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Summary
We induced people with either an emotional or a calculative mindset in an ostensibly unrelated study. We then asked them to make a helping decision. The decision was either about their intention to donate to charity (Study 1) or about how to allocate resources between two helping organizations (Study 2). The results suggest that an induced emotional mindset makes us more likely to help, but that an induced calculative mindset makes us more likely to allocate to an organization helping many statistical-out-group victims rather than few identified in-group victims. The results are in line with the suggestion made by Czyz’yk and Loewenstein (2011) saying that people should rