

In the Midst of Political Divide: Impact of
Social Value Orientation Manipulation on Political Prejudice

Alex Casper, Katherine Gomulkiewicz, Anna Catherine McCrary, Izem Ustun

Davidson College

Author Note

Alex Casper, Department of Psychology, Davidson College.

Katherine Gomulkiewicz, Department of Psychology, Davidson College.

Anna Catherine McCrary, Department of Psychology, Davidson College.

Izem Ustun, Department of Psychology, Davidson College.

We would like to thank Dr. Good for her help with data collection and experimental design and the students in Psy318 for their partnership and advice throughout the experiment.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Katherine Gomulkiewicz, Department of Psychology, Davidson College, Davidson, NC 28035.

Contact: kagomulkiewicz@davidson.edu

On my honor I have neither given nor received unauthorized information regarding this work, I have followed and will continue to observe all regulations regarding it, and I am unaware of any violation of the Honor Code by others.

–Alex Casper, Katherine Gomulkiewicz, Anna Catherine McCrary, Izem Ustun

Abstract

The present study builds on research which demonstrates a correlation between personality characteristics such as Social Value Orientation (SVO) and political ideology. Forty-eight Davidson students from psychology classes participated in the experiment. Prior to our experimental manipulation we collected data on participants' political affiliation. We randomly assigned participants to an SVO condition (prosocial or proself). Participants proceeded through a series of scenarios and were asked to choose outcomes based on condition. Participants then used feeling thermometers, a type of slider scale, to rate levels of prejudice towards 24 groups. Our hypothesis stated that participants in the prosocial condition would indicate less prejudice than participants in the proself condition. We found no significant relationship found between SVO and prejudice. Our results have implications for future research related to general prejudice measures, type of threat as an indicator of prejudice, and the directionality of the relationship between SVO and prejudice.

Key words: social value orientation; political prejudice; political ideology

In the Midst of Political Divide: Impact of
Social Value Orientation Manipulation on Political Prejudice

With a dominant two-party political system in the United States of America, social psychologists often study the factors that may contribute to an individual's political affiliation (Republican or Democrat) and political ideology (conservative or liberal). In light of the most recent presidential election race between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, many Americans have been grappling with major political divides in this country. However, for many years psychologists have been studying the differences between liberals and conservatives to try and determine what factors contribute to an individual's political affiliation and, in turn, what this affiliation means for the way an individual acts politically.

One particular area of research has explored the impact of political affiliation and ideology on political prejudice and intolerance. This research is based on an assumption that prejudice and intolerance associated with political ideologies can lead to political actions, such as voting for particular candidates or legislation, which supports those associated prejudices. Historically, social psychologists have suggested that conservatives are more politically prejudiced than their liberal counterparts (Crawford, Modri, & Motyl, 2013). This evidence has been used in the psychological community and the wider mass media to suggest that liberals are more tolerant, whereas conservatives are more prejudiced.

However, Brandt, Reyna, Chambers, Crawford, and Wetherell (2014) refute these assumptions and indicate that both liberals and conservatives show political prejudice towards different groups. This new wave of social psychology research has looked at both conservatives and liberals to see how and when each group displays prejudice. Psychologists have found that the amount of prejudice displayed by conservatives and liberals depends on

the target group members' political ideology and perceived choice in group membership. For example, liberals are more likely to be intolerant towards conservative groups and conservatives are more likely to be intolerant towards liberal groups (Brandt et al. 2014).

Another study by Brandt and Crawford (2016) suggests that the only reason trends related to prejudice favor liberals is because liberal prejudice has not been studied enough. According to Brandt and Crawford (2016), past research focused too much on prejudice against liberally-favored groups. There was a lack of comparison to groups that were conservatively-favored and, without such a comparison group, liberal prejudice cannot be uncovered. In other words, Brandt and Crawford (2016) suggest that previous research has been one-sided in its discussion of political prejudice.

Additional research focuses on explaining more thoroughly why and when both liberals and conservatives exhibit prejudice. Crawford (2014) indicates that, while both liberals and conservatives can be prejudiced, the cause of this prejudice may differ based on types of threats to self and ideals. In Crawford's (2014) research, safety threats, those which stemmed from perceived danger to the group, sparked prejudice in liberal groups whereas realistic threats, those which stemmed from group competition over limited societal resources, sparked prejudice in conservative groups. This indicates that it is not that one group (liberal or conservative) is more prejudice than the other but rather that it takes a different type of threat to cause a prejudiced reaction from members of those groups.

Additionally, this research indicates that there may be underlying personality characteristics which contribute to the importance of different types of threats and how this impacts political ideology.

