



Psychology Extended Research Project Application for Ethical Approval

1. Applicant details

Staff name: Dr Karl-Andrew Woltin

University email address: Woltin.Karl-Andrew@roehampton.ac.uk

2. External review

Has this project been considered by the University Ethics Committee?

University ethics approval: Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes please enter your reference number: [Click here to enter text.](#)

3. Topic title: Practice what you value: The impact of value frame and individual differences on value-congruent behaviour

4. Topic background

In the text box below you should provide a brief background and rationale for the project(s). This should be done in a way that is both accessible and scholarly, i.e. have proper cited sources

The purpose of this proposed project is to test if a fit between framing values either in terms of approach or avoidance and individuals' chronic inclinations towards either approach (behavioural activation system, BAS and promotion focus) or avoidance (behavioural inhibition system, BIS, and prevention focus) increase behaviour in line with the targeted value (here: universalism/equality). It is an extension of two previous 3rd year student projects (Sade Hamilton, ethic reference 3YP_2017/17_135; Rachel Fapohunda, ethic reference 3YP_2017/17_133).

The theory of basic human values (Schwartz, 1992) is concerned with the *content* of human motivation, and it proposes that there are ten basic values that represent different underlying motivational goals. The current project only focuses on the value of universalism (i.e., concern with social justice, tolerance and equality). To date, values have been predominantly conceptualized as desirable ideals people strive for, for example as "desirable trans-situational goals" (Schwartz, 1994, p. 21) or as "enduring beliefs that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). However, values can also be conceptualised as counter-ideals people seek to avoid, and thus values might repel individuals to the degree that they identify themselves by the value that they repel (Van Quaquebeke, Graf, Kerschreiter, Schuh, & van Dick, 2014).

Process theories of human motivation are concerned with the self-regulatory processes underlying behaviour, highlighting differences in strategic inclinations during goal pursuit. Several theories postulate a general distinction between individuals who are rather approach- or avoidance-oriented in pursuing their goals (see Carver, Sutton, & Scheier, 2000). These theories consider a behavioural approach system (BAS), which motivates approach towards specific end-states, is activated by reward/non-punishment signals, and biased towards positive cues and approach goals, as opposed to a behavioural inhibition system (BIS), which motivates avoidance of specific end-states (i.e., inhibits movement that may lead to negative outcomes), is activated by punishment/non-reward signals, and biased towards negative cues and avoidance goals. Similarly, according to regulatory focus theory, the two distinct self-regulatory systems operating within individuals are a promotion and a prevention focus (Higgins, 1997, 1998). In a promotion focus, the goals individuals pursue are hopes, wishes, and aspirations (ideals), which they pursue using eager strategies, and they focus on the presence or absence of positive outcomes (gains). Conversely, in a prevention focus, the goals individuals pursue are duties, obligations, and

responsibilities (oughts), which they pursue with vigilant strategies, and they focus on the presence or absence of negative outcomes (losses). Of interest in the current context, a strategic approach (avoidance) orientation "is the natural strategy for promotion (prevention) self-regulation" (Higgins, 1997, p. 1282, parenthesis added; see also Higgins 1998; cf. Carver & Scheier 1998). Thus, regulatory focus and motivational orientation often operate similarly (e.g., Friedman & Förster, 2000; 2002).

Previous research has found that framing of messages to fit individual's regulatory focus or motivational orientations increases value and engagement. For example, messages focusing on desirable outcomes people seek to approach are more effective in a promotion focus and with approach motivation (BAS), and those focusing on undesirable outcomes people seek to avoid are more effective in prevention focus and with avoidance motivation (BIS; e.g., Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004; Cesario, Corker, & Jelinek, 2013; Mann, Sherman, & Updegraff, 2004; Sherman, Mann, & Updegraff, 2006). Moreover, high BAS individuals donate more money to charities promoting positive compared with preventing negative outcomes (and vice-versa for high BIS individuals; Jeong, Shi, Baazova, Chiu, Nahai et al., 2011).

