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Study Scenarios

Pre-Pandemic Scenario
In a particular company, a group of coworkers was responsible for completing a very important project. The project itself involved few complications, but one problem constantly plagued the group. One coworker, who we will call Mark/Mary, consistently showed up late for meetings and, worse, missed deadlines.

Mark/Mary had reasonable excuses for every incident. For example, in one case he/she was tied up with an emergency with his/her 6-month old, and in another he/she had to go to his/her 7-year old’s parent teacher conference.

In the final analysis, his/her work did not get done to the group’s satisfaction. Some group members felt like they were often charged with the responsibilities that should have been Mark/Mary’s. Group relations suffered. The members of the group often lost their patience with each other and became sidetracked from the project. As a result of these issues, the final product did not meet expectations of quality.

Pandemic Scenario
Due to the coronavirus outbreak, people need to adjust to different work-from-home and mixed work modes.

In a particular company, a group of coworkers was responsible for completing a very important project. The project itself involved few complications, including partially adjusting to work-from-home mode due to the coronavirus outbreak, but one problem constantly plagued the group. One coworker, who we will call Mark/Mary, consistently showed up late for online meetings and, worse, missed deadlines.

Mark/Mary had reasonable excuses for every incident. For example, in one case he/she was tied up with an emergency with his/her 6-month-old, and in another he/she had to go to his/her 7-year old’s virtual parent teacher conference.

In the final analysis, his/her work did not get done to the group’s satisfaction. Some group members felt like they were often charged with the responsibilities that should have been Mark/Mary’s. Group relations suffered. The members of the group often lost their patience with each other and became sidetracked from the project. As a result of these issues, the final product did not meet expectations of quality.
Supplemental Analyses

Overview

The direct effects of 2 (Pandemic: Pre-Pandemic vs. Pandemic) × 2 (Employee gender: Male vs. Female) on the outcomes are pre-registered. The indirect effects from the moderated mediation analyses are pre-registered as exploratory analyses in https://osf.io/d48cv/?view_only=b677b9927eb04cb58cc9093bcf68fa6c.

The main analyses in the manuscript presented the moderated mediation effects of Pandemic and Gender on punishment and support through culpability judgment with Pandemic as the moderator. Table S1 presented a follow-up analysis with employee gender as a moderator. Table S2 and Table S3 presented the analyses by separating the culpability judgment into blameworthiness and responsibility respectively. Given that blameworthiness and responsibility were highly correlated, the analyses in the manuscript combined them into culpability judgment to simplify the presentation. The pattern of results are similar. Table S4 and Table S5 present the same moderated mediation analyses as the ones in the main text but with perceived status and perceived competence of the target as the mediators respectively. The effects of perceived status and perceived competence showed similar trend as the effect on culpability, although they did not reach statistical significance (p < .05).

Table S6 displays the means of culpability across different demographic groups. Table S7 displays the results with all the covariates (participant nationality, socioeconomic status, number of children, gender). Tables S8 through S11 are exploratory subsample analyses of the 2 (Pandemic: Pre-Pandemic vs. Pandemic) × 2 (Employee gender: Male vs. Female) effect on culpability judgement. These analyses were conducted in order to explore whether participants with different demographic characteristics such as nationality, SES, number of children, and gender show different patterns of culpability judgement towards men and women whose family interrupt work. For factors that show at least marginally significant effects (p < .10), we display the differences in Figures S1 through S5.
Table S1
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Culpability Judgment with Employee Gender as moderator (N = 971)

| Mediator: Culpability Judgment | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI  |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----|------|------|---------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | -.60 | .40 | -1.50 | .135 | [-1.37, .18] |
| Employee Gender x Pandemic | -.20 | .18 | -1.11 | .267 | [-.55, .15] |

| DV: Bonus | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI  |
|-----------|-------------|-----|------|------|---------|
| Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) Culpability | 5.70 | 1.59 | 3.58 | .0004 | [2.58, 8.82] |
| Culpability | -4.29 | .41 | -10.53 | <.001 | [-5.08, -3.49] |

Index of moderated mediation

| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|-------------|-----|--------|
| -2.27       | 1.10 | [-4.56, -.18] |