Another study by Chambers, Schlenker, and Collisson (2013) suggests that liberals and conservatives can both be prejudiced, but towards different target groups. In this study

they looked at liberal and conservative participants' prejudice towards targets that the participants thought had similar values and opinions to their own. The results indicated that for both conservatives and liberals, perceived political values of the target groups were significantly correlated with their impressions of these target groups, meaning they had more positive views of people that they thought had similar views to themselves. For example, if a liberal participant rated a target as also having a liberal view on an issue (such as gun control), they had more positive impressions of that target. This further supports that both political groups can be equally prejudiced against those who do not share their values (Chambers et al. 2013).

One major development in the research of the relationship between political ideology and prejudice is the examination of how personality characteristics play into that relationship. One experiment by Crawford and colleagues (2013) had participants rate conservative and liberal targets with traits assessing human nature and human uniqueness; participants then reported their ideology, party affiliation, and antipathy towards their opposing party. The results of this experiment indicate that liberals are often associated more strongly with human nature traits such as kindness, while conservatives are more often tied to human unique traits such as logic (Crawford et al., 2013).

Another experiment, conducted by Luguri, Napier, and Dovidio (2012), explores personality differences between conservatives and liberals. They identified two particular mindsets, concrete and abstract, which the researchers hypothesized would be related to prejudice. They manipulated participants to regard certain groups in an abstract way (what would they hypothetically deserve) or a concrete way (what would they actually do to them). They then measured prejudice. The results of their experiment revealed an interaction between political orientation and mindset, suggesting that abstract thinkers have more

warmth and liking towards non-normative groups than concrete thinkers. These experiments indicate there are different personality characteristics which may underlie the difference in a person's political ideology.

The personality characteristics which is often looked at in relation to prejudice and political ideology is Social Value Orientation (SVO). SVO represents an individual's tendency to act in either a prosocial or proself way when making socially impactful decisions (Chirumbolo, Leone, & Desimoni, 2016). Individuals with a prosocial SVO tend to maximize social benefits for all individuals in a given situation, while proself individuals tend to maximize personal outcomes. Past research such has indicated that SVO can be related to situational analysis. Emonds, Declerck, Boone, Vandervliet, and Parizel (2011) showed that participants with a proself SVO activate portions of their brains associated with conceptual and calculative reasoning processes. This contrasts with prosocial participants, who have brain activation consistent with decision making focused on representation of punishment and norm compliance when making decisions (Emonds et al., 2011). Although our study does not use brain activation imaging such as an fMRI, we continued to explore the relationship between SVO as related to decision making and this led to literature specifically focused on the impact of SVO on political ideology.

Wei, Zhao, and Zheng (2016) mapped out a potential relationship between SVO, political orientation, and prejudice. They hypothesized that SVO is an underlying personality characteristic which can be used to predict political orientation. Proself individuals are more likely to be conservative, while prosocial individuals are more likely to be liberal. In turn, liberal and conservative ideology predict types of prejudice, demonstrating a link between prejudice and SVO through political orientation. Chirumbolo and colleagues (2016) set out to test this relationship, measuring SVO and using it as a predictor of political ideology and

prejudice, among other factors. They found significant support for SVO as a predictor of ideology and prejudice, but were unable to demonstrate a causal relationship as SVO was not manipulated in their study, merely measured in each participant.

SVO is a personality indicator which measures whether an individual values more prosocial or proself outcomes. Our experiment expands on Chirumbolo et al. (2016), another important experiment connecting personality characteristics and political ideology. This experiment examined how SVO can be significantly correlated with political ideology. We hope to build on prior research like Luguri et al. (2012), which shows a connection between SVO and political ideology and prejudice.

Our experiment builds upon previous research on personality traits in relation to political ideology and prejudice. However, instead of measuring SVO, as past research has, we plan to manipulate participants' SVO to see if we can alter their level of political prejudice, regardless of previous political affiliation or ideology. Essentially, we aim to see if SVO can be situationally altered in ways that impact political prejudice. We predict that participants in the prosocial SVO condition will show less prejudice than participants in the proself SVO condition. Additionally, we will look at political ideology as a covariate to see if this impacts the results. If we find significant results, this would indicate that SVO can be situationally manipulated and is a factor which may be used to predict levels of prejudice. We hope that our experiment will contribute to research that explores the factors that contribute to political ideology and prejudice.

Method

Participants

A sample of 48 undergraduate students from 100- and 200-level psychology courses at Davidson College participated in our experiment in exchange for research credit. The

small participant pool at Davidson College limited sample size. There were 31 female participants and 17 male participants. 36 (75%) participants identified as Caucasian, six (12.5%) as African American, five (10.4%) as Hispanic/Latinx, four (8.3%) as Asian/Pacific Islander, and three (6.3%) as Other. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 23 years old ($M = 19.49$, $SD = 1.16$).