STUDY RATIONALE OMITTED FOR THE ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT TASK

References

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Cavrer, C. S., Sutton, S. K., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Action, emotion, and personality: Emerging conceptual integration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 741-751.
- Cesario, J., Corker, K. S., & Jelinek, S. (2013). A self-regulatory framework for message framing. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 238-249.
- Cesario, J., Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from "feeling right". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 388-404.
- Friedman, R. S., & Förster, J. (2000). The effects of approach and avoidance motor actions on the elements of creative insight. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 477-492.
- Friedman, R. S., & Förster, J. (2002). The influence of approach and avoidance motor actions on creative cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 41-55.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and Prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 1-46). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Jeong, E. S., Shi, Y., Baazova, A., Chiu, C., Nahai, A. et al. (2011). The relation of approach/avoidance motivation and message framing to the effectiveness of charitable appeals. *Social Influence*, 6, 15-21.

- Mann, T., Sherman, D., & Updegraff, J. (2004). Dispositional motivations and message framing: A test of the congruency hypothesis in college students. *Health Psychology, 23*, 330-334.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In Zanna, M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 19-45.
- Sherman, D. K., Mann, T., & Updegraff, J. A. (2006). Approach/avoidance motivation, message framing, and health behavior: Understanding the congruency effect. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*, 165-169.
- Van Quaquebeke, N., Graf, M. M., Kerschreiter, R., Schuh, S. C., & van Dick, R. (2014). Ideal values and counter-ideal values as two distinct forces: Exploring a gap in organizational value research. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 16*, 211-225.
- Wolfin, K.-A., & Bardi, A. (in preparation). Fitting values to human motivation: Exploring approach versus avoidance perspective on guiding principles in life. *Unpublished manuscript*.

5. Research methodology

This section should include the details of the design and methods, i.e., what will be done and how. Attach copies of questionnaires (along with their permissions for use or licensing conditions) in your appendix and provide a brief explanation below. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that the use of all questionnaires adheres to licensing and copyright conditions. If you are using a lab-based paradigm briefly describe the experiment (e.g. location, procedure, experimental stimuli). If the research involves interviews/focus groups briefly describe the location of the study, provide example questions, indicate if participants will be audio or video recorded and list any stimuli/media that will be used during the session.

Design

The study will measure participants' regulatory focus (IV1A, promotion and prevention) and their motivational orientation (IV1B, approach and avoidance) with established scales. It will then present participants with a series of tasks (detailed below) used in previous research to increase their value of universalism (equality). This will be done by either framing this value as an ideal end state and in terms of approach (e.g., achieving equality) or in terms of a counter-ideal end state and in terms of avoidance (e.g., preventing inequality; IV2). Participants will then be allocated to minimal groups and use matrices to distribute points to their minimal ingroup and the minimal outgroup (DV1). They will subsequently also be asked to what extent they are willing to promote "equality" and "prevent inequality" slogans by wearing t-shirts with such slogans and to volunteer for organisations that aim to ensure equality or prevent inequality (DV2, DV3).

Thus, though students collect data collectively, each student has their own project, as specified below:

Student 1 – IV1A, IV2, DV1

Student 2 – IV1A, IV2, DV2, 3

Student 3 – IV1B, IV2, DV1

Student 4 – IV1B, IV2, DV2, 3

There are thus 2 studies that actually take place, one with a 2 (regulatory focus) x 2 (value framing) design and one with a 2 (motivational orientation) x 2 (value framing design) design, with overall three different dependent variables to be tested (point allocation, willingness to promote slogans, willingness to volunteer for organisations).

Participants

240 undergraduate students will be recruited using SONA (Psychology participant recruitment system) from the University of Roehampton and given 1 credit for participating in a 50 minute study. Volunteer participants will be recruited online (email, twitter, facebook, etc.; see appendix 3). Participants will be aged 18 or over; there are no further inclusion or exclusion criteria. Justification of sample size: G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) indicates that to detect a medium size effect ($f=.025$ / $\eta_p^2=.06$) with $\alpha=.05$ and 90% power ($1-\beta$) using the above design requires 240 participants. Students will thus have to recruit 60 participants each for this lab experiment (i.e., 10 more than previously expected for 3rd year projects of this nature). Participants will be run in group sessions (of min. 4 participants), so this will at maximum take 15 hours per 3rd year student.

