

Kellogg Journal of Organization Behavior

1998 Issue

Leigh Thompson, Editor

Online at <http://www.kellogg.nwu.edu/research/ktag/kjob.htm>

© 2001 Kellogg Teams and Groups Center



The Effect of Mood on Social Value Orientation: Positive Mood

Induces Prosocial Behavior while Negative Mood Induces

Individualistic and Competitive Behavior

Shirli Kopelman

Northwestern University

Abstract

Prior research has demonstrated that there are individual differences in social value orientation, which dictate differential preferences for particular distributions of outcomes in situations of social interdependence. Prosocials (those motivated to maximize joint gains) exhibit more cooperation than individualists (who are motivated to maximize own gain, regardless of other) and competitors (motivated to maximize relative gain in relation to other). The assumption of this article is that these are not necessarily stable and fixed personality traits, but may be influenced by situational factors. We examine whether emotional states have differential effects on social value orientation. In this study we focus on the contrast between happy and sad moods compared to a control group, as a representation of a positive versus negative emotional state. Following a mood manipulation a measure of participants' social value orientation will be assessed. We hypothesize that in the case of a negative mood a person will be more likely to exhibit individualistic and competitive preferences for distributions of outcomes in situations of social interdependence. On the other hand, in a positive mood, a person will be more likely to exhibit prosocial orientations.

Does mood influence the degree to which people who are interdependent vary in how they take the other person into account? Consider a situation where parents give a bag of candy to elder siblings and tell them to share it with a younger sibling. Would elder siblings choose to share more or less candy if they were in a good or bad mood? Similarly, when a manager is told to divide bonus money among members of a work group, of which he/she is a part, could self-interest and competitive motives conflict with considerate and altruistic ones depending on the manager's mood that day? We propose to study whether the current mood of an individual influences the decision regarding distribution of a desired or undesired good in one's possession between oneself and another. We note that social value orientation is an indicator, expressing individuals' behavior in settings of outcome-interdependence. This paper will examine whether current mood has immediate affects on social value orientation of an individual as expressed through preferences for particular distributions of desired goods, in situations of social interdependence.

Social Value Orientation and Mood

Social value orientation is a way to describe individual preferences for particular distributions of outcomes in situations of social interdependence. Messick and McClintock (1968) showed that individuals differ in the ways in which they evaluate outcomes for themselves and others in prisoners' dilemma and other games with varied outcomes and partner characteristics. Decomposed games provide a means for assessing the motivational orientation of participants. McClintock (1972) proposed four major motivational orientations that an individual may assume in defining the attractiveness of various alternative outcomes: individualism, competition, cooperation, and altruism. Later, McClintock (1976) stated that an infinite number

of social value orientations could be distinguished. Empirically there is support for a three-category typology distinguished as cooperation (also referred to as prosocial), individualism, and competition (e.g. Beggan, Messick, and Allison, 1988; Liebrand and Van Run, 1985). In line with empirical work, we will look at social value orientation along these three motivational categories: 1) prosocial - preference to maximize joint gains; 2) individualism - the tendency to maximize one's own outcome, without regard to the outcomes of the others; 3) and competition - the inclination to maximize the relative gain of oneself in comparison with another.

Usually it is considered that social value orientation refers to stable preferences for certain patterns of outcomes to oneself and others. If this were so, we would not expect social value orientation to be affected by a transitory state such as mood. One would rather argue that the opposite causal relationship should be true, i.e. that social value orientation will influence mood. It might then seem intuitive that prosocial people would generally be in better moods, while competitive people would be in worse moods. In this context, we quote MacCrimmon and Messick (1976): "A question of psychological significance is the degree to which such motives are situationally, as opposed to dispositionally, determined. ...we do not want to leave the impression that when describing a motive... we have in mind a stable personality characteristic of a person." [p.99]. Similarly, McClintock (1972) discussed ways in which the environment may operate to define the availability of outcome distributions so as to increase or decrease the likelihood that a given motivational orientation will be employed. Does this imply that a situational or transitory state such as mood might influence the choice of social value orientation?