Materials

Social Value Orientation manipulation. SVO was manipulated using a custom survey which was roughly based on a triple dominance decomposed game described in Luguri et al. (2012). Our game involved participants selecting from possible actions in unrelated, hypothetical situations. An example of a question is as follows: *a friend calls you to ask if his brother would be able to borrow your car. He acknowledges that it is a big request, but explains his brother has been out of work for nearly 4 months and is attempting to go to a job interview. What do you do?* Participants were presented with two response options, one proself and one prosocial. They saw both options regardless of condition assignment. Participants in the proself condition were instructed to maximize personal outcomes over outcomes for all individuals in the hypothetical situations (*explain that you don't feel comfortable allowing a stranger to drive your car, but you are willing to drive the brother to his interview, as long as he can pay you a small amount for gas and your time*). Those in the prosocial condition were instructed to maximize outcomes for all people in the situations which were presented to them (*allow the brother to take the car*).

Our aim was to have participants to think in the manner of their assigned condition. By attempting to answer questions as if they had their assigned SVO, we hoped that participants would temporarily adopt the mentality of their assigned SVO. Past SVO testing has used both two-response (prosocial and proself) and three-response options (prosocial,

individualist, and competitor), as the individualist and competitor categories may be combined (Joireman, Lasane, Bennett, Richards, & Salaimani, 2001; Chirumbolo et al., 2016). We chose to use the two-response option to simplify the choice for participants (Joireman et al., 2001). See Appendix A for all situations and responses included in the game.

The first three items were called practice items. These items were repeated if participants answered any of the questions incorrectly based on their assigned condition. The practice items were repeated at most one time, and, regardless of whether or not they were correctly answered the second time, participants were then shown the 10 test items. All questions were designed to encourage participants to think in the manner of their condition assignment. After running 20 total participants, we found a mistake in the instructions for the prosself practice problems. For participants in the prosself condition, the prosself category was incorrectly defined once in only the prosself practice section, though it was correctly defined in all other instructions. See Appendix D for the corrected prosself instructions.

Condition assignment. Participants were assigned to their conditions using a modified block design. This design is something that we created for our experiment, and to our knowledge we are the first to use this method in order to randomize participants. The procedure involved an algorithm which was developed to generate a list of four items. Each item was one of the two conditions of the experiment, prosself or prosocial, and was selected randomly. The algorithm then checked that half of the list was prosself, and half prosocial. If not, the list was randomized again. Fifteen random blocks were generated, then the order of those blocks was randomized. This final list was then used to assign participants to each condition. The first participant run in the experiment was assigned to the first condition on the list, and so on. Thus, participants were still randomly assigned to conditions, but we

could ensure a difference of no more than four between the numbers of participants in each condition. We used this method to allow for random assignment, but not lose statistical power due to our small sample size. This was deemed necessary because small imbalances in the number of participants in each group could have interfered with our ability to detect significant differences between conditions, due both to our small sample size and limited participant pool.

Political ideology measure. Participants reported political ideology on a Likert-type scale (1 = *Extremely liberal*; 7 = *Extremely conservative*) and also political affiliation on a Likert-type scale (1 = *Strong Democrat*; 7 = *Strong Republican*) taken from Crawford and colleagues' (2013) measures (see Appendix B for list of scale options). Results from these questions were positively correlated to each other, $r(48) = .85, p < .00$. A single score, comprised of the mean of the two scales, was created for each participant and was called ideology.

Prejudice measure. Prejudice was measured by adapting Brandt and Crawford's (2016) prejudice measure to rate 24 target groups such as Christian fundamentalists, big business, feminists, whites, etc. (see Appendix C for list of all target groups and the full measure) ($\alpha = .93$) on feeling thermometers (0 = *unfavorable and very cold*, 100 = *very warm and favorable*). Feeling thermometers allowed participants to move a slider to the position they felt most accurately identified their position on each group. We used this scale because it has been shown to positively correlate with other prejudice measures in the past (Crawford, 2014; Brandt & Crawford, 2016). A single prejudice score, comprised of the mean of all prejudice scale item answers, was created for each participant. This score was called general prejudice ($M = 63.62, SD = 13.60$).