Materials and Procedure

Participants will be invited to take part via SONA or as volunteers (see appendix 3) and will be given an informed consent form to read before starting the respective study, in which they are informed that they are free to withdraw from the experiment at any time and without having to give a reason or incur any penalty and also about the different questionnaires and tasks the study entails (see appendix 1). Participants will be run in groups of min. 4 people. They will start by creating their own unique seven-digit participation code and filling in a demographics questionnaire (see appendix 4). Participants will then fill in half of the approach and avoidance items from the Approach/Avoidance Portrait Value Questionnaire that measure universalism and power (power because this is the value empirically found to be opposed to universalism; Schwartz, 1994); they will fill in the other half at the end of the experiment to see if the manipulations increased universalism values (AP- and AV-PVQ: Woltin & Bardi, in preparation; see appendix 5). Subsequently, their regulatory focus will be measured using the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 2001; see appendix 6) and their motivational orientation will be measured using the BIS/BAS scale (Carver & White, 1994: see appendix 7).

Participants will then be randomly assigned to the different value framing conditions. In both, they will perform several tasks, all directly taken from Arieli, Grant and Sagiv (2014), but tailored to universalism (rather than benevolence,

as in the original research). In the ideal/approach framing condition they will first read a short scientific testimony that stresses the importance of universalism (see appendix 8). The second exercise is designed to increase the value of universalism. Participants are asked to write a short persuasive essay about the importance of universalism (see appendix 9). In the counter-ideal/avoidance framing condition participants will engage in the same tasks, but they will be framing universalism in terms of avoiding negative outcomes (see appendices 8-9; information in brackets). To check if these tasks indeed increased participants universalism values, participants will fill in the other half of the approach and avoidance items from the Approach/Avoidance Portrait Value Questionnaire that measure universalism (see appendix 5).

Participants will then be randomly assigned to a minimal group (red or blue) following and adaptation of Tajfel's (1970) minimal group paradigm as used by Maio, Hahn, Frost, and Cheung (2009). Group membership will be determined by drawing a slip of paper from several papers with "red" and "blue" labels and containing numbers from 30-100. Participants are told that the number is a code for them to write in their decision booklets, which they will then receive. They are further told that they will be asked to allocate points to members of both groups and that their decisions will affect future red and blue group members taking part in future sessions. They will be given general instruction on how to make point allocations using the matrices in their booklets (Bourhis, Schadev, & Gagnon, 1994). After having read the instructions, they are further told that their current group will be given the average number of points that members of their group assigned to future members of their groups, meaning that the more points participants allocate to their own group, the more points they will receive themselves. This caveat is a modification of Tajfel's (1970) paradigm used by Maio, Olson, Allen, and Bernard (2001) to give participants added incentive to favour their own group and to increase conflict with the value of equality. Participants then indicate their group colour and code number on the front of their booklets. These booklets will contain six Tajfel matrices (for two examples, see appendix 10), all of which are taken from Bourhis et al. (1994). For each matrix, participants are asked to put a cross in the column that corresponds to the number of points they wish to allocate to the two future participants and to write their choice below the matrix. A measure of intergroup equality will be computed by subtracting the points allocated to the outgroup from the points allocated to the ingroup across the six matrices.

Participants then answer questions gauging their motivation to promote "equality" and "prevent inequality" slogans and to volunteer for organisations that aim to ensure equality or prevent inequality (see appendix 11). Finally, participants are fully debriefed (see appendix 2).

Additional References

Arieli, S., Grant, A. M., & Sagiv, L., (2014). Convincing yourself to care about others: An intervention for enhancing benevolence values. *Journal of Personality*, 82, 15-24.

Bourhis, R. Y., Schadev, I., & Gagnon, A. (1994). Intergroup research with the Tajfel matrices: Methodological notes. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.),

The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario Symposium (Vol. 7, pp, 209-232). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cavrer, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impeding reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 319-333.

Higgins, E.T., Friedmam, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O.N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientation from subjective histories of success: promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioural, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175-191.

