2013; Organized with A. Barasch. With G. Newman, C. Olivola, and A. Imas.

## **PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

---

Society of Experimental Social Psychology (2016-present)

Academy of Management (2011-present)

Society for Judgment and Decision Making (2011-present)

International Association of Conflict Management (2013-present)

Society for Personality and Social Psychology (2013-present)

## **TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

---

Teaching at Booth:

- Strategies and Processes of Negotiation (MBA, Spring 2018); For all sections, median rating on all judgments = 5/5
- Current Topics in Behavioral Science (PhD, Winter 2018); median rating on all judgments = 5/5

Teaching Assistantships at Wharton:

- Teamwork and Leadership (MBA, Professor Nancy Rothbard, Summer/Fall 2013, Summer/Fall 2014)
- Teamwork and Leadership (MBA, Professor Adam Grant, Summer/Fall 2012)
- Managerial Decision Making (Undergraduate & MBA, Professor Katherine Milkman, Spring 2015)
- Managerial Decision Making (Undergraduate, Professor Uri Simonsohn, Fall 2013)
- Managerial Decision Making (Undergraduate & MBA, Professor Uri Simonsohn, Fall 2012)
- Introduction to Decision Theory (Undergraduate, Professor Sumantra Sen, Spring 2010)

- Public Political Process (Undergraduate, Professor John Gasper, Fall 2009)

## ADVISING

---

### Student collaborators

- Alex Moore, PhD student in Behavioral Science (UChicago Booth)
- David Munguia Gomez, PhD student in Behavioral Science (UChicago Booth)
- \*Anam Barakzai, PhD student in Psychology (UChicago)
- Annabelle Roberts, PhD student in Behavioral Science (UChicago Booth)
- Melissa Beswick, PhD student in Behavioral Science (UChicago Booth)
- Alex Kristal, former lab manager (UChicago), currently PhD student in Marketing (London Business School)
- Samantha Kassirer, former masters student (UChicago), currently PhD student in Management (Northwestern, Kellogg)
- Shun Wang, masters student (UChicago)
- Nicholas Herzog, research assistant (UChicago)
- Celia Gaertig, PhD student in OID (Penn, Wharton)
- Joshua Lewis, PhD student in OID (Penn, Wharton)
- Matthew Lupoli, PhD student in Management (UCSD Rady), currently Assistant Professor at Deakin University
- T. Bradford Bitterly, PhD student in OID (Wharton), currently post-doc at University of Michigan

*\*indicates that I served on this student's dissertation committee*

## REVIEWING

---

### Editorial board member:

- *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2017-present

### Ad hoc reviewer:

- *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- *Journal of Economic Psychology*
- *Psychological Science*
- *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*
- *Management Science*
- *Journal of Marketing Research*
- *Social Psychological and Personality Science*
- *Nature: Human Behavior*
- *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*
- *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*
- *Review of General Psychology*

### Conference reviewer:

- Behavioral Decision Research in Management Conference (2018)
- Society of Judgment and Decision-Making Annual Conference (2016-present)

- Academy of Management Annual Conference (2013-present)
- International Association of Conflict Management Annual Conference (2014-present)

## **OTHER SERVICE**

---

### At Chicago Booth

- Co-director of Ed & Emma Lab (with Ed O'Brien), 2017-present
- Presenter at Kellogg-Booth student symposium, 2018
- Organizational Behavior committee member, 2017-present
- Co-organizer of Kellogg-Booth Organizational Behavior Workshop, 2017
- Presenter at PhD student orientation, 2016

### As a graduate student at Wharton

- Founding member of Wharton Society for the Advancement of Women in Business Academia
- Organizer of Schweitzer Ethics and Emotions lab

## **MEDIA COVERAGE**

---

### Selected Media Mentions:

- The Atlantic, Bloomberg View, Business Insider, Chicago Sun Times, Chicago Booth Review, Fast Company, Financial Times, Inc., Knowledge@Wharton, Pacific Standard, TIME Magazine

### Editorials:

- "Why we resist treating charities like investments" Market Watch, Aug. 22, 2016. By Jonathan Berman, Alix Barasch, Emma Levine, and Deborah Small
- "Should You Broadcast Your Charitable Side?" Behavioral Scientist, March 27, 2018. By Deborah Small, Jonathan Berman, Emma Levine, and Alix Barasch.