Procedure

Participants arrived at the lab to participate in two separate experiments for two research teams both conducted by undergraduate students in a social psychology methods course. Due to the need to collect baseline political ideology information without priming participants to think of political ideology, we asked the researchers in the first study to collect information on political ideology and political affiliation for us to use. After participants completed the first study, they were asked to leave the room so we could set up our experiment. We then began our study by bringing participants back into the room and obtaining informed consent from participants as a group. All participants were given the consent form at a computer, and were given the opportunity to go over the form with the researcher. Participants gave consent in the previous study for the collection of general demographic information, however we ensured that once they began our study that we also obtained specific consent for our demographic questions. If not, then we did not obtain the demographic data from the other research team to maintain the ethics of consent.

Participants were then informed that they would be playing a game designed to measure their ability to evaluate the social impacts of their actions in different situations, which is how we characterized the SVO manipulation game. Participants were presented with a brief description of the condition they had been assigned to, either proself or prosocial. They were told what their assignment meant, and given a description of what an appropriate answer based on their condition looked like. After confirming through practice trials that participants understood the premise of the game and could correctly select the situations that they were instructed to, each participant played the game to completion. The final screen then instructed the participants to call over the researcher. The researcher then closed out of the computer browser window which the participants had been using and opened a new one containing the feeling thermometers and a demographic questionnaire. Participants were

then told they would complete demographic information, which included the feeling thermometers. We did this to control for social desirability impacting participant responses, which was considered a greater risk based on the social atmosphere at the college. After completing the feeling thermometers and demographic survey, participants were debriefed, allowed to ask questions, and informed of all deception that occurred.

Results

Our hypothesis predicted that manipulating SVO would lead to a statistically significant change in prejudice levels. Specifically we predicted that the proself group would show more prejudice compared to the prosocial group. We also wanted to see if ideology acted as a moderator for the relationship between SVO and prejudice. We predicted that ideology would not be a covariate with our dependent variable, prejudice.

As a manipulation check, we correlated each SVO question with condition (proself and prosocial) to verify that the correct answers to the hypothetical situations could be identified according to each participant's assigned condition. Condition displayed a significant positive correlation with all SVO questions at the .01 level (see Table 1), indicating that the manipulation was effective, and participants selected the answers that correctly corresponded to their assigned condition.

We then conducted an independent samples *t*-test to test our hypothesis that SVO would affect level of prejudice. There was no significant difference between the prejudice of the prosocial group ($N = 24$, $M = 65.26$, $SD = 14.77$), and the prejudice of the proself group ($N = 24$, $M = 61.97$, $SD = 12.41$), $t(46) = .84$, $p = .41$. These results do not support our hypothesis because they indicate that SVO condition had no significant effect on prejudice.

Since our results were not significant, we ran a one-way between subjects ANOVA to look at political ideology as a potential covariate. However, there was no significant main

effect of political ideology ($F(1, 45) = .01, p = .92$) or SVO condition ($F(1, 45) = .63, p = .43$) on general prejudice. We also tested for a Pearson correlation between general prejudice and political ideology. These results showed no significant correlation, $r(48) = .04, p = .81$. Both of these null results suggest that ideology does not account for the effect of SVO manipulation on prejudice.

After completing our analyses, we wanted to verify that the error in the proself condition's practice instructions, and our correction of this error halfway through, did not impact our results. We ran an independent samples t -test between the prejudice scores of proself participants who saw the instructions with the error, and the proself participants who saw the corrected instruction. There was no significant difference between the two groups, $t(22) = 1.64, p = .54$, suggesting that the error had no significant effect on our results.

Discussion

We hypothesized that prejudice would be higher for individuals placed in the proself condition than for individuals placed in the prosocial condition. We did not find significant results however to support this hypothesis. We also explored the possibility that ideology was a covariate and accounted for the lack of significance in the findings however, this relationship was also not significant. Although our results were not significant, there were a few important limitations to our research and there still remain many potential implications and further research areas.

Our study had a few methodological limitations which may have influenced our lack of significant findings. Specifically we had two limitations related to the test we administered to participants to manipulate SVO. First, while previous research links prejudice to both SVO and political ideology (Luguri et al., 2012), this research treats SVO as an individual difference variable. Our study was the first or one of the first which

attempted to manipulate SVO. We modified an existing measure for this purpose and while our manipulation check indicates that participants were able to answer the questions as directed to by their condition assignment, we were unable to check broader validity or reliability for the scale. Although participants were able to distinguish between prosocial and proself options as directed, we cannot be sure about the strength of this manipulation of their own SVO. Therefore, a possible explanation of our findings is simply that our manipulation was too weak to generate significant differences in SVO between our two groups. Secondly, our instructions error (given to the first nine proself participants) could have further weakened our manipulation. While we corrected the instructions for later participants in the experiment, it is still possible that the error affected our manipulation in the proself condition.