Maio, G. R., Hahn, U., Frost, J.-M, & Cheung, W.-Y. (2009). Applying the value of equality unequally: Effects of value instantiations that vary in typicality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 598-614.

Maio, G. R., Olson, J. M., Allen, L., & Bernard, M. M. (2001). Addressing discrepancies between values and behaviour: The motivating effect of reasons. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 104-117.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96-102.

6A. Participants

Do you plan to include vulnerable participants?

No, I will not include participants that fall into vulnerable groups ☒

(If your study DOES include vulnerable participants then move on to Section 6B.)

How many participants will be recruited? 240

I will include:

Males and Females ☒ Females only ☐ Males only ☐

Age range:

18-65 ☒ other (please specify) [Click here to enter text.](#)

How will participants be recruited?

SONA ☒

If SONA is to be used, please indicate the number of credits that will be awarded 1

Printed materials (e.g. Posters. Please include a copy of the poster or other printed material in the appendix of this application) ☐

Online (email, twitter, facebook etc. Please include in the appendix a copy of the recruitment text that will be presented online) ☒

Personal approach within the University ☒

Other ☐ (please provide details below)

6B. Vulnerable participants

(If your study DOES NOT include vulnerable participants then move on to Section 7.)

Will any of your participants fall into the following groups?

Yes, young people under the age of 18 ☐

Yes, people with learning or communication difficulties ☐

Yes, patients ☐

Yes, other vulnerable groups ☐

Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance

If any student is to work with children or other vulnerable groups then Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance must be applied for and granted before the study starts. To apply for DBS clearance please email Tom Cottington in Admissions t.cottington@roehampton.ac.uk

Supervisor declaration

DBS Checks will be or are currently being processed by University of Roehampton

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

DBS Checks have been carried out by University of Roehampton

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐

How many participants will be recruited? [Click here to enter text.](#)

I will include:

Males and Females ☐ Females only ☐ Males only ☐

Age range:

18-65 ☐ other (please specify) [Click here to enter text.](#)

How will participants be recruited?

SONA ☐

If SONA is to be used, please indicate the number of credits that will be awarded [Click here to enter text.](#)

Printed materials (e.g. Posters. Please include a copy of your poster or other printed material in the appendix of this application) ☐

Online (email, twitter, facebook etc. Please include in the appendix a copy of the recruitment text you will present online) ☐

Personal approach within the University ☐

Other ☐ (*please provide details below*)

7. Where will the study be conducted?

On campus: ☒

(MRI studies performed at CUBIC are considered as On campus)

Online: ☐

Off campus UK: ☐

I understand that testing off campus by UG Psychology project students is only permitted in special circumstances and with explicit approval from the supervisor and Departmental Ethics Committee. I will discuss the risk assessment with my student(s) and ensure that they are familiarised with, and adhere to, the Roehampton Lone Worker Policy.

Overseas: ☐

I understand that testing overseas by UG Psychology project students is only permitted in special circumstances and with explicit approval from the supervisor and Departmental Ethics Committee. I will need to obtain an overseas risk assessment and submit the completed document with this application. I will discuss this risk assessment with my student(s) and ensure that they are familiarised with, and adhere to, the Roehampton Lone Worker Policy.

8. Participant confidentiality and data storage

Each participant will be provided with a unique identifier: YES ☒ NO ☐

All electronic data will be stored on password protected devices: YES ☒ NO ☐

Any hard copies of consent forms will be kept securely by the supervisor: YES ☒ NO ☐

Any hard copies of questionnaire data will be securely stored and kept separate from participant consent forms: YES ☒ NO ☐

All data will be stored by the supervisor for 10 years: YES ☒ NO ☐

If you have answered NO to any of the above questions please provide details.

9. Ethical considerations

In the box below please discuss any ethical issues associated with the study and how you will deal them. Points to be considered are participant consent and debrief, inclusion/exclusion criteria, right to withdraw, sensitive topics, risks to participants and/or researchers, dissemination and use of findings. In addition, any form of deception should be clearly detailed (outline why this is necessary and the nature of the deception -these details should also be included in the debrief form).