Conditional indirect effects

| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|-------------|-----|--------|
| Female Employee | .85 | .79 | [-.69, 2.46] |
| Male Employee | -1.42 | .75 | [-2.94, -.005] |
Table S1 (contd.)
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Culpability Judgment with Employee Gender as moderator (N = 971)

|          | DV: Probation |          | DV: Invitation |          |
|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|----------|
|          | Coefficient   | SE       | t              | p        | 95% CI   | Coefficient | SE       | t        | p        | 95% CI   |
| Pandemic | -.31          | .17      | -1.85          | .065     | [-.64, .02] | .65         | .13      | 4.90     | <.001    | [.39, .91] |
| (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Culpability | .28          | .04      | 6.56           | <.001    | [.20, .37] | -.47        | .03      | -13.90   | <.001    | [-.54, -.41] |
| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI |
| | .15          | .08      | [.01, .32] | | | |
| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI |
| Female Employee | -.06        | .06      | [-.17, .04] | | | |
| Male Employee | .09         | .05      | [-.003, .20] | | | |
| Pandemic | -.25          | .12      | -.49           | -.02     | [-.49, -.02] | | | | | |
| (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Culpability | .25          | .12      | [.07, .26] | | | |
| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI | Coefficient | SE       | 95% CI |
| Female Employee | .09         | .09      | [.07, .26] | | | |
| Male Employee | -.16        | .08      | [.32, .004] | | | |
Table S1 (contd.)
**Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Culpability Judgment with Employee Gender as moderator (N = 971)**

| Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) Culpability | DV: Empathetic Understanding | 95% CI |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
|            | Coefficient | SE | t     | p     |        |
| Pandemic   | .36         | .14 | 2.56  | .011  | [.09, .64] |
|            | -.44        | .04 | -12.02 | <.001 | [-.51, -.37] |

Index of moderated mediation

| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
|-------------|----|--------|
| -.23        | .11 | [-.46, -.01] |

Conditional indirect effects

| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
|-------------|----|--------|
| Female Employee | .09 | .08 | [-.07, .25] |
| Male Employee | -.14 | .08 | [-.30, .005] |
Table S2
*Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Blameworthiness (N = 971)*

| Mediator: Blameworthiness | Coefficient | SE  | t      | p    | 95% CI |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -.61        | .42 | -1.47  | .143 | [-1.43, .21] |
| Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | -.19        | .19 | -1.03  | .302 | [-.56, .18] |
| Employee Gender x Pandemic | .56         | .26 | 2.14   | .033 | [.05, 1.08] |

| DV: Bonus | Coefficient | SE  | t      | p    | 95% CI |
|-----------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -.69        | 1.60| -.43   | .665 | [-3.83, 2.45] |
| Blameworthiness | -4.08      | .39 | -10.50 | <.001 | [-4.85, -3.32] |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----|-------|
|                               | -2.30       | 1.12| [-4.60, -.18] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| Pre-Pandemic Pandemic | .20         | .77 | [-1.29, 1.76] |
| Pandemic                  | -2.10       | .80 | [-3.74, -.59] |
| DV: Probation |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employee Gender | .16 | .17 | .93 | .353 | [-.17, .49] |
| (0 = female, 1 = male) |   |   |   |   |   |
| Blameworthiness | .25 | .04 | 6.04 | <.001 | [.17, .33] |
| Index of moderated mediation |   |   |   |   |   |
| Coefficient | .14 | .07 |   |   | [.01, .30] |
| Conditional indirect effects |   |   |   |   |   |
| Pre-Pandemic | -.01 | .05 |   |   | [-.11, .08] |
| Pandemic | .13 | .05 |   |   | [.03, .25] |
| DV: Invitation |   |   |   |   |   |
| Employee Gender | .27 | .13 | 2.01 | .045 | [.01, .53] |
| (0 = female, 1 = male) |   |   |   |   |   |
| Blameworthiness | -.45 | .03 | -13.66 | <.001 | [-.51, -.38] |
| Index of moderated mediation |   |   |   |   |   |
| Coefficient | -.25 | .12 |   |   | [-.50, -.02] |
| Conditional indirect effects |   |   |   |   |   |
| Pre-Pandemic Pandemic | .02 | .08 |   |   | [.14, .19] |
| Pandemic | -.23 | .09 |   |   | [-.40, -.06] |
Table S2 (contd.)

Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Blameworthiness (N = 971)

| DV: Empathetic Understanding | Coefficient | SE  | t   | p    | 95% CI       |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|------|--------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | .06         | .14 | .41 | .684 | [-.22, .34]  |
| Blameworthiness            | -.41        | .03 | -11.89 | <.001 | [-.48, -.34] |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI       |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------------|
|                               | -.23        | .11 | [-.45, -.02] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI       |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 | .02         | .08 | [-.13, .17]  |
| Pandemic                     | -.21        | .08 | [-.37, -.06] |
Table S3
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Responsibility (N = 971)

| Mediator: Responsibility | Coefficient | SE  | t        | p       | 95% CI          |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|----------|---------|-----------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -0.61       | 0.39 | -1.58    | 0.114   | [-1.37, 0.15]   |
| Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | -0.26       | 0.17 | -1.52    | 0.128   | [-0.60, 0.08]   |
| Employee Gender x Pandemic | 0.51        | 0.24 | 2.08     | 0.038   | [0.03, 0.98]    |

| DV: Bonus | Coefficient | SE  | t        | p       | 95% CI          |
|-----------|-------------|-----|----------|---------|-----------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -1.08       | 1.62 | -0.67    | 0.506   | [-4.27, 2.11]   |
| Responsibility | -3.76       | 0.43 | -8.79    | <0.001  | [-4.61, -2.92]  |

Index of moderated mediation

| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI          |
|-------------|-----|-----------------|
| -1.91       | 0.96 | [-3.89, -1.12]  |

Conditional indirect effects

| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI          |
|-------------|-----|-----------------|
| Pre-Pandemic | 0.39     | 0.65   | [-0.86, 1.70]  |
| Pandemic    | 1.51   | 0.69   | [-2.94, -0.24] |
Table S3 (contd.)
*Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Responsibility (N = 971)*

| DV: Probation | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI    |
|---------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-----------|
| Employee Gender | .17 | .17 | 1.00 | .319  | [.16, .50] |
| Responsibility | .32 | .04 | 7.20 | <.001 | [.23, .41] |

| Index of moderated mediation |
|-------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI    |
| .16           | .08  | [.01, .34] |

| Conditional indirect effects |
|-------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI    |
| Pre-Pandemic | .03 | .06 | [.15, .07] |
| Pandemic    | .13 | .06 | [.02, .26] |

| DV: Invitation | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI    |
|----------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-----------|
| Employee Gender | .23 | .14 | 1.67 | .095  | [.04, .50] |
| Responsibility | -.43 | .04 | -11.78 | <.001 | [-.50, -.36] |

| Index of moderated mediation |
|-------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI    |
| -.22         | .11  | [-.43, -.01] |

| Conditional indirect effects |
|-------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI    |
| Pre-Pandemic | .04 | .07 | [-.10, .20] |
| Pandemic    | -.17 | .08 | [-.32, -.03] |
Table S3 (contd.)

Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Responsibility (N = 971)

| DV: Empathetic Understanding | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI    |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-----------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) Responsibility | .02 | .15 | .14  | .889  | [-.26, .31] |
| Responsibility              | -.39        | .04 | -10.14 | <.001 | [-.46, -.31] |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
|                              | -.20        | .10 | [-.39, -.01] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 | .04         | .07 | [-.09, .18] |
| Pandemic                     | -.16        | .07 | [-.29, -.03] |
Table S4
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Status (N = 971)

| Mediator: Perceived Status | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI      |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----|------|------|-------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | .41         | .39 | 1.04 | .298 | [-.36, 1.18] |
| Pandemic (0 = Pre-Pandemic, 1 = Pandemic) | .90         | .18 | 5.11 | <.001| [.56, 1.25]  |
| Employee Gender x Pandemic | -.31        | .25 | -1.27| .206 | [-.80, .17]  |

| DV: Bonus | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI      |
|-----------|-------------|-----|------|------|-------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -1.28       | 1.52| -.84 | .400 | [-4.27, 1.71] |
| Perceived Status | 5.76       | .39 | 14.85| <.001| [5.00, 6.52] |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI      |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------|
|                               | -1.81       | 1.44| [-4.70, .92] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI      |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 | .55         | 1.01| [-1.40, 2.52] |
| Pandemic                     | -1.26       | 1.01| [-3.32, .71]  |
Table S4 (contd.)

Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Status (N = 971)

| DV: Probation | Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | Perceived Status |
|---------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|
|               | Coefficient | SE  | t     | p    | 95% CI    |
|               | .21         | .17 | 1.20  | .229 | [-.13, .54] |
|               | -.15        | .04 | -3.49 | .001 | [-.24, -.07] |

| Index of moderated mediation |
|------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
| .05          | .04 | [-.02, .15] |

| Conditional indirect effects |
|------------------------------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 |
| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
| -.01        | .03 | [-.08, .04] |
| .03          | .03 | [-.02, .10] |

| DV: Invitation | Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | Perceived Status |
|----------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|
|                | Coefficient | SE  | t     | p    | 95% CI    |
|                | .22         | .10 | 2.07  | .039 | [.01, .42] |
|                | .82         | .03 | 30.48 | <.001| [.76, .87] |

| Index of moderated mediation |
|------------------------------|
| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
| -.26         | .20 | [-.65, .15] |

| Conditional indirect effects |
|------------------------------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 |
| Coefficient | SE | 95% CI |
| .08          | .14 | [-.20, .36] |
| -.18         | .14 | [-.46, .10] |
Table S4 (contd.)

Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Status

| DV: Empathetic Understanding | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI     |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|------------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | -0.01       | 0.14 | -0.09 | .931  | [-0.29, 0.27] |
| Perceived Status            | 0.41        | 0.04 | 11.16| <.001 | [0.34, 0.48] |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
|                              | -0.13       | 0.10 | [-0.34, 0.07] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 | 0.04        | 0.07 | [-0.10, 0.18] |
| Pandemic                     | -0.09       | 0.07 | [-0.24, 0.05] |
Table S5

*Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Competence (N = 971)*

| Mediator: Competence | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI          |
|----------------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|
| Employee Gender      | .44         | .41 | 1.09 | .276  | [-.35, 1.24]    |
| Pandemic             | .27         | .18 | 1.48 | .138  | [-.09, .63]     |
| Employee Gender x Pandemic | -.48   | .26 | -1.86| .063  | [-.98, .03]     |

| DV: Bonus            | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p     | 95% CI          |
|----------------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-----------------|
| Employee Gender      | .03         | 1.50| .02  | .985  | [-2.91, 2.97]   |
| Perceived Competence | 6.10        | .37 | 16.26| <.001 | [5.36, 6.83]    |

| Index of moderated mediation | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
|                               | -2.91       | 1.59| [-6.03, .20] |

| Conditional indirect effects | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
| Pre-Pandemic                 | -.21        | 1.11| [-2.39, 1.96] |
| Pandemic                     | -3.12       | 1.14| [-5.41, -.94] |
Table S5 (contd.)
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Competence (N = 971)

| DV: Probation                   | Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|------|------|---------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | .18         | .17 | 1.05 | .294 | [-.16, .52] |
| Perceived Competence            | -.13        | .04 | -2.98| .003 | [-.21, -.04] |

| Index of moderated mediation    | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|---------|
|                                | .06         | .05 | [-.003, .17] |

| Conditional indirect effects    | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|---------|
| Pre-Pandemic Pandemic           | -.02        | .11 | [-.24, .20] |
| Pandemic                        | -.31        | .11 | [-.53, -.09] |

DV: Invitation

| Coefficient | SE  | t    | p    | 95% CI  |
|-------------|-----|------|------|---------|
| Employee Gender (0 = female, 1 = male) | .33         | .12 | 2.67 | .008  | [.09, .58] |
| Perceived Competence              | .61         | .03 | 19.49| <.001 | [.55, .67] |

| Index of moderated mediation    | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|---------|
|                                | -.29        | .16 | [-.60, .02] |

| Conditional indirect effects    | Coefficient | SE  | 95% CI  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|---------|
| Pre-Pandemic Pandemic           | -.02        | .11 | [-.24, .20] |
| Pandemic                        | -.31        | .11 | [-.53, -.09] |
Table S5 (contd.)
Results of the Moderated Mediated Effects of Employee Gender and Pandemic on Punishment and Support through Perceived Competence (N = 971)

|                      | Coefficient | SE  | t   | p    | 95% CI       |
|----------------------|-------------|-----|-----|------|--------------|
| DV: Empathetic Understanding |             |     |     |      |              |
| Employee Gender      | .09         | .14 | .65 | .514 | [-.18, .37]  |
| (0 = female, 1 = male) |             |     |     |      |              |
| Perceived Competence | .47         | .04 | 13.46 | <.001 | [.40, .54]   |
|                      |             |     |     |      |              |
| Index of moderated mediation |             |     |     |      |              |
| Coefficient          | -.23        | .12 |     |      | [-.47, .02]  |
|                      |             |     |     |      |              |
| Conditional indirect effects |             |     |     |      |              |
| Pre-Pandemic         | -.02        | .09 |     |      | [-.19, .16]  |
| Pandemic             | -.24        | .09 |     |      | [-.41, -.07] |