Another possible explanation for our results is that we had a limited number of participants to draw on. Past correlations found between SVO, prejudice, and political ideology have been significant, but also generally weak (Bäckström & Björklund, 2007).

The limited number of participants in our study could have reduced sensitivity to the point where we could not detect significant differences between our two groups.

Outside of methodological explanations and participant pool size, it is possible there are larger conceptual reasons which could help to explain our null results. One explanation is that the hypothesized direction of the relationship between SVO, prejudice, and political ideology did not represent the actual direction of that relationship. While relationships between SVO, prejudice, and political ideology have been thoroughly established (Bäckström & Björklund, 2007; Luguri et al., 2012; Chirumbolo et al., 2016), the direction of the relationship starting with SVO and leading to prejudice has only been hypothesized. It is possible that prejudice or political ideology are what lead to specific SVO traits, rather than the other way around. A potential future experiment we suggest would be first manipulating

political prejudice and then seeing if there is a significant effect on a person's SVO.

Another potential conceptual consideration is the timing of our experiment. Data collection occurred during the final stages of the 2016 presidential election, which was an extremely divisive and tense political moment in United States history. If both SVO and political ideology contribute to prejudice in some way, it is possible that the ongoing election was a strong reminder of participant's political identity. Strong activation of political ideology could have already been contributing to prejudice in such a way that our SVO manipulation had no or little effect, even if it would have shown an effect without that strong ideology activation.

While our results were not significant, our experiment still serves to provide strong direction for future research. A possible extension of our work is a replication experiment that uses a stronger SVO manipulation and a larger sample size. A stronger SVO manipulation could be achieved by asking participants more scenario questions or placing participants in an in-depth single scenario filled with multiple SVO-based decisions rather than multiple scenarios with a single decision for each.

Our experiment did not confirm our hypothesis, but we did show evidence in support of prior research done on generalized prejudice. Our research was based in part on a theory of generalized prejudice put forward by McFarland (2010). McFarland describes a theory of generalized prejudice, wherein prejudicial feelings towards one group are symptomatic of an underlying tendency towards prejudice which can affect individual perception of many groups. When testing the reliability of our feeling thermometers as a method of measuring prejudice, we demonstrated through strong scale reliability of prejudice across our 24 different categories. In doing so, we show additional support for generalized prejudice, in spite of having unrelated, and even contradictory, categories in our prejudice measure (e.g.

liberals and conservatives).

While we did demonstrate support for general prejudice, we did not show support for differences in prejudice between liberals and conservatives. In fact only one of the 24 prejudice measures showed a significant difference in prejudice levels between the groups. This contradicts previous research on the topic (Brandt et al., 2014; Brandt & Crawford, 2016; Crawford, 2014) which argues that there should be a difference in the types of prejudice exhibited by liberals and the types of prejudice exhibited by conservatives. Our experimental results show that not only was there no difference in level of prejudice based on ideology but also that there was essentially no difference in type of group that sparked prejudice. It is possible that our SVO manipulation did in some way impact prejudice, as we hypothesized it would, and that this impact was to disrupt the differences between liberals and conservatives, masking the trends which prior research would lead us to expect in prejudice measures when comparing liberals and conservatives.

However, as our study was not designed to uncover such trends, and since our results were null, further research should be done to examine if this is the case. One possible way to examine this would be to replicate our experiment, but instead of randomly assigning SVO conditions, assign half of participants to an SVO which matches their own, and half to the opposite. This could then compare participants whose SVO was manipulated with those who did not undergo SVO manipulation, to see what effects that might have on prejudice differences between political ideologies.

Our null results seem to refute a causal relationship between SVO, political ideology, and prejudice. However, we caution against inferring from this that no link exists. Because of several potential threats to validity in our experiment, we believe our work should serve as a springboard for other research rather than as definitive evidence about the link between

SVO, ideology, and prejudice. We hope that our work can be used to develop new research to explore the actual nature of the relationship between SVO, prejudice, and political ideology. This is an area which, up to now has not been very thoroughly explored. While our results themselves may not be conclusive, we have taken the first step towards studying not just the existence of the relationship between those three factors, but the nature of that relationship. As journalists, economists, and citizens grapple with the implications of the election of Donald Trump, we urge psychologists to keep studying this important area of research. Determining how personality traits may influence prejudice and political ideology could be critical in understanding the cause of the controversy and perceived prejudice from all sides in the aftermath of that presidential race. It is our hope that future research will continue to follow that path and explore exactly what leads to the strong correlation between SVO, ideology, and prejudice.