OMITTED FOR THE ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT TASK

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

10. Declaration

Supervisor declaration (to be completed prior to submission)

☒ I consider the submission to be ethically sound, to comply with the BPS Code of conduct, and that all the information given in this form is correct, provides a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project and that all documentation meets the required standards.

☒ I confirm that all the scales/questionnaires included in this application are, where applicable, fully licensed and that appropriate permissions for use have been obtained and appropriate training will be provided to the student(s).

☒ I understand that this submission may be audited by the Psychology Department Ethics Committee and/or nominated members of the University.

Signature (print name): Dr Karl-Andrew Woltin

Date: 16/01/2017

11. Appendices

Please list below any additional documentation you are attaching to this document. You must include a copy of your consent and debrief forms.

1. Participant consent form
2. Participant debrief form
3. Online recruitment text (email, twitter, facebook, etc.)
4. Demographic questionnaire
5. AP- and AV-PVQ items measuring universalism & power
6. Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (IV1A)
7. BIS/BAS Scales (IV1B)
8. Approach (*Avoidance*) version of the scientific testimony (part of IV2)
9. Approach (*Avoidance*) version of the essay instructions (part of IV2)
10. Examples of Tajfel matrices (DV1)
11. Items to measures motivation to promote equality slogans and to volunteer for organisations (DV2, 3)
12. Health & Safety Risk Assessment for Ethics Applications

Appendix 1: Participant consent form

OMITTED FOR THE ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT TASK

Appendix 2: Participant debrief form

OMITTED FOR THE ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT TASK

Appendix 3: Online recruitment text (email, twitter, facebook, etc.)

Dear [NAME TBC],

My name is [NAME OF STUDEND TBC] and I am a third year student in Psychology Single Honours studying at Roehampton University. I am conducting a study on personality and personal beliefs as part of the requirements for my degree.

I would like to invite you to participate in this interesting study.

The study entails you answering three questionnaires, reading information and writing a short text, and participating in a short group decision exercise. Overall, this will not take more than 50 minutes of your time.

If you would like to participate, which I very much hope, please contact me through my Roehampton email address: [E-MAIL TBC]. Please also feel free to ask me any questions you might have about the study.

Many thanks in advance for your help!

Best wishes,
[NAME OF STUDENT TBC]

Appendix 4: Demographic questionnaire

Please complete the following

How old are you?

At birth, were you described as...:
(TICK ONE)

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Your ethnicity
(TICK ONE)

- ☐ White British
- ☐ White Irish
- ☐ Other White
- ☐ Indian
- ☐ Pakistani
- ☐ Bangladeshi
- ☐ Arabic
- ☐ Other Asian
- ☐ Black Caribbean
- ☐ Black African
- ☐ Other Black
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Other

What is your native language?
(TICK ONE)

- ☐ English
- ☐ Other: _____

I am...:
(TICK ONE)

- ☐ Participating for course credit
- ☐ Participating as a volunteer

Are you a Roehampton University
student?
(TICK ONE)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Appendix 5: AP- and AV-PVQ items measuring universalism & power

Overview on the items of the male Approach- and Avoidance-PVQ. All items start with "It is important for him/her.." and are completed by the text in the table. Responses are given on the following scale: 1 = not like me at all, 2 = not like me, 3 = a little like me, 4 = moderately like me, 5 = very much like me.