## **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

---

Procter & Gamble, Cincinnati, OH Worked in sales and consumer analytics	2008 – 2011
Emma's Knish & Coffee, Philadelphia, PA Founded a modern knishery, funded by Wharton Entrepreneurial Programs	2008 – 2009



### Deception & honesty

Levine, E.E. & Cohen, T.R. (2018). You can handle the truth: Mispredicting the consequences of honest communication. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

People highly value the moral principle of honesty, and yet, they frequently avoid being honest with others. In the present research, we explore the actual and predicted consequences of honesty in everyday life. We utilize field and laboratory experiments that feature two types of honesty interventions: 1) instructing individuals to focus on complete honesty across their interactions for a period of time, and 2) instructing individuals to engage in specific honest conversations that they frequently avoid in everyday life. In Studies 1a and 1b, we randomly assigned individuals to either be (or imagine being) honest, kind, or conscious of their communication in every conversation with every person in their life for three days. We find that people significantly mispredict the consequences of honesty: focusing on honesty (but not kindness or communication-consciousness) is more pleasurable, meaningful, socially connecting, and does less relational harm than individuals expect. We extend our investigation by examining the consequences of specific well-controlled honest conversations for both communicators and their relational partners in two preregistered laboratory experiments. In Study 2 we examine the predicted and actual consequences of honestly disclosing personal information, and in Study 3 we examine the predicted and actual consequences of honestly sharing negative feedback. Our results suggest that individuals broadly misunderstand the consequences of increased honesty because they overestimate how negatively others will react to their honesty. Overall, this research contributes to our understanding of affective forecasting processes and uncovers fundamental insights on how communication and moral values shape well-being.

Lupoli, M.J., Levine, E.E., & Greenberg, A.E. (2018). Paternalistic lies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 146, 31-50.

Many lies that are intended to help others require the deceiver to make assumptions about whether lying serves others' best interests. In other words, lying often involves a paternalistic motive. Across seven studies (N=2,260), we show that although targets appreciate lies that yield unequivocal benefits relative to honesty, they penalize paternalistic lies. We identify three mechanisms behind the harmful effects of paternalistic lies, finding that targets believe that paternalistic liars (a) do not have benevolent intentions, (b) are violating their autonomy by lying, and (c) are inaccurately predicting their preferences. Importantly, targets' aversion towards paternalistic lies persists even when targets receive their preferred outcome as a result of a lie. Additionally, deceivers can mitigate some, but not all, of the harmful effects of paternalistic lies by directly communicating their good intentions. These results contribute to our understanding of deception and paternalistic policies.

Levine, E.E., Hart, J., Moore, K., Rubin, E. Yadav, K., & Halpern, S. (2018). The surprising costs of silence: Asymmetric preferences for prosocial lies of commission and omission. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(1), 29-51.

Across 7 experiments ( $N = 3883$ ), we demonstrate that communicators and targets make egocentric moral judgments of deception. Specifically, communicators focus more on the costs of deception to them—for example, the guilt they feel when they break a moral rule—whereas targets focus more on whether deception helps or harms them. As a result, communicators and targets make asymmetric judgments of prosocial lies of commission and omission: Communicators often believe that omitting information is more ethical than telling a prosocial lie, whereas targets often believe the opposite. We document these effects within the context of health care discussions, employee layoffs, and economic games, among both clinical populations (i.e., oncologists and cancer patients) and lay people. We identify moderators and downstream consequences of this asymmetry. We conclude by discussing psychological and practical implications for medicine, management, behavioral ethics, and human communication.

Gaspar, J.P., Levine, E.E., Schweitzer, M.E. (2015) Why We Should Lie. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 306-309.

In contrast to the view that honesty is moral and dishonesty is immoral, we posit that some types of deception are moral. Further, we argue that we should teach our employees, students, and children to tell some types of lies. By doing this, we can become more ethical and less hypocritical. Specifically, we advocate for accounting for the benefits of deception and the costs of honesty. By teaching people to use deception thoughtfully and deliberately, we can create more ethical individuals and organizations. We call for scholars and managers to think differently about deception and, in particular, to think more carefully about ethical policies and proclamations regarding honesty and deception.

Levine, E.E., Schweitzer, M.E. (2015) Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 88-106.

