

Supplementary Information

This file contains supplementary information regarding:

1. Product evaluation questionnaire
2. Debriefing Questionnaire
3. Site Specific Methods Information

Product Evaluation Questionnaire

We would like you now to please evaluate the effectiveness of the therapeutic gel pack you have examined and then to circle the extent to which you would recommend it as a product to different people.

Part 1

How effective do you find the therapeutic gel pack?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not At All			Extremely			

Part 2

To what extent would you recommend this gel pack to your family?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Recommend At All			Highly Recommend			

To what extent would you recommend this gel pack to your friends?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Recommend At All			Highly Recommend			

To what extent would you recommend this gel pack to strangers?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not Recommend At All			Highly Recommend			

Part 3

Please estimate the approximate internal temperature of the therapeutic pack in degrees Fahrenheit [Celsius]: _____

Now that you've answered the questions, please place the therapeutic pack back in the box you took it from.

Once you've returned the therapeutic pack, please turn the page to complete the questionnaire.

Dependent Variable - Framing

Having completed the study we would like to thank you for your participation and offer you an option of rewards. Please indicate which you would prefer by ticking the appropriate box.

Critical reward question: Kenyon - Version A

- | | |
|---|---|
| Refresh yourself with a Snapple! <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to The Pink <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Made from the best stuff on earth! | Cupcake! Have a gift voucher on |
| Quench your thirst with a refreshing | us! Give someone the gift of the |
| drink! | best cupcakes in Mount Vernon! |

Critical reward question: Kenyon - Version B

- | | |
|---|--|
| Refresh yourself with a Pink <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to a Snapple! Made <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cupcake! Have a gift voucher on us! | from the best stuff on earth! Give |
| Satisfy yourself with the best | someone the gift of a refreshing |
| cupcakes in Mount Vernon! | drink! |

Critical reward question: Michigan State - Version A

- | | |
|---|--|
| Refresh yourself with a Snapple! <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to an ice cream cone <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Made from the best stuff on earth! | from the MSU Dairy Store. Have a |
| Quench your thirst with a refreshing | gift voucher on us! Give someone |
| drink! | the gift of the best ice cream in |
| | East Lansing! |

Critical reward question: Michigan State - Version B

- | | |
|---|--|
| Refresh yourself with an ice cream <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to a Snapple! Made <input type="checkbox"/> |
| cone from the MSU Dairy Store. | from the best stuff on earth! Give |
| Have a gift voucher on us! Satisfy | someone the gift of a refreshing |
| yourself with best ice cream in East | drink! |
| Lansing! | |

Critical reward question: Manchester - Version A

- | | |
|--|---|
| Treat yourself to a fruit smoothie! <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to a tasty fruit juice! <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Made from the best stuff on earth! | Have a gift voucher on us! Give |
| Quench your thirst with a refreshing | someone the gift of the best fruit |
| drink! | juice in Manchester! |

Critical reward question: Manchester - Version B

- | | |
|--|--|
| Treat yourself to a fruit juice! Have a <input type="checkbox"/> | Treat a friend to a fruit smoothie! <input type="checkbox"/> |
| gift voucher on us! Satisfy yourself | Made from the best stuff on earth! |
| with the best fruit juice in | Give someone the gift of a |
| Manchester! | refreshing drink! |

Debriefing Questionnaire

1. What do you think the purpose of the study was?
2. Did anything you did on one question affect how you responded to another question?
3. Did you think there was a link between the product rating study and the choice of gift/reward you chose?
4. How do you think the product rating experience might have influenced your choice of gift/reward?

Site Specific Methods Information

Kenyon College

The research team (three-four volunteers and K. S. Corker) set up a table at a local community event on June 7 and July 5, 2013. Passers-by were approached and asked to participate in a three-five minute “product evaluation study” with a free gift for participation. Gift choices were not revealed to participants. Participants who inquired were informed that they would receive a choice of gifts valued at approximately \$2. Attempts were made to obscure the rewards for participation from plain view. Furthermore, the research team volunteers were blind to the hypotheses of the study, and the testing area was partitioned off from the recruitment area by an approximately 4’ wide by 7’ tall fabric screen.

One member of the research team was responsible for maintaining the hot and cold packs. Packs were stored in small, Styrofoam coolers (labeled ‘1’ and ‘2’) to maintain consistent pack temperatures. Hot packs (HeatMax brand 4” x 5” Hand and Body Warmers) were activated at least one hour before data collection began and were used for each entire occasion of data collection, based on pre-testing that revealed that it took about an hour for packs to reach peak temperatures. Once at their peak temperature, packs remained consistently hot for many hours (i.e., > 8 hours). Cold packs (Dynarex brand 4” x 5” Instant Cold Packs) were changed out once every 10 minutes, based on pre-testing that revealed 10 minutes to be the typical time that pack temperatures would exceed 60 degrees Fahrenheit.

Participants first completed informed consent, before being provided with a study packet. They were instructed to take their packet to the testing area, where they would evaluate a product specified on page two of their packet. They were requested not to talk to other participants and to return when they had completed their evaluations. A cover sheet obscured condition assignment from the research assistant. The main dependent measure was located on the final page of the packet; participants checked a box to indicate their reward choice. After completing the evaluation, participants returned their packets and were asked to complete a debriefing questionnaire while the

research assistant retrieved their selected reward. Participants were then given their reward, an information sheet that explained the study's purpose, and were dismissed.

Kenyon College student participants signed up for the study in the online research participation website. They came to an indoor testing room that consisted of a lobby and a private testing area. The basic procedure was otherwise the same as it was for community participants.

In terms of a priori exclusions, five participants declined to choose a reward, one participant experienced a procedural failure (there was no therapeutic pack in the box for her to evaluate), one participant evaluated both therapeutic packs, and one participant required the assistance of another person to complete the entire procedure. Furthermore, four participants were ± 3 *SD* away from the mean temperature estimate within their temperature condition (one in the hot condition and three in the cold condition). Coding of the debriefing responses revealed that no participants connected the temperature manipulation to selfishness of reward choices. In total, then, 12 participants were excluded on the basis of these a priori criteria. An additional 10 participants were excluded in the exploratory analysis on the basis of research assistant notes indicating that the participant had to be prompted verbally to choose a reward or experienced some other anomaly (e.g., "participant seemed drunk").

Michigan State University

The procedure was based on the Kenyon College protocol; unless otherwise noted, the same procedures were followed. The research team (one to two volunteers and J.A. Wortman) set up tables at various locations on the Michigan State University campus between October 30 and November 19, 2013. The testing area was partitioned off from the recruitment area by a 2' high foam board partition.

Hot packs were used for an entire collection occasion. Cold packs were changed out once every 10 minutes, or if data collection was moving slowly (i.e., there was fewer than one participant every 10 minutes), the research assistant would replace the cold pack for each participant individually prior to completion of the survey.

In terms of a priori exclusions, one participant evaluated both therapeutic packs.

Furthermore, three participants were ± 3 *SD* away from the mean temperature estimate within their temperature condition (one in the hot condition and three in the cold condition). Coding of the debriefing responses revealed that nine participants seem to have connected the temperature manipulation to selfishness of reward choices. In total, then, 13 participants were excluded on the basis of these criteria.

University of Manchester

Researchers set up tables and testing areas at each event, and passers-by were approached to take part in a product-evaluation study. Participants were brought to the testing area, where they were separated from each other by partitions. They were first given an overview of the study (Participant information sheet) and a consent form to sign. Once the consent form was signed, they were given a questionnaire booklet. The cover page asked for basic demographic details and also served to hide the second page which instructed the participant which of two black boxes in front of them they should open; one box contained a hot pack and one contained a cold pack. The cover page ensured that researchers were blind to the temperature pack condition that participants were assigned to.

On the questionnaire, participants evaluated the effectiveness of either the hot/cold pack on a scale ranging from (1) not at all to (7) extremely, and indicated to what extent they would recommend the product to their family, friends, or strangers. Finally they estimated the internal temperature of the gel pack in degrees Celsius. Once participants completed these questions they were instructed to place the evaluated product back in its original box. This also served to ensure that researchers remained unaware of the participant's condition until at least after the debrief. The final page of the questionnaire included the critical reward choice where participants chose either a voucher (for a fruit juice/smoothie) for themselves (self-interested option) or for a friend (prosocial/altruistic option).

Before leaving the screened off area, each participant completed a short funnel debriefing

questionnaire which allowed us to establish whether the participant saw through the manipulation of the study or not. Once the participant had completed the funnel debrief, they were brought away from the testing area, given their voucher reward and a page explaining the true nature of the study.

During testing sessions, hot and cold packs were tested by hand at regular intervals, with cold packs needing replacing approximately every 15 mins, while hot packs were replenished approximately once an hour. The same basic procedure was followed for all study locations and for both indoor and outdoor testing. For outdoor testing, the recruiting and testing areas were covered using portable gazebos.

Prior to analysis 23 participants' data were removed: 9 for having seen through the study manipulation, 4 for not responding to the critical reward question, 2 for not completing the debrief questionnaire, 5 for having not given a pack temperature estimate, and 3 for having temperature estimates that were > 3 standard deviations from the mean for that condition.