| Value | Item | Approach-PVQ | Avoidance-PVQ |
|--------------|------|---|--|
| Universalism | un1 | .. that the weak and vulnerable in society are protected | .. to prevent harm to from coming to the weak and vulnerable in society |
| | un2 | .. that every person in the world has equal opportunities in life | .. that inequality of opportunities in the world does not exist |
| | un3 | .. that everyone be treated justly, even people he doesn't know | .. that there is no unjust treatment, not even concerning people he doesn't know |
| | un4 | .. to take care of nature | .. to avoid actions that may harm nature |
| | un5 | .. to take part in activities to defend nature | .. not to sit by as the natural world is destroyed |
| | un6 | .. to protect the natural environment from destruction or pollution | .. to prevent damage to the natural environment caused by destruction or pollution |
| | un7 | .. to be tolerant towards all kinds of people and groups | .. to avoid being intolerant towards any kind of person or group |
| | un8 | .. to listen and understand people who are different from him | .. to avoid misunderstanding people who are different from him |
| | un9 | .. to accept people even when he disagrees with them | .. to avoid negatively judging people even when he disagrees with them |
| Power | po1 | .. that people do whatever he says they should | .. that people do not ignore what he says they should do |
| | po2 | .. to have the power to make people do what he wants | .. to avoid being powerless to control others |
| | po3 | .. to be the one who tells others what to do | .. to avoid being ordered around by someone else |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| po4 | .. to have the power that money can bring | .. to avoid being powerless due to lack of money |
| po5 | .. to be wealthy | .. to avoid being poor |
| po6 | .. to own expensive things that show his wealth | .. to avoid buying things that do not show his wealth |

Appendix 6: Regulatory Focus Questionnaire

This set of questions asks you HOW FREQUENTLY specific events actually occur or have occurred in your life. Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the appropriate number below it.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | <p>7. Do you often do well at different things that you try?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> |
| <p>2. Growing up, would you ever “cross the line” by doing things that your parents would not tolerate?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | <p>8. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> |
| <p>3. How often have you accomplished things that got you “psyched” to work even harder?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | <p>9. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don’t perform as well as I ideally would like to do.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very true true often true</p> |
| <p>4. Did you get on your parents’ nerves often when you were growing up?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | <p>10. I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 certainly certainly false true</p> |
| <p>5. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | <p>11. I have found very few hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them.</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 certainly certainly false true</p> |
| <p>6. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable?</p> <p>1 2 3 4 5 never sometimes very or seldom often</p> | |

(Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 are reverse-scored.

Promotion: 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11.

Prevention: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8)

Appendix 7: BIS/BAS Scales

Each item of this questionnaire is a statement that a person may either agree with or disagree with. For each item, indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with what the item says. Please be sure to respond to all questions,

do not leave any items blank and be honest with your response. Please indicate only one response per item. Remember to consider each item individually; no item has bearing on any prior or following item. Don't worry about being "consistent" in your responses.

Choose from the following four response options:

- 1 = very true for me
- 2 = somewhat true for me
- 3 = somewhat false for me
- 4 = very false for me

1. A person's family is the most important thing in life.
2. Even if something bad is about to happen to me, I rarely experience fear or nervousness.
3. I go out of my way to get things I want.
4. When I'm doing well at something I love to keep at it.
5. I'm always willing to try something new if I think it will be fun.
6. How I dress is important to me.
7. When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized.
8. Criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit.
9. When I want something I usually go all-out to get it.
10. I will often do things for no other reason than that they might be fun.
11. It's hard for me to find the time to do things such as get a haircut.
12. If I see a chance to get something I want I move on it right away.
13. I feel pretty worried or upset when I think or know somebody is angry at me.
14. When I see an opportunity for something I like I get excited right away.
15. I often act on the spur of the moment.
16. If I think something unpleasant is going to happen I usually get pretty "worked up."
17. I often wonder why people act the way they do.
18. When good things happen to me, it affects me strongly.
19. I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at something important.
20. I crave excitement and new sensations.
21. When I go after something I use a "no holds barred" approach.
22. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
23. It would excite me to win a contest.
24. I worry about making mistakes.

(Items other than 2 and 22 are reverse-scored.)

BAS: 3, 9, 12, 21 -drive subscale; 5, 10, 15, 20 -fun seeking subscale; 4, 7, 14, 18, 23- reward responsiveness subscale.

BIS: 2, 8, 13, 16, 19, 22, 24.

Filler items: 1, 6, 11, 17.)

Appendix 8: Approach (Avoidance) version of the scientific testimony

(Approach and [Avoidance] versions together for the purpose of the ethics form)

Please read this scientific information attentively.

