

This is the accepted version of the online supplementary materials for the manuscript below in press by Elsevier in *Personality and Individual Differences*, available at

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111083>

Aldrovandi, S., Dhillon, J., & Rentzelas, P. (in press). To achieve and to conform: Motivational values predict social comparison orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2021.111083.

#### Additional information about social media recruitment

A convenience sampling technique was employed to recruit participants from sites such as Twitter and Facebook. Participants decided whether to respond to a social media advert that offered brief information about the study and that included a link to the online survey hosted on Qualtrics®. On access to such link, participants were presented with additional detail through a study information page, which was then followed by a screen that presented the consent form.

Table A1. *Descriptive statistics for the variables under consideration*

Variable	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>α</i>
						( <i>LL</i> )	( <i>UL</i> )			
Power	-0.98	-0.99	0.95	-3.06	1.88	-1.74	-0.31	0.19	-0.23	.74
Achievement	-0.20	-0.13	0.96	-2.65	1.70	-0.65	0.44	-0.42	-0.15	.84
Hedonism	0.17	0.27	0.89	-2.47	1.88	-0.14	0.75	-0.86	0.80	.79
Stimulation	-0.30	-0.32	0.95	-2.38	1.88	-1.10	0.44	0.09	-0.71	.77
Self-direction	0.71	0.73	0.60	-0.65	2.45	0.28	1.10	0.20	0.42	.66
Universalism	0.64	0.63	0.68	-1.05	2.38	0.17	1.19	-0.13	-0.32	.62
Benevolence	0.53	0.58	0.62	-1.23	1.65	0.20	1.00	-0.50	0.02	.66
Conformity	-0.21	-0.15	0.83	-3.13	1.75	-0.82	0.31	-0.21	0.77	.69
Tradition	-0.97	-1.00	0.88	-3.13	1.10	-1.64	-0.33	0.12	-0.42	.62
Security	0.18	0.15	0.65	-1.68	1.45	-0.10	0.63	-0.52	0.33	.55
SCO	37.54	37.50	6.17	23.00	50.00	34.00	42.75	-0.21	-0.43	.77

*Notes.* *IQR (LL)* = Interquartile Range, Lower Limit; *IQR (UL)* = Interquartile Range, Upper Limit; *s* = skewness; *k* = kurtosis. SCO was the outcome variable. Standard errors for skewness and kurtosis were  $SE(s) = 0.25$  and  $SE(k) = 0.49$ , respectively. The coefficient  $\alpha$  indicates Cronbach's internal reliability.

Table A2. *Pearson' r Coefficients for the Correlation Between the Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Power										
2. Achievement	.54***									
3. Hedonism	.13	.01								
4. Stimulation	.10	.07	.47***							
5. Self-direction	-.08	-.09	.01	.23*						
6. Universalism	-.57***	-.40***	-.39***	-.14	.28**					
7. Benevolence	-.32**	-.52***	-.08	-.04	.02	.24*				
8. Conformity	-.29**	-.17	-.36***	-.53***	-.41***	.04	.04			
9. Tradition	-.38***	-.44***	-.29**	-.39***	-.34***	-.01	.14	.31**		
10. Security	.03	-.20*	-.12	-.28**	-.24*	-.17	-.22*	.10	.09	
11. SCO	.21*	.41***	-.01	-.14	-.17	-.23*	-.28**	.19	-.06	-.03

Notes. \*\*\* $p < .001$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$ .

Table A3. *Prior,  $P(M)$  and posterior,  $P(M|Data)$  model probabilities, posterior odds ( $BF_M$ ), and Bayes Factors ( $BF_{10}$ ) for the 10 best models predicting SCO*

Models	P(M)	P(M data)	$BF_M$	$BF_{10}$	$R^2$
Null model (including Age and Gender)	9.77e-4	2.53e-5	0.03	1.00	.033
A + C	9.77e-4	0.05	53.53	1964.73	.242
A + H + C	9.77e-4	0.02	23.12	873.36	.248
A + C + T	9.77e-4	0.02	22.84	862.91	.248
A + U + C	9.77e-4	0.02	21.42	810.21	.247
P + A + C	9.77e-4	0.02	20.85	789.31	.246
A + B + C	9.77e-4	0.02	20.28	767.95	.246
A + S + C	9.77e-4	0.02	18.27	693.23	.244
A + C + SE	9.77e-4	0.02	18.23	691.72	.244
A + S-D + C	9.77e-4	0.02	17.11	649.93	.243
A + H + C + T	9.77e-4	0.01	13.13	500.57	.244

*Note.* A = achievement; C = conformity; H = hedonism; T = tradition; U = universalism; P = power; B = Benevolence; S = Stimulation; S-D = Self-Direction; SE = Security. We limited the output to the best 10 models for ease of interpretation. The same outcomes were observed when different priors and their width were tested.

Table A4. *Hierarchical Regression Analysis on SCO*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	$\beta$	$ t $	<i>p</i>
Step 1					
Gender	-1.33	1.49	-.09	0.89	.376
Age	-0.11	0.07	-.16	1.55	.126
R <sup>2</sup>	.03				
Step 2					
Gender	-0.03	1.54	-.01	0.02	.986
Age	-0.05	0.08	-.08	0.71	.477
Power	1.36	1.13	.21	1.20	.233
Achievement	4.06	1.49	.63	2.73	.008**
Hedonism	1.83	1.23	.26	1.49	.141
Stimulation	0.27	0.99	.04	0.27	.791
Self-direction	1.47	1.51	.14	0.98	.332
Universalism	1.89	1.97	.21	0.96	.342
Benevolence	0.76	1.62	.08	0.47	.640
Conformity	3.20	1.33	.43	2.40	.019*
Tradition	2.06	1.42	.29	1.44	.153
Security	1.23	1.51	.13	0.81	.418
R <sup>2</sup>	.28				

*Notes.* \*\* $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$ . Residuals were normally distributed. Inspection of the residuals over predicted values and all partial scatterplots revealed that the assumptions of homoscedasticity and linearity were met, respectively. Low multicollinearity was evidenced by the correlation coefficients between the predictors, which were not too high (all  $|rs| < .58$ ), and by the high tolerance values, which were all  $> .80$ . Finally, although Conformity did not significantly correlate with SCO it significantly predicted it when entered in the regression equation. This result was due to the direct effect of Conformity on SCO ( $B = 1.98$ ,  $SE = 0.68$ ; 95% CI = 0.65, 3.30) being of opposite direction to its indirect effect via Achievement ( $B = -0.59$ ,  $SE = 0.36$ ; 95% CI = -1.30, 0.12), which reduced the total effect of Conformity on SCO as captured by the zero-order correlation ( $B = 1.39$ ,  $SE = 0.75$ ; 95% CI = -0.08, 2.86).