Table S6
Means of Culpability Judgment Across Different Groups

|                  | Pre-Pandemic |                      | Pandemic |                      |                      |
|------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                  | Female Target (N = 236) | Male Target (N = 246) | Female & Male Target Combined (N = 482) | Female Target (N = 240) | Male Target (N = 249) | Female & Male Target Combined (N = 489) |
| **Nationality**  | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       |
| UK               | 5.87  2.07    | 5.83  2.03    | 5.85  2.05    | 5.59  2.16    | 6.11  1.78    | 5.87  1.98    |
| US               | 6.07  2.04    | 6.65  1.86    | 6.36  1.95    | 5.99  1.53    | 6.85  1.69    | 6.36  1.65    |
| all else         | 6.25  1.74    | 5.93  1.85    | 6.07  1.81    | 5.91  2.19    | 6.24  1.93    | 6.08  2.06    |
| **SES**          | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       |
| Low              | 6.30  1.95    | 5.94  1.91    | 6.12  1.93    | 5.86  2.08    | 6.01  1.76    | 5.94  1.91    |
| Middle           | 5.87  1.98    | 6.11  2.04    | 6.00  2.01    | 5.70  1.93    | 6.55  1.62    | 6.10  1.83    |
| High             | 5.73  1.86    | 5.83  1.90    | 5.78  1.87    | 5.92  2.12    | 6.60  2.11    | 6.27  2.14    |
| **# of Children**| Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       |
| No children      | 6.25  1.85    | 5.94  1.99    | 6.09  1.93    | 5.88  2.02    | 6.26  1.87    | 6.08  1.95    |
| More than 1 child| 5.70  2.06    | 6.03  1.87    | 5.86  1.97    | 5.70  2.13    | 6.41  1.85    | 6.07  2.01    |
| **Participant Gender** | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       | Mean  SD       |
| Female           | 5.82  2.04    | 6.01  2.12    | 5.91  2.07    | 5.52  2.10    | 5.92  1.79    | 5.71  1.97    |
| Male             | 6.34  1.78    | 5.93  1.73    | 6.12  1.76    | 6.08  1.98    | 6.51  1.87    | 6.31  1.93    |
Table S7

Results for Employee Gender × Pandemic with Nationality, SES, # of children, and participant gender as covariates (N = 971)

| DV: Culpability | $F$ (1,961) | $p$  | Partial eta squared | $R$-squared | Adjusted $R$-squared |
|-----------------|------------|------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Intercept       | 6890.45    | <.001| .88                  | .03         | .02                  |
| Gender          | 2.30       | .129 | .002                 |             |                      |
| Pandemic        | .15        | .703 | <.001                |             |                      |
| Gender × Pandemic| 5.07      | .025 | .01                  |             |                      |
| Nationality     | 4.07       | .017 | .01                  |             |                      |
| SES             | .26        | .772 | .001                 |             |                      |
| Children        | .07        | .789 | <.001                |             |                      |
| Participant gender | 8.81    | .003 | .01                  |             |                      |

Notes. Gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male; Pandemic is coded as 0 = pre-pandemic, 1 = pandemic; Nationality: 0 = U.K., 1 = U.S., 2 = all else*; Social Economic Status (SES) is coded as 0 = low, 1 = middle, 2 = high**

*The samples of some subgroups are too small to be analyzed separately. The two largest groups (U.S. and the U.K.) are coded separately, and the rest are grouped into one. We recognize the diversity within the subgroups. The findings should be interpreted with caution.

**Income of the respondents is used as a proxy of their SES. According to the Office for National Statistics, the median income in the U.K. was £29,000 in year 2020. Therefore, we categorize participant’s income levels based on the median as a proxy for different SES categories.
### Table S8

*Results for Employee Gender × Pandemic × Nationality (U.K. vs. U.S. vs. all else) on Culpability (N = 971)*

| DV: Culpability | $F$ (1, 959) | $p$    | Partial eta squared | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Intercept       | 7393.02     | <.001  | .89                 | .02       | .01               |
| Gender          | 5.19        | .023   | .1                  |           |                   |
| Pandemic        | .01         | .908   | <.001               |           |                   |
| Nationality     | 4.13        | .016   | .01                 |           |                   |
| Gender × Pandemic | 3.12    | .078   | .003                |           |                   |
| Pandemic × Nationality | .02 | .977   | <.001               |           |                   |
| Gender × Nationality | 1.90   | .150   | .004                |           |                   |
| Gender × Pandemic × Nationality | .13 | .880   | <.001               |           |                   |

*Notes. Gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male; Pandemic is coded as 0 = pre-pandemic, 1 = pandemic; Nationality: 0 = U.K., 1 = U.S., 2 = all else*

*The samples of some subgroups are too small to be analyzed separately. The two largest groups (U.S. and the U.K.) are coded separately, and the rest are grouped into one. We recognize the diversity within the subgroups. The findings should be interpreted with caution.