Scientific Evidence on Equal Treatment

For many years, social scientists believed that individuals were fundamentally prejudiced and behave in a discriminatory manner. However, recent research in psychology and related social sciences shows that individuals are significantly more objective and fair (*less subjective and unfair*) than most people realize. For example:

- Over the past two decades, a team of psychologists asked a large sample of people across the world's cultures to rank their core values, or guiding principles in life, in order of importance. The results of this study showed that the majority of people in the majority of the world's cultures describe universalism—entailing a concern with promoting tolerance, protection of the equal treatment of all people, social justice and equality (*entailing a concern with preventing intolerance, unequal treatment of people, social injustice and inequality*)—as one of their most important values (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).
- In 30 years of research, psychologist Dr Daniel Batson and colleagues have shown that people are far more concerned with ensuring equal opportunities (*with preventing unequal treatment and discrimination*) than typically expected. These studies demonstrate, for example, that simply asking individuals to imagine another person's perspective leads them to care about ensuring (*preventing*) the other person's just treatment (*unjust treatment*). Merely thinking about equal opportunities (*unequal opportunities*) of others motivates individuals to give up considerable time and energy in order to promote equality and fairness (*fight inequality and discrimination*), for example by supporting human rights groups (Batson, 1990, 1991).
- Psychologists and economists have collaborated to assemble a large body of evidence that people are willing to sacrifice their own material and financial well being in order to promote and maintain justice and equity (*prevent injustice and inequity from getting worse*) (Rabin, 1998).

Recent research has also shown that acting fair and impartial (*unfair and discriminatory*) has surprising benefits to individuals (*has surprising negative consequences for individuals*). For example:

- Psychologists have found that treating others equally and in a fair manner improves a person's mood and satisfaction (*treating others unequally and in an unfair manner decreases a person's mood and satisfaction*) with life, as well as fostering more positive (*negative*) interpersonal relationships (Carlson et al., 1998; George & Brief, 1992; Seligman et al., 2005).
- In work contexts, researchers have found that ensuring that colleagues receive equal treatment (*accepting unequal treatment of colleagues*), even colleagues one does not know, allows people to build valuable social networks, earn strong reputations, and gain high social status (*leads people to find themselves in aversive networks, have a bad reputation, and to lose*

social status) (Bolino, 1999; Flynn, 2003; Grant, in press; Podsakoff et al., 2003).

- In a ground-breaking study conducted at the University of Michigan, psychologists followed elderly adults for five years, and found that the more they were engaged in standing up for the equal treatment of different groups in society, the healthier they were (*the more they engaged in prejudice and accepted the unequal treatment of different groups in society, the more likely they were to fall ill*). Standing up for the equal treatment of others even increased longevity by reducing personal distress (*accepting the unequal treatment of others even decreased longevity by increasing personal distress*), and increasing physical and mental health (*and decreasing physical and mental health*) (Brown, Nesse, Vinokur, & Smith, 2003).

Appendix 9: Approach (*Avoidance*) version of the essay instructions

(Instruction for the essay: persuasive text on the importance of universalism; approach and [*avoidance*] versions together for the purpose of the ethics form)

Please take the next five to ten minutes to write a persuasive essay attempting to convince a panel of reviewers that it is important to promote social justice, equality, and equal treatment of people (*to prevent social injustice, inequality, and unequal treatment of people*).

Appendix 10: Examples of Tajfel matrices

Matrix 1:

Please place a checkmark in the box that contains the points that you give to subject 115 in the RED group and subject 128 in the BLUE group:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 115 | RED | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| 128 | BLUE | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |

Please write the points that each person receives according to the box that you have chosen:

Points for 115 of RED: _____

Points for 128 of BLUE: _____

Matrix 2:

Please place a checkmark in the box that contains the points that you give to subject 116 in the RED group and subject 113 in the BLUE group:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 116 | RED | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 113 | BLUE | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 16 |

Please write the points that each person receives according to the box that you have chosen:

Points for 116 of RED: _____

Points for 113 of BLUE: _____

Appendix 11: Items to measures motivation to promote equality slogans and to volunteer for organisations

Please answer the following questions.