It appears that some research has supported the claim that social value orientation may be influenced by situational factors. For example, positive relationships lead to more altruism and

cooperation, while negative relationships lead to more individualism and competitiveness (e.g. Lowenstein et al., 1989; Bazerman et. al., 1992). Oesch and Murnighan (1997) show that, in addition to the perception of a relationship as positive or negative, whether the other is perceived as competent or incompetent also influences social motives and allocations. We ask whether moods may underlie the perception of a relationship as positive or negative or even directly influence social value orientation.

The influence of cognitive assessment of the interpersonal relationship on social value orientation could be mediated by additional factors such as mood. Affect had been the most largely ignored topic by the cognitive revolution in social psychology until it was reintroduced as an important concern in the early eighties. Although there is an on-going philosophical debate concerning the primacy of cognition versus affect (Zajonc, 1984; Lazarus, 1984), it is presently widely accepted that both factors influence behavior, whether dependently or interdependently. Isen (1987) reviews a large body of evidence, which indicates that under normal circumstances positive affect promotes helpfulness, generosity, responsibility, friendliness and sociability. Mood also influences judgments and memory about prototypical and atypical relationships (Forgas, 1995), as well as how people explain conflict in close relationships (Forgas, 1994). Given the impact of affect on individuals' perceptions of interpersonal relationships, mood may underlie shifts in social value orientation, depending on whether they assess the relationship as positive or negative. Likewise, affect could have a direct impact on social value orientation that is not mediated by some mechanism other than by the perception of the relationship as positive or negative. If affect influences perception - a cognitive process - it's effect may last longer than if it is simply the transitory mood at play.

An Example of the Possible Implication of Mood's Influence on Social Value Orientation in the Field of Negotiations

Assuming mood has an influence on social value orientation, determining the degree and direction of this interaction may help shed light on research that has examined both of these factors independently. To take an example from the field of negotiations, in recent years, both the influence of mood on negotiations and the influence of social value orientation on negotiations seem to have been studied separately and independently. The current study could suggest to theoretically integrate these two distinct streams of research.

The influence of mood on negotiations and the case of the emotional negotiator (Thompson, Nadler, and Kim, 1997) have recently become a focus of interest. Kramer et. al. (1993) showed that positive mood along with the motivation to maintain high-self esteem affect both prenegotiation expectations and postnegotiation judgments. According to Forgas and Moylan (1996), happy negotiators planned and used significantly more cooperative and integrative negotiating strategies than sad negotiators. The influence of emotions on negotiating strategies has come to the foreground.

Social value orientation, on the other hand, has also been found to impact negotiator cognition and behavior (De Dreu and Van Lange, 1995). Prosocial orientations exhibited lower levels of demand and greater levels of concessions, as well as ascribed greater levels of fairness and considerateness to the other person. Social value orientation was also found to influence negotiators' choice and recall of heuristics (De Dreu and Boles, 1997). Prosocial negotiators choose and recall more cooperative than competitive heuristics, while competitive negotiators chose and recall more competitive heuristics than cooperative ones. Negotiators with individualistic orientations did not choose more cooperative or competitive heuristics, but were

found to recall more competitive ones. The integration of social value orientation with the study of negotiations “is promising because it may provide more insight into the types of sequential transformations that discriminate prosocial subjects from individualists and competitors, as well as the specific motives that may underlie different negotiation strategies.” (De Dreu and Van Lange, 1995, p. 1187)

Similarly, the integration of mood and social value orientation may be just as promising. If indeed there is an interaction between mood and social value orientation, future studies of negotiations may need to control for the direction of this interaction. This can be exemplified in another area in negotiations to which social value orientation has been extended - the study of mixed motivational orientations in groups. Weingart and Brett (1996) examine how groups composed of members with different motivational orientations shift toward a common orientation during the negotiation and how this may influence their ability to reach an agreement. How exactly do these groups interact emotionally? May processes such as emotional contagion (Hatfield et. al., 1992) influence divergence or convergence of social value orientation within groups? An interaction between social value orientation and mood may have wide and interesting implications in the field of negotiations.