### Figure S1

*Means of Culpability Across Different Nationalities*

*Note. Culpability ratings between U.K. & U.S. are significantly different ($p = .007$). U.K. vs. All else ($p = .105$), US vs. All else ($p = .124$) are not significantly different.*
Table S9

Results for Employee Gender $\times$ Pandemic $\times$ Social Economic Status (SES) on Culpability (N = 971)

| DV: Culpability | $F$ (1, 959) | $p$    | Partial eta squared | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Intercept       | 8546.41     | <.001  | .90                 | .02       | .01               |
| Gender          | 4.53        | .034   | .01                 |           |                   |
| Pandemic        | 1.21        | .271   | .001                |           |                   |
| SES             | .03         | .973   | <.001               |           |                   |
| Gender $\times$ Pandemic | 4.75    | .030   | .01                 |           |                   |
| Pandemic $\times$ SES | 2.39    | .092   | .01                 |           |                   |
| Gender $\times$ SES | 2.66    | .071   | .01                 |           |                   |
| Gender $\times$ Pandemic $\times$ SES | .02     | .981   | <.001               |           |                   |

Notes. Gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male; Pandemic is coded as 0 = pre-pandemic, 1 = pandemic; Social Economic Status (SES) is coded as 0 = low, 1 = middle, 2 = high*

*Income of the respondents is used as a proxy of their SES. According to the Office for National Statistics, the median income in the U.K. was £29,000 in year 2020. Therefore, we categorize participant’s income levels based on the median as a proxy for different SES categories.

Figure S2

Interaction Effect of Employee Gender $\times$ SES on Culpability
Figure S3
Interaction Effect of Pandemic × SES on Culpability
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Table S10

Results for Employee Gender × Pandemic × # of Children on Culpability (N = 971)

| DV: Culpability | F (I, 963) | p     | Partial eta squared | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared |
|-----------------|------------|-------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Intercept       | 7757.32    | .000  | .89                 | .01       | .01                |
| Gender          | 4.15       | .042  | .004                |           |                    |
| Pandemic        | .39        | .533  | <.001               |           |                    |
| # of Children   | .86        | .354  | .001                |           |                    |
| Gender × Pandemic| 3.79       | .052  | .004                |           |                    |
| Pandemic × # of Children | .61 | .436 | .001                |           |                    |
| Gender × # of Children | 3.14 | .077 | .003                |           |                    |
| Gender × Pandemic × # of Children | .34 | .562 | <.001               |           |                    |

Notes. Gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male; Pandemic is coded as 0 = pre-pandemic, 1 = pandemic; # of Children is coded 0 = no children, 1 = have one or more children

Figure S4

Interaction effect of Employee Gender × # of Children on Culpability
Table S11

Results for Employee Gender × Pandemic × Participant Gender on Culpability (N = 971)

| DV: Culpability | $F$ (1, 963) | $p$   | Partial eta squared | $R$-squared | Adjusted $R$-squared |
|-----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Intercept       | 9026.44     | .000  | .90                 | .02         | .02                 |
| Gender          | 1.51        | .220  | .002                |             |                     |
| Pandemic        | .02         | .903  | <.001               |             |                     |
| Participant gender | 9.89    | .002  | .01                 |             |                     |
| Gender × Pandemic | 4.39     | .037  | .01                 |             |                     |
| Pandemic × Participant gender | 1.95    | .163  | .002                |             |                     |
| Gender × Participant gender | 1.31    | .252  | .001                |             |                     |
| Gender × Pandemic × Participant gender | 1.57    | .211  | .002                |             |                     |

Notes. Gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male; Pandemic is coded as 0 = pre-pandemic, 1 = pandemic; Participant gender is coded as 0 = female, 1 = male

Figure S5

Means of Culpability Across Participant Gender

Note. Culpability ratings between female and male participants are significant ($p = .002$).