References

- Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice: The role of social dominance, authoritarianism, and empathy. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 28, 10-17. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.10
- Brandt, M. J. & Crawford, J. T. (2016). Answering unresolved questions about the relationship between cognitive ability and prejudice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1177/1948550616660592
- Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). The ideological-conflict hypothesis: Intolerance among both liberals and conservatives. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23, 27-34. doi:10.1177/0963721413510932
- Chambers, J. R., Schlenker, B. R., & Collisson, B. (2013). Ideology and prejudice: The role of value conflicts. *Psychological Science*, 24, 140-149. doi:10.1177/0956797612447820
- Chirumbolo, A., Leone, L., & Desimoni, M. (2016). The interpersonal roots of politics: Social value orientation, socio-political attitudes and prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 91, 144-153. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.001
- Crawford, J. T. (2014). Ideological symmetries and asymmetries in political intolerance and prejudice toward political activist groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 284-298. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2014.08.002
- Crawford, J. T., Modri, S. A., & Motyl, M. (2013). Bleeding-heart liberals and hard-headed conservatives: Subtle political dehumanization through differential attributions of human nature and human uniqueness traits. *Journal of Social and Political*

Psychology, 1, 86-104. doi:10.5964/jspp.v1i1.184

Emonds, G., Declerck, C. H., Boone, C., Vandervliet, E. J., & Parizel, P. M. (2011).

Comparing the neural basis of decision making in social dilemmas of people with different social value orientations, a fMRI study. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics*, 4, 11-24. doi:10.1037/a0020151

Psychology, and Economics, 4, 11-24. doi:10.1037/a0020151

Luguri, J. B., Napier, J. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2012). Reconstructing intolerance: Abstract

thinking reduces conservatives' prejudice against nonnormative groups. *Psychological Science*, 23, 756-763. doi:10.1177/0956797611433877

McFarland, S. (2010). Authoritarianism, social dominance, and other roots of generalized

prejudice. *Political Psychology*, 31, 453-477. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00765.x

Joireman, J. A., Lasane, T. P., Bennett, J., Richards, D., & Salaimani, S. (2001). Integrating

social value orientation and the consideration of future consequences within the extended norm activation model of proenvironmental behaviour. *British Journal of Psychology*, 40, 133-155. doi:10.1348/014466601164731

Wei Z., Zhao Z., & Zheng Y. (2016). Moderating effects of social value orientation on the

effect of social influence in prosocial decisions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:952. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00952

Table 1

SVO Questionnaire Cross-Question and Condition Correlations

Measure	Condition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Condition	—	.65**	.75**	.88**	.46**	.71**	.84**	.85**	.79**	.71**	.67**
1. SVO 1	.65**	—	.54**	.62**	.36**	.77**	.59**	.79**	.62**	.68**	.63**
2. SVO 2	.75**	.54**	—	.80**	.46**	.59**	.68**	.75**	.63**	.59**	.55**
3. SVO 3	.88**	.62**	.80**	—	.50**	.68**	.88**	.81**	.83**	.68**	.65**
4. SVO 4	.46**	.36**	.46**	.50**	—	.41**	.46**	.47**	.42**	.32*	.47**
5. SVO 5	.71**	.77**	.59**	.68**	.41**	—	.65**	.84**	.68**	.81**	.76**
6. SVO 6	.84**	.59**	.68**	.88**	.46**	.65**	—	.78**	.79**	.65**	.62**
7. SVO 7	.85**	.79**	.75**	.81**	.47**	.84**	.78**	—	.81**	.84**	.71**
8. SVO 8	.79**	.62**	.63**	.83**	.42**	.68**	.79**	.81**	—	.68**	.65**
9. SVO 9	.71**	.68**	.59**	.68**	.32*	.81**	.65**	.84**	.68**	—	.76**
10. SVO 10	.67**	.63**	.55**	.65**	.47**	.76**	.62**	.71**	.65**	.76**	—

Note. **. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX A

Social Implications Questionnaire

Q27 Participant Number

Q2 Please ask the researcher to come over now. They will assign you to either the prosocial or proself condition.

Q1 Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. For this study, you will be making some decisions designed to look at how well you can figure out what the effects of your actions are on others in social situations. You will be presented with a series of questions involving hypothetical situations where someone asks you to do something. You will then be presented with two options for how to respond to that situation. One of those options represents a proself choice, meaning that the main benefit of that option will be to you. The other option will be the prosocial choice, meaning that this option will have the most benefit to everyone in the hypothetical situation, but your personal benefit will not be as high as the proself choice.

Q3 (Shown if participants are assigned to the prosocial condition) You have been assigned to the prosocial condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit everyone involved in each situation, rather than which option would be best for you. You will now be presented with three practice questions. Your job is to pick the option which

is best for everyone in the situation.