(Participants will randomly see four t-shirts, each two with equality and two with inequality slogans / claims; order of presentation will be counter-balanced)

1. To what extent would you be willing to wear the following t-shirts to promote their slogans / claims? (1=not at all willing, 7=very willing)

| | |
|------------|---|
| T-shirt A: | Equity is productive / Discrimination is destructive |
| T-shirt B: | People of quality don't fear equality / People lacking quality promote inequality |
| T-shirt C: | Equality is at the heart of social good / Inequality is the root of social evil |
| T-shirt D: | I stand up for equality / I stand up against inequality |

(For the following questions, order of questions pertaining to the organisations will be counter-balanced).

There are several NGOs (non governmental organisations) in London that are concerned human rights. For example, the **Equality and Diversity Forum (EDF; www.edf.org.uk)** promotes dialogue and understanding across the separate equality strands and ensures the recognition of the crosscutting nature of equality issues. This organisations stands up for justice and fairness. Similarly, the **International Movement against all Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR; www.imadr.org)** promotes the implementation of instruments to ensure the acknowledgement of deep-rooted societal inequality. This organisation combats injustice and discrimination.

2. To what extent are you motivated to volunteer for these organisations? (1=not at all motivated, 7=very motivated)
The EDF (1-7)
The IMADR (1-7)
3. How many hours per month would you be willing to work as a volunteer for these organisations? Please enter the number of hours in the box below:
The EDF: _____
The IMADR: _____
4. Would you be willing that these organisations contact you via email to sign you up?
The EDF
☐ Yes
☐ No



| |
|--|
| The IMADR <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|--|

Appendix 12: Health and safety risk assessment for ethics applications



Health & Safety Risk Assessment for Ethics Applications

| RISK ASSESSMENT FORM | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|---|
| Risk Assessment Reference Number | | | |
| Title of Project | Practice what you value: The impact of value frame and individual differences on value-congruent behaviour | | |
| Description of activity | Experiments run on campus in the context of 4 3 rd year students' extended research project (ERP). Participants (N=240) are either psychology students of the University of Roehampton participating for course credit or other students of the University of Roehampton participating on a voluntary basis. | Date | From : Oct 2017 Until: Aug 2018 (academic year 2017/2018) |
| Area/Locations | On campus in testing cubicles | | |
| Project team | Name | Job Title | Signed |
| | Dr Karl-Andrew Woltin | Lecturer | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Hazards | 1. n/a (filling in online questionnaire) | | |
| Who can be harmed? | 1. n/a (filling in online questionnaire) | | |
| How can someone be harmed? | 1. n/a (filling in online questionnaire) | | |
| Number of people affected | 244 | Rate n/a | H=Hourly, D=Daily, W=Weekly, M=Monthly, Q=Quarterly, S=Six monthly, A=Annually |
| Consequence | 1. n/a (filling in online questionnaire) | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------|------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Existing Control Measures | 1. Participants can withdraw at any time and without consequences for course credit (i.e., participants participating for course credit). 2. Participants can contact the principal investigator, the supervisor, and the head of department should they have questions or concerns. 3. Participants receive full information on the informed consent form and full debriefing on the debrief form. 4. Participants can only participate if they give their informed consent and indicate they are at 18 years or older. Failing to affirm either will entail them not being able to start the studies. 5. Contact information of the student welfare officer, the health and wellbeing centre, the medical centre, and the Samaritans is provided on the debrief form should participants feel troubled or worried for whatever reason. | | | | | | | | |
| Comments | These are run on campus with the investigator present, and in which participants receive full information. There is no deception, and there is no sensitive content that might cause anxiety or induce negative affect beyond everyday life experiences. All material and measures have been used in previous research and had ethical approval at the University of Roehampton before. | | | | | | | | |
| Risk rating | VL | VH=Very High, H=High, M=Medium, L=Low, VL=Very Low | | | | | | | |
| Further possible control measures | | | | | | | | | |
| Any further actions required | | | | | | | | | |
| Responsible person | Description of hazard | Details of action taken | Date | Completed | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Signed (Applicant) |  | Print Name | Karl-Andrew Woltin | Date | 16.01.2017 | | | | |
| Signed (Supervisor / PI) |  | Print Name | Diane Bray | Date | 16.01.2017 | | | | |