How Does Positive Versus Negative Mood Influence Social Value Orientation?

Previous research on the influence of mood on helping behavior provides insight into our hypotheses regarding the direction of interaction between mood and social value orientation. It seems reasonable to make some parallel assumptions concerning the willingness of an individual to help another and the willingness to give to another. In studies of helping behavior, mood is manipulated as an independent variable while the dependent variable - helping behavior -

measures the participants' willingness to help another person through some specific action. In the case of social value orientation, prosocial orientations take into account the gain of another person since their concern is to maximize joint gains. This could be seen as an indication that a person is willing "to give" to another. Individualistic orientations take only their own gain into account, thus they seem not to be concerned with giving to the other. Competitive orientations not only want to do well for themselves in terms of gains, they also want the other to do relatively poorly, and thus definitely do not seem concerned with giving. Even though the actions of helping behavior and giving through distribution of a valued commodity may not perfectly coincide, assessing previous research on mood and helping behavior may prove insightful for understanding the effect of mood on social value orientation.

Positive mood. The vast majority of research has consistently shown that positive mood, induced in a variety of ways, consistently motivates an array of helping behavior (e.g. Berkovitz and Connor, 1966; Cunningham, 1979). The only exception seems to be the case where the helping behavior itself may reduce one's happy state - in such a case people may not be as likely to act on it because they strive to maintain their positive state. Isen & Simmonds (1978) have shown that people who were induced into a positive mood by receiving coins in a coin-return slot of a public telephone were less likely compared to control participants to help a stranger, when the helping behavior was portrayed as an action that would make them feel depressed. Since in the current study the distribution choice between oneself and the other is not assumed to have any allusion to uncomfortable consequences, this exception should not be consequential. Thus, in line with the predominate finding that positive mood consistently promotes helping behavior, we hypothesize that participants in a good mood will be more likely to be "giving" toward the other person, and thus will more likely employ prosocial value orientations.

Negative mood. The literature on the effects of negative moods on helping behavior is not as straightforward as that on positive moods. Some studies such as Cialdini, Darby, and Vincent (1973) show that having sad thoughts motivates helping, while others such as Moore, Underwood, and Rosenhan (1973) show that it inhibits helping behavior. In addition, some studies show that negative mood does not affect helping behavior at all (Harris and Siebal, 1975). Thus, there are two conflicting views. First, people in a negative mood will take positive steps, like helping another, in order to get out of their negative mood. Second, there is research that shows that people in a negative mood will remain congruent with their mood, and thus be less likely to exhibit helping behavior.

In the case of negative mood, the influence on helping behavior does not provide as clear a guide regarding its influence on helping behavior. If indeed the first view is correct, and people in a negative mood are motivated to take positive action in order to better their mood, one of two things may happen in the case of distributions in situations of social interdependence. One option is that people would take as much as they can, or at least more for themselves and ignore the other person in order to achieve the end of improving their mood. Another is that they would attempt to indirectly improve their mood through a giving gesture to the other person. In the first case, they would display competitive or individualistic orientations. In the latter they would be more likely to exhibit prosocial value orientations. However, the first option - that people would take more for themselves - seems to be a more rational and parsimonious choice. If one can better one's mood immediately by providing for oneself, it seems that one would do so rather than choose a strategy of indirect mood enhancement by giving to another.

On the other hand, if we follow the second point of view inferred from research on mood and helping behavior - negative mood inhibits helping behavior - there is no reason altogether to

assume that people in a negative mood will be likely to give to another. Rather the contrary may be true. If one behaves in a congruent fashion to one's negative mood then one may even become more self-centered or competitive, and thus be even less likely to give. In this case, negative mood would seem to motivate individualistic and competitive social motives, rather than prosocial. Thus, it seems that both views lead to the same conclusion - that negative mood would enhance the probability of individualistic and competitive choices of behavior.