Philosophers, psychologists, and economists have long asserted that deception harms trust. We challenge this claim. Across four studies, we demonstrate that prosocial deception can increase trust. Specifically, prosocial lies increase the willingness to pass money in the trust game, a behavioral measure of benevolence-based trust. In Studies 1a and 1b, we find that altruistic lies increase trust when deception is directly experienced and when it is merely observed. In Study 2, we demonstrate that mutually beneficial lies also increase trust. In Study 3, we disentangle the effects of intentions and deception; intentions are far more important than deception for building benevolence-based trust. In Study 4, we show that although prosocial lies increase benevolence-based trust, they harm integrity-based trust. To measure integrity-based trust behavior, we introduce a new economic game, the Rely-or-Verify game. Our findings expand our understanding of deception and deepen our insight into the mechanics of trust.

Levine, E. E., & Schweitzer, M.E. (2014). Are liars ethical? On the tension between benevolence and honesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 53, 107-117.

We demonstrate that some lies are perceived to be more ethical than honest statements. Across three studies, we find that individuals who tell prosocial lies, lies told with the intention of benefitting others, are perceived to be more moral than individuals who tell the truth. In Study 1, we compare altruistic lies to selfish truths. In Study 2, we introduce a stochastic deception game to disentangle the influence of deception, outcomes, and intentions on perceptions of moral character. In Study 3, we demonstrate that moral judgments of lies are sensitive to the consequences of lying for the deceived party, but insensitive to the consequences of lying for the liar. Both honesty and benevolence are essential components of moral character. We find that when these values conflict, benevolence may be more important than honesty. More broadly, our findings suggest that the moral foundation of care may be more important than the moral foundation of justice.

### **Prosocial behavior & cooperation**

Levine, E.E, Bitterly, T.B., Cohen, T.R., Schweitzer, M.E. (2018). Who is trustworthy? Guilt-proneness increases trustworthy intentions and behavior. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Existing trust research has disproportionately focused on what makes people more or less trusting, and has largely ignored the question of what makes people more or less trustworthy. In this investigation, we deepen our understanding of trustworthiness. Across six studies using economic games that measure trustworthy behavior and survey items that measure trustworthy intentions, we explore the personality traits that predict trustworthiness. We demonstrate that guilt-proneness predicts trustworthiness better than a variety of other personality measures, and we identify sense of interpersonal responsibility as the underlying mechanism by both measuring it and manipulating it directly. People who are high in guilt-proneness are more likely to be trustworthy than are individuals who are low in guilt-proneness, but they are not universally more generous. We demonstrate that people high in guilt-proneness are more likely to behave in interpersonally sensitive ways when they are more responsible for others' outcomes. We also explore potential interventions to increase trustworthiness. Our findings fill a significant gap in the trust literature by building a foundation for investigating trustworthiness, by identifying a trait predictor of trustworthy intentions and behavior, and by providing practical advice for deciding in whom we should place our trust.

Levine, E. E., Barasch, A., Rand, D., Berman, J. Z., & Small, D. A. (2018). Signaling emotion and reason in cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(5), 702-719.

We explore the signal value of emotion and reason in human cooperation. Across four experiments utilizing dyadic prisoner dilemma games, we establish three central results. First, individuals infer prosocial feelings and motivations from signals of emotion. As a result, individuals believe that a reliance on emotion signals that one will cooperate more so than a reliance on reason. Second, these beliefs are generally accurate—those who act based on emotion are more likely to cooperate than those who act based on reason. Third, individuals' behavioral responses towards signals of emotion and reason depend on their own decision mode: those who rely on emotion tend to conditionally cooperate (that is, cooperate only when they believe that their partner has

cooperated), whereas those who rely on reason tend to defect regardless of their partner's signal. These findings shed light on how different decision processes, and lay theories about decision processes, facilitate and impede cooperation.

Berman, J.Z., Barasch, A., Levine, E.E., & Small, D.A. (2018). Impediments to Effective Altruism: The Role of Subjective Preferences in Charitable Giving. *Psychological Science*, 29(5), 834-844.

Charity could do the most good if every dollar donated went to causes that produced the greatest welfare gains. In line with this proposition, the effective-altruism movement seeks to provide individuals with information regarding the effectiveness of charities in hopes that they will contribute to organizations that maximize the social return of their donation. In this research, we investigated the extent to which presenting effectiveness information leads people to choose more effective charities. We found that even when effectiveness information is made easily comparable across options, it has a limited impact on choice. Specifically, people frequently choose less effective charity options when those options represent more subjectively preferred causes. In contrast to making a personal donation decision, outcome metrics are used to a much greater extent when choosing financial investments and when allocating aid resources as an agent of an organization. Implications for effective altruism are discussed.