Q4 (Shown if participants are assigned to the proself condition) You have been assigned to the proself condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit you the most. You will now be presented with three practice questions. Your job is to pick the option which is best for everyone in the situation. For the practice section, we have added point values to each question. The points will not be tracked, but they are supposed to represent the benefit to each person in each situation. You can use these points to figure out how each option will affect you and the other person in the situation. These point values will not be present after the practice section, they are only there to help you understand what it is you are supposed to be looking for.

Q19 You are walking down a street on your way to a friend's house when you see another person kneeling in the grass. They introduce themselves as Jane. Jane asks you to stop and help her find a key that she has dropped in the grass. Do you:

- Agree to help Jane, knowing that finding her key may take a while
- Help Jane, but let her know that whether or not you find the key you can only spare a minute or two

Q7 A friend calls you to ask if his brother would be able to borrow your car. He acknowledges that it is a big request, but explains his brother has been out of work for nearly 4 months and is attempting to go to a job interview. Do you:

- Allow the brother to take the car
- Explain that you don't feel comfortable allowing a stranger to drive your car, but you are willing to drive the brother to his interview, as long as he can pay you a small amount for gas

and your time

Q9 You are at the bar when the bartender, Meagan, comes up to you. She explains that it is very busy tonight, and asks you if you would be able to help her by taking a drink over to her friend at another table. Do you:

-Agree to help Meagan

-Help Meagan, but only on the condition that your next drink is free

Q23 (Display this question if Prosocial is selected... AND if Q19, Q7, or Q9 was incorrectly answered) You have incorrectly answered one or more of the practice questions. Remember, you have been assigned to the prosocial condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit everyone involved in each situation, rather than which option would be best for you. Please try the practice questions again. Please do your best to answer them correctly. After these questions, you will begin the test questions regardless of how you answer them, but consistent incorrect answers may affect your results.

Q24 (Display this question if proself is selected... AND if Q19, Q7, or Q9 was incorrectly answered) You have incorrectly answered one or more of the practice questions. Remember, you have been assigned to the proself condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit you the most. Please try the practice questions again. Please do your best to answer them correctly. After these questions, you will begin the test questions regardless of how you answer them, but consistent incorrect answers may affect your results.

Q20 You are walking down a street on your way to a friend's house when you see another

person kneeling in the grass. They introduce themselves as Jane. Jane asks you to stop and help her find a key that she has dropped in the grass. Do you:

- Agree to help Jane, knowing that finding her key may take a while
- Help Jane, but let her know that whether or not you find the key you can only spare a minute or two

Q21 A friend calls you to ask if his brother would be able to borrow your car. He acknowledges that it is a big request, but explains his brother has been out of work for nearly 4 months and is attempting to go to a job interview. Do you:

- Allow the brother to take the car
- Explain that you don't feel comfortable allowing a stranger to drive your car, but you are willing to drive the brother to his interview, as long as he can pay you a small amount for gas and your time

Q22 You are at the bar when the bartender, Meagan, comes up to you. She explains that it is very busy tonight, and asks you if you would be able to help her by taking a drink over to her friend at another table. Do you:

- Agree to help Meagan
- Help Meagan, but only on the condition that your next drink is free

Q5 (Display this question if prosocial is selected...) That was the end of the practice questions. Remember, you have been assigned to the the prosocial condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit everyone involved in each situation, rather than which option would be best for you. You will now be asked another

series of questions. You will not be told whether you answer correctly or not. Please do your best to answer the questions as you have been assigned to.

Q25 (Display this question if proself is selected...) That was the end of the practice questions. Remember, you have been assigned to the proself condition. This means that you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit you the most. You will now be asked another series of questions. You will not be told whether you answer correctly or not. Please do your best to answer the questions as you have been assigned to.

Q8 While at a café you see someone at the table next to you spill a drink on themselves. They call a server over to ask for assistance. Do you:

- Offer them a spare shirt, as they seem to be your size and you happen to have one on you
- Hand them napkins from your table

Q11 You walk in to a hotel to check in to your reserved room for the night. After taking your name, the receptionist explains that your room has been downgraded to make room for a large family that won a vacation at the same hotel. You will be compensated for the difference and given a complementary night for a future stay, but will need to sleep in a double bed instead of one of the two queens in your original reservation, and you do not know how likely it is that you would use the complementary night. Do you:

- Agree to the switch
- Ask to speak to the manager to discuss what might be worked out

Q12 Steven is in one of your classes, but was out sick recently. He asks you if you would be able to sit with him over the weekend to go over what he missed. Do you:

-Agree to go over the notes with him

-Offer Steven your notes, but explain that you don't really have the time to sit down with him like he asked

Q13 You are at the mall with your friend Nathan. You have been looking for a new pair of shoes that you need, but have not been able to find anything that fills your needs. Nathan asks to borrow some money to buy a video game that he sees in the window of a store. Do you:

-Give Nathan the money

-Say no, but offer to return to the mall with Nathan the following weekend to purchase the game, whether or not you are able to find your shoes this trip

Q14 One of your neighbors, Anne, asks you to house-sit for her over the course of a week. She needs you to make sure the flowers are watered and the mail brought in, but not much else. She offers to pay you a small amount per day for this favor. Do you:

-Offer to house-sit, but decline the money, as she is not asking for much anyway

-Accept her offer

Q15 You are walking along the beach when you see someone struggling to set up their beach umbrella. Do you:

-Offer to help set up the umbrella

-Give them advice on what you think they may be doing wrong, but do not stop to help

Q26 In the lobby of your apartment building, another resident, Tom, asks you if you know how to fix a clogged shower drain. Do you:

-Retrieve the unclogging tools you have in your apartment to help Tom unclog his drain

-Give Tom the unclogging tools you have so he can unclog his own drain

Q16 You are walking down a busy street when you see someone ahead of you drop ten dollars. Do you:

-Speed up so you can grab the money and return it to them

-Shout after them, hoping to get their attention, but keep the money if they cannot hear you

Q17 You are at a baseball game and are lucky enough to catch a home-run ball. A few minutes after you do so, a young boy walks up to you wearing the jersey of the player who hit the homerun. He asks if he can see the ball, making it clear that he does not want to keep it, only to see it for a short time. However, you had already put the ball in your bag, and a friend you are with just took the bag with them to go buy snacks. Do you:

-Explain to the boy that you do not have the ball on you, but if he waits you will give it to him

-Explain to the boy that you do not have the ball on you, but if he waits you will allow him to hold it like he asked

Q18 A major video game manufacturer is releasing their new console, and in order to get their console as early as possible several people have lined up outside the store the night before it is released. You happen to be walking by this line on your way to meet a friend for dinner when someone in line stops you and asks if you can hold their place for them so they can use a nearby public restroom. You agree to hold his spot, but ten minutes later he has not reappeared. Do you:

-Continue to hold the spot, and text your friend that you may be late for dinner

-Leave, as you only agreed to stay for ten minutes, but ask the others in line to allow the man to retake his spot when he returns

APPENDIX B

Political Ideology Scales

Scales taken from Crawford et al. (2013).

Please select the option with which you most identify.

1. Extremely liberal
2. Liberal
3. Somewhat Liberal
4. Neutral, Middle of the road
5. Somewhat conservative
6. Conservative
7. Extremely conservative

Please select the option with which you most identify.

1. Strong Democrat
2. Democrat
3. Independent, leaning towards Democrat
4. Independent
5. Independent, leaning towards Republican
6. Republican
7. Strong Republican

APPENDIX C

Prejudice Scale and Demographic Questions

Please move the thermometer to the position which most clearly matches your opinion on each group. You may skip any groups if you are uncomfortable.

Unfavorable and very cold

Very warm and favorable

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Christian Fundamentalists	
Big Business	
Christians	
Tea Party	
The Military	
Conservatives	
Catholics	
Working Class People	
Rich People	
Middle Class People	
Poor People	
Labor Unions	
Mormons	
Feminists	
People on Welfare	

Whites	
Liberals	
Illegal Immigrants	
Muslims	
Blacks	
Gay Men and Lesbians	
Atheists	
Asian Americans	
Hispanics	

Please select the option with which you most identify.

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Choose not to answer

What is your age (in years)?

To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you *most* identify? (Choose as many as apply.)

- ☐ African-American (non-Hispanic)
- ☐ Asian/Pacific Islanders
- ☐ Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- ☐ Hispanic/Latinx
- ☐ American Indian/Native American

- ☐ Other
- ☐ Choose not to answer

APPENDIX D

Corrected Social Implications Questionnaire

After having run 20 participants, researchers found an error in the instructions for the proself practice problems. In these instructions, participants were incorrectly instructed “to pick the option which is best for everyone in the situation.” (See Question 4 in Appendix A). Upon realizing this error, the question was corrected and the new wording is provided below:

Q4 (Shown if participants are assigned to the proself condition) You have been assigned to the proself condition. This means you will be tasked with picking the options which benefit you the most. You will now be presented with three practice questions. Your job is to pick the option which is best for you in particular.