Based on the above analysis of previous studies on mood and helping behavior we have made a hypothesis on the direction of influence that mood might have on social value orientation. Our choice of a happy versus sad mood is grounded in that research. The manipulation of the negative versus positive representative mood is intended to have a similar degree of magnitude, therefore our use of two relatively cooler emotions. We would not want to compare happy versus angry emotions, since an angry state is assumed to have a higher level of arousal and is often considered a hot state. Future analysis could take into account the larger array of emotional states and examine whether they have differential effects on social value orientation. In the present study we focus on the contrast between happy and sad moods, compared to a control group, as a representation of positive versus negative emotional states.

To summarize, this paper examines whether mood influences social value orientation of an individual. Will individual preferences for particular distributions of outcomes in situations of social interdependence, change as a result of the individual's mood? We assume that social value orientations of individuals may be influenced by situational factors, rather than being a stable personality trait. In this study the situational factor is mediated by a manipulative change in the individual's current mood. It is not clear whether a mood manipulation will influence an individual's cognitive evaluation of the distributive situation - their assessment of the given

relationship for example - or whether mood spontaneously influences the choice decision directly. Thus, at this point it is difficult to predict the duration of the impact of mood on social value orientation.

Presently, we are interested to know whether mood altogether influences social value orientation, and thus we measure social value orientation immediately following a mood manipulation. As inferred from research on mood and helping behavior previously discussed, we hypothesize that in the case of a negative mood a person will be more likely to exhibit individualistic and competitive behavior when allocating a distributive sum between oneself and a perceived other. On the other hand, in a positive mood, a person will be more likely to exhibit prosocial orientations.

In this study, 120 participants will be induced into either positive (happy), control (relatively neutral), or negative (sad) moods. Following this manipulation a measure of their social value orientation will be assessed. We hypothesize that in the condition of a happy mood the number of prosocial preferences for distribution of outcomes in situations of social interdependence will be larger than those in the control and sad mood conditions. On the other hand, we hypothesize that in the condition of a sad mood the number of individualistic and competitive participants will exceed those in the happy and control mood conditions.

Method

Participants

Participants will be told that for reasons of efficiency they will be participating in two short but unrelated studies. As a part of the allegedly unrelated prior experiment they will view happy, neutral, or sad videotapes. The purpose of these is to induce mood as an independent

variable. In the alleged second experiment, social value orientation will be measured with a common structured forced choice technique, and compared to an open-ended active allocation choice. The experiment involves a 3 X 1 design, with three conditions of mood (happy, control, sad) and a measure of social value orientation. This study will include 120 participants, forty in each mood condition. They will be recruited by an advertisement in the Northwestern student paper, as well as by advertising posters through out the campus. They will be paid separately for the two allegedly different experiments.

Procedure

The independent variable in this study is mood. It will be manipulated in two directions: positive and negative. The dependent variable is social value orientation. Social value orientation can have one of three values: prosocial, individualistic, and competitive. One hundred and twenty participants will be randomly assigned to one of three groups; those induced to be in a happy mood, those induced to be in a sad mood and a control group with no mood manipulation. The control group is not necessarily assumed to be in a neutral mood but enables a comparison of the relative size of mood effects due to positive and negative mood manipulations. Thus all statements about the effect of positive and negative mood refer to relative, and not absolute, differences.

Mood induction. Participants will view happy, sad, or neutral videotapes in an allegedly unrelated prior experiment. Participants will sign up for two unrelated experiments to “save subject time” and will be run in groups of 15. Three experimenters will alternate running the different mood manipulation so as to control for an experimenter effect on mood the manipulation. The 10-minute mood induction films will include: a) an excerpt from The Three

Stooges (positive mood); b) an educational program on astronomy (control); and c) a film dealing with a mother's death from cancer (negative mood). Forgas (1995), previously used a similar technique for manipulating mood with different videotapes, and found these to be significantly effective. In this first allegedly separate experiment, participants will be told that this is a study designed to compare peoples' judgment of personality by viewing characters in films. They will be told to pay close attention to the characters presented, as they will be asked to answer questions regarding their personality traits following the viewing.