Berman, J.Z., Levine, E.E., Barasch, A., Small, D.A. (2015). The braggart's dilemma: On the social rewards and penalties of advertising prosocial behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(1), 90-104.

People often brag about, or advertise, their good deeds to others. Seven studies investigate how bragging about prosocial behavior affects perceived generosity. The authors propose that bragging conveys information about an actor's good deeds, leading to an attribution of generosity. However, bragging also signals a selfish motivation (a desire for credit) that undermines the attribution of generosity. Thus, bragging has a positive effect when prosocial behavior is unknown because it informs others that an actor has behaved generously. However, bragging does not help—and often hurts—when prosocial behavior is already known, because it signals a selfish motive. Additionally, the authors demonstrate that conspicuous cause marketing products have effects akin to bragging by signaling an impure motive for doing good deeds. Finally, the authors argue that bragging about prosocial behavior is unique because it undermines the precise information that the braggart is trying to convey (generosity). In contrast, bragging about personal achievements does not affect perceptions of the focal trait conveyed in the brag. These findings underscore the strategic considerations inherent in signaling altruism.

\*Barasch, A., \*Levine, E.E., Berman, J.Z., Small, D.A. (2014). Selfish or selfless? On the signal value of emotion in altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 393. \*denotes equal authorship

Theories that reject the existence of altruism presume that emotional benefits serve as ulterior motives for doing good deeds. These theories argue that even in the absence of material and reputational benefits, individuals reap utility from the feelings associated with doing good. In response to this normative view of altruism, this article examines the descriptive question of whether laypeople penalize emotional prosocial actors. Six studies find that emotion serves as a positive signal of moral character, despite the intrapsychic benefits associated with it. This is true when emotion motivates prosocial behavior (Studies 1, 2, 3, and 5) and when emotion is a positive outcome of prosocial behavior (i.e., “warm glow”; Studies 4, 5, and 6). Emotional actors are considered to be moral because people believe emotion provides an honest and direct signal that the actor feels a genuine concern for others. Consequently, prosocial actors who are motivated by the expectation of emotional rewards are judged differently than prosocial actors who are

motivated by other benefits, such as reputational or material rewards (Study 6). These results suggest that laypeople do not view altruism as incompatible with all benefits to the self.

Barasch, A., Levine, E.E., Schweitzer, M.E (2016). Bliss is ignorance: How the magnitude of expressed happiness influences perceived naïveté and interpersonal exploitation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 137, 184-206.

Across six studies, we examine how the magnitude of expressed happiness influences social perception and interpersonal behavior. We find that happiness evokes different judgments when expressed at high levels than when expressed at moderate levels, and that these judgments influence opportunistic behavior. Specifically, people perceive very happy individuals to be more naïve than moderately happy individuals. These perceptions reflect the belief that very happy individuals shelter themselves from negative information about the world. As a result of these inferences, very happy people, relative to moderately happy people, are more likely to receive biased advice from advisors with a conflict of interest and are more likely to be chosen as negotiation partners when the opportunity for exploitation is salient. Our findings challenge existing assumptions in organizational behavior and psychology by identifying a significant disadvantage of expressing happiness, and underscore the importance of examining emotional expressions at different magnitudes. We call for future work to explore how the same emotion, experienced or expressed at different levels, influences judgment and behavior.

Levine, E.E., Schweitzer, M.E. (2015). The affective and interpersonal consequences of obesity; *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 127, 66-84.

The incidence of obesity in the United States has tripled over the past fifty years, posing significant challenges for organizations. We build on stereotype content research and offer an overarching framework to understand individuals' affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses to obesity. Across five studies, we demonstrate that individuals associate obesity with perceptions of low competence. Perceptions of low competence predict affective (disgust, sympathy) and behavioral (low help, high harm) responses to obesity. Consistent with the BIAS Map (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007), these discriminatory responses are moderated by perceptions of warmth. We demonstrate that, in some cases, shifting perceptions of warmth is just as effective as losing weight for curtailing discrimination towards the obese. Our findings demonstrate that social categorization is labile and we offer prescriptive advice for individuals seeking to change the way others perceive them.