Table 1. Blue indicates statistics used by Zwann to do the p-curve analysis for time. Green indicates statistics used for a p-curve analysis for money. Yellow indicates additional statistics that were also used by the TES analysis.

Experiment 1	The percentage of participants who cheated varied across conditions, $\chi^2(2, N = 98) = 14.61, p = .001$ (see Fig. 1); participants were more likely to cheat in the money condition (87.5%, 28/32) than in either the control condition (66.7%, 22/33), $\chi^2(1, N = 65) = 3.97, p < .05$, or the time condition (42.4%, 14/33) $\chi^2(1, N = 65) = 14.44, p < .001$. Also, participants were less likely to cheat in the time condition than in the control condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 66) = 3.91, p < .05$.
Experiment 2	$F(1, 138) = 2.77, p = .099$. As predicted, this effect was qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 138) = 3.99, p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$ (see Table 1 for information about the percentage of people who cheated and the extent of cheating in each condition). Only when the game was framed as an intelligence test did thinking about money lead to greater cheating than thinking about time, $F(1, 138) = 6.69, p = .01$. When the game was framed as a personality test, there was no difference in cheating between the money and time conditions, $F < 1$. In fact, participants primed with money cheated less when they thought the game assessed their personality than when they thought it assessed their intelligence, $F(1, 138) = 4.58, p = .03$. There was no such difference among those primed with time, $F < 1$.
Experiment 3	A 2 (prime) × 2 (mirror) analysis of variance on the extent of cheating revealed a significant main effect for both prime condition, $F(1, 116) = 4.81, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .04$, and mirror condition, $F(1, 116) = 5.01, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .04$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 116) = 4.30, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = .04$ (see Table 2 for information about the percentage of cheaters and the extent of cheating in each condition). Only when participants did not complete their tasks in front of a mirror did thinking about money lead to greater cheating than thinking about time, $F(1, 116) = 9.11, p = .003$. When a mirror was present, there was no difference in cheating between the money and time conditions, $F < 1$.
Experiment 4	***Cheating.*** We observed the same pattern of results for cheating, $\chi^2(2, N = 213) = 16.44, p < .001$: Participants were more likely to cheat in the money condition (73.3%, 55/75) than in either the control condition (57.4%, 39/68), $\chi^2(1, N = 143) = 4.04, p = .044$, or the time condition (40.0%, 28/70), $\chi^2(1, N = 145) = 16.44, p < .001$. Participants were less likely to cheat in the time condition than in the control condition, $\chi^2(1, N = 138) = 4.16, p = .041$.