After the film participants will be asked to answer one open-ended question regarding the characters and a series of brief questions among which will also be embedded questions regarding their current mood (See Appendix A for description of the different films and a copy of the questions). These will be rated on a seven-point scale of happy-sad, or good-bad and their order will be reversed in half the cases to control for order-effects. The second part of the questionnaire - in fact the manipulation check - will conclude this part of the procedure. After participants will be debriefed, thanked, and paid for their participation, they will be led down the hall to a different room where another experimenter will welcome them to the allegedly second experiment.

Social value orientation task. The social value orientation task will be construed as the allegedly second experiment in which participants will be asked to partake. A different experimenter will welcome each group and introduce this experiment as related to decision-making processes that involve allocation of money or other valuable goods. Each participant will be seated in a cubicle so that no other participant can see his or her desktop space. On each desk participants will find their experimental packet which will include instructions for two separate

tasks (See Appendix B for details). The order of the two tasks will be reversed for half the participant so as to control for an order effect.

The first task is a technique used to measure social value orientation based on decomposed games (Messick and McClintock, 1968) - a measurement technique that has been demonstrated to have good internal consistency (e.g., Liebrand & Van Run, 1985) as well as test-retest reliability (Kuhlman, Camac, & Cunha, 1986). In this task, each participant will receive a form with explanations followed by a set of choice distributions. In total there will be nine decomposed games derived from Kuhlman and Marshello (1975) measures of individual differences. Participants will be asked to choose one of three distributions of outcomes between themselves and another - random - person. They will be asked to make independent decisions about distributing the outcome between themselves and the other person. Each case has the same general format with three choices each stating “you get \$x and the other will get \$y”. They must select one among the three given choices for each case. Table 1 provides examples of the decomposed games used in the present study.

From the outcome distribution choices we can calculate social motivation scores for each individual. Each of their distribution preferences represents at least one of the three social motives: prosocial, individualistic, or competitive. Prosocial choices are those that maximize joint gains (for example, option “c” in Example 1 in Table 1). Individualistic motives are represented by choices that maximize one’s own gain regardless of the others (option “b” in Example 1 in Table 1). Competitive motives are represented by choices that maximize relative gains (option “a” in Example 1 in Table 1). Participants choosing at least six times a prosocial alternative will be classified as prosocial. Participants choosing at least six times a competitive

alternative will be classified as competitors, and participants choosing at least six times an individualistic alternative will be classified as individualists.

Task two will be an active open-choice manipulation intended both to give a real-monetary incentive so as to motivate participation, as well as an allocative decision. Participants will be given \$10 (9 single dollar bills and four quarters) and told to make a decision how much of it they keep as their pay for participation in this study and how much they donate to charity to the United Way – an umbrella charity organization. They will be told that this decision will remain completely anonymous as no where on any forms will they be asked to write their names. They will be given two separate small white labeled envelopes into which they will insert the sum of money kept and that given, and will be asked to seal each of them¹. The relative sums that they keep for themselves versus the amount that they donate will later be correlated to the results of the social value orientation task. We will analyze whether prosocials give more to charity than individualists and competitors, and if so whether there is also a difference between the relative amounts that individualists and competitors give.

Half the participants will be given the forced choice technique first, and the other half will be given the allocative open-ended choice first in order to manipulate for order effects. Following both social orientation tasks, participants will be asked to complete a short questionnaire, as well as an open-ended question regarding what motivated their decision concerning the pay they received for the study, and how they feel about it. This will serve as an additional mood manipulation check. They will then be asked to put all the materials other than the envelope with their pay (the forced choice technique, the envelope for charity, and the

¹ It is not necessary for us to track individual participants, the open-ended and fixed-choice measurement of social value orientation will still be paired, and at the end of the experiment will be marked so as to track which prior mood-manipulation was induced.

demographic questionnaire) in a large brown envelope. After these are collected, participants will be debriefed and thanked for their participation.

TABLE 1. Two Examples of Decomposed Games

| option | Example 1 | | Example 2 | |
|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | you get | other gets | you get | other gets |
| a | \$480 | \$ 80 | \$500 | \$100 |
| b | \$540 | \$280 | \$500 | \$500 |
| c | \$480 | \$480 | \$550 | \$300 |

APPENDIX A

Description of Mood Manipulation. After participants are welcomed to the experiment they will be told: “You are about to partake in a study designed to compare people’s judgment of different characters in a film. You will be shown a short, ten-minute film, and will then be asked to answer several questions. While viewing the film you should pay close attention to the various personalities involved. There are no right or wrong responses. Please do not discuss anything with fellow participants during the film, nor while you answer the questionnaires. Are there any questions?”

Once the task is clear, they will be shown one of three films depending on the mood manipulation group. The following pages describe the video and questionnaires used in each of the three mood manipulations:

Film 1: Sad Mood Manipulation

The film shown will tell the story of a widow dying of cancer.

Brief description. A widowed woman comes out of a doctor's office where she is told that she has cancer and has only three months to live. She returns home distressed and calls her two sons, both of whom are married with children, and live, in the same city. Then, there are two scenes showing each son discussing his reaction with his wife after the children have gone to bed. One son, Joe, tells his wife that he intends to take 3 months leave from work so he can dedicate his time to his dying mother. We see the wife crying but don't hear her reaction. We then see the second son, Steve, in a similar scene. Steve asks his wife opinion as to what they should do, and together they decide it may be a good idea to put his mother in a nursing home where she will have good care.

Questionnaire 1

A. Compare the characters of the two sons, Joe and Steve. Discuss the personality of each and indicate with which one you identify more. (Please limit your answer to the space provided in this page - *one page will be allotted*).

B. Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 7. Mark only one answer for each question:

1. To what degree did you identify with the son you indicated in your answer in part A?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| barely identified/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | identified very much |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|

2. How distressed did that son seem to be?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| barely distressed/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | distressed very much |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|

3. How would you rate his mood?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| bad/upset | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | good |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|

4. How responsible/mature was his reaction?

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| barely took responsibility | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very mature/ responsible |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------|

5. Was his wife supportive?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| barely supportive/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very supportive |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

6. How worried was the second son?

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| barely worried/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very worried |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|

7. How responsible is the reaction of the other son?

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| barely responsible/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very responsible |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|

8. How supportive was the other son's wife?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| barely supportive/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very supportive |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

9. How devastated did the mother seem to be as she walked out of the doctor's office?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| barely devastated/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very devastated |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

10. How do you currently feel?

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| sad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | happy |
| good | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | bad |

Film 2: Good Mood Manipulation

A ten-minute clip of a Three Stooges will be shown.

Questionnaire 2

A. Give a short paragraph describing each of the characters. Which one do you think is the funniest and why? (Please limit your answer to the space provided in this page - *one page will be allotted*).

B. Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 7. Mark only one answer for each question:

1. How funny did you find the character you chose as the funniest one in part A?
barely funny/not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very funny

2. How familiar are you with the Three Stooges?
barely familiar/not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very familiar

3. Watching this video clip of the three stooges put me in a _____ mood.
bad/sad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good/happy

4. How often do you watch comedy shows?
rarely / not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very often

5. Does watching comedy usually put you in a good mood?
rarely / not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much so

6. How convincing are the characters in the Three Stooges?
rarely / not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much so

7. Was the character you found to be the funniest also the most convincing?

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| rarely / not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very much so |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

8. How different do you find the characters one from the other?

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| rarely / not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very much so |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

9. How interesting did you find the story line in this selection?

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| rarely interesting / not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very interesting |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|

10. Relative to the story, do the characters add a marginal versus major contribution to the comical aspects of the movie?

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| minor impact/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | major impact by characters |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|

Film 3: Control for Mood Manipulation

A ten-minute clip from an educational channel will show a teacher giving a lecture on astronomy geared to high school students.

Questionnaire 3

A. Imagine this teacher interacting in a real classroom with high school students. Describe this situation focusing on the teacher's personality? (Please limit your answer to the space provided in this page - one page will be allotted).

B. Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 7. Mark only one answer for each question:

1. Does this teacher remind you of a specific teacher you once had?

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| not very much/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very much |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|

2. How interesting do you find the field of astronomy?

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| not very interesting/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very interesting |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|

3. How engaging was the teacher's presentation in the film?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| not very engaging/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very engaging |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

4. Was the presentation well structured?

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| not very structured/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very structured |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|

5. Did you enjoy viewing this lecture?

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| not very much/ not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very much |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|

6. How do you feel following this film?

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| bad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | good |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|

7. Do you judge the teacher as a good or bad teacher?

bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

8. Do you find the teacher to be a friendly person?

not very
friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very
friendly

9. How would you rate the physical appearance of the teacher?

unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 attractive

10. How professional do you find the teacher?

not
professional 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very
professional

APPENDIX B: Social value orientation task

Task 1

Directions. On your desk you will find \$10 (9 single dollar bills and four quarters) and two white envelopes. One envelope says “my pay” the other “charity”. You are asked to make a decision how to divide the \$10 dollars between the amount you will get for participating in this study and how much you will be giving to charity. Anything you put in the charity envelope will be forwarded to United Way - an umbrella charity organization. Your decision regarding how much to keep, and how much to donate will remain completely anonymous both to your peers participating in the experiment, as well as to the experimenters. To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name on any of the handouts in this study. If you have any questions regarding this task, raise your hand and the experimenter will approach you.

Please divide the money among the two envelopes and seal each of them.

Task 2

Outcome Distribution Preferences

In this part of the study we ask you to choose one of three distributions of outcomes between yourself and some other, random, person. You will be asked to make nine independent decisions. Please indicate your own preference; there are no right or wrong answers.

For example:

| | A | B | C |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Your gain | \$500 | \$500 | \$550 |
| Other's gain | \$100 | \$500 | \$300 |

If you circle answer A: you will get \$500, and the other person will get \$100.

If you circle answer B: you will get \$500, and the other person will get \$500.

If you circle answer C: you will get \$550, and the other person will get \$300.

If there is anything unclear about the task - please raise your hand and the experimenter will approach you, otherwise, you may begin.

Circle only one answer for each question:

| | A | B | C |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1) You get: | \$480 | \$540 | \$480 |
| Other gets: | \$ 80 | \$280 | \$480 |
| 2) You get: | \$560 | \$500 | \$500 |
| Other gets: | \$300 | \$500 | \$100 |
| 3) You get: | \$520 | \$520 | \$580 |
| Other gets: | \$520 | \$120 | \$320 |
| 4) You get: | \$500 | \$560 | \$490 |
| Other gets: | \$100 | \$300 | \$490 |
| 5) You get: | \$560 | \$500 | \$490 |
| Other gets: | \$300 | \$500 | \$ 90 |
| 6) You get: | \$500 | \$500 | \$570 |
| Other gets: | \$500 | \$100 | \$300 |

The Effect of Mood on Social Value Orientation

| | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 7) You get: | \$510 | \$560 | \$510 |
| Other gets: | \$510 | \$300 | \$110 |
| 8) You get: | \$550 | \$500 | \$500 |
| Other gets: | \$300 | \$100 | \$500 |
| 9) You get: | \$480 | \$490 | \$540 |
| Other gets: | \$480 | \$100 | \$300 |

References

- Baron, R. A. (1990). Environmentally induced positive affect: its impact on self-efficacy, task performance, negotiation, and conflict. Journal of Applied and Social Psychology, 20, 5, 368-384.
- Bazerman, M., Loewenstein, G. F., & Blount White, S. (1992) Reversals of preference in allocation decisions: judging an alternative versus choosing among alternatives. Administrative Science Quarterly, 37, 220-240.
- Beggan, J. K., Messick, D. M., & Allison, S. T. (1988). Social values and egocentric bias: Two tests of the might over morality hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 606-611.
- Berkovitz, L., & Connor, W. H. (1966). Success, failure, and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 664-669.
- Cialdini, R. B., Darby, B. L., & Vincent, J. E. (1973). Transgression and altruism: A case for hedonism. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 502-516.
- Cunningham, M. R. (1979). Weather, mood, and helping behavior: The sunshine Samaritan. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1947-1956.
- De Dreu, C. K. & Van Lange, P. A. M. (1995). The impact of social value orientations on negotiator cognition and behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 11, 1178-1188.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Boles, T. L. (1997). Motivated cognition in negotiation: Social value orientation influences choice and recall of decision heuristics. In press.
- Forgas, J. P. & Moylan, S. J. (1996). One feeling good and getting your way: Mood effects on expected and actual negotiation strategies and outcomes. Unpublished manuscript.
- Forgas, J. P. (1995). Strange couples: mood effects on judgments and memory about prototypical and atypical relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 7, 747-765.
- Forgas, J. P. (1994). Sad and guilty? Affective influences on the explanation of conflict in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 1, 56-68.
- Harris, M., and Siebal, C. (1975). Affect, aggression, and altruism. Developmental Psychology, 11, 623-627.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T. & Rapson, R. L. (1992). Primitive emotional contagion. Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 151-177. In M. S. Clark (Ed.) Emotions and social behavior. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Isen, A. M. (1987). Positive affect, cognitive processes, and social behavior. In L. Berkovitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 20, pp. 203-253). New York: Academic Press.

Isen, A. M. & Simmonds, S. F. (1978). The effect of feeling good on a helping task that is incompatible with good mood. Social Psychology, 41, 4, 346-349.

Kuhlman, D. M., Camac, C., & Cunha, D. A. (1986). Individual differences in social orientation. In H. Wilke, D. Messick, & C. Rutte (Eds.), Experimental social dilemmas (pp. 151-176). New York: Verlag Peter Lang.

Kuhlman, D. M., & Marshello, A. (1975). Individual differences in game motivation as moderators of preprogrammed strategic effects in Prisoner's Dilemma. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 922-931.

Kramer, R. M. , Newton, E., & Pommerenke, P. L. (1993). Self-enhancement biases and negotiator judgment: Effects of self-esteem on mood. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 56, 110-133.

Lazarus, R. S. (1984). On the primacy of cognition. American Psychologist, 39, 2, 124-129.

Liebrand, W. B. G., & Van Run, G. (1985). The effects of social motives across two cultures on behavior in social dilemmas. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21, 86-100.

Loewenstein, G. F., Bazerman, M. H., & Thompson, L. (1989). Social utility and decision making in interpersonal contexts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 3, 426-441.

MacCrimmon, K. R. & Messick D. M. (1976). A framework for social motives. Behavioral Science, 21, 86-100.

McClintock, C. G. (1976). Social motivations in settings of outcome interdependence. In D. Druckman (Ed.), Negotiations: Social psychology perspective. (pp. 49-77). Beverly Hills: Sage.

McClintock, C. G. (1972). Social motivation - a set of propositions. Behavioral Science, 17, 438-454.

Messick, D. M. & McClintock C. G. (1968). Motivational Bases of choice in experimental games. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4, 1-25.

Moore, B., Underwood, B., & Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). Affect and altruism. Developmental Psychology, 8, 99-104.

Oesch, J. M. & Murnighan, K. J. (1997). What I deserve: the effects of social motives, relationships, and competence on salaries and other allocations. Academy of Management paper.

Thompson, L., Nadler, J. & Kim, P. H. (1997). Some like it hot: the case for the emotional negotiator. In L. Thompson, D. Messick, & J. Levine (Eds.), Shared cognition in organizations: the management of knowledge, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weingart, L., & Brett, J. (1996). Mixed motivational orientations in negotiating groups: convergence and reaching agreement. Academy of Management paper.

Zajonc, R. B. (1984). On the primacy of affect. American Psychologist, 39, 2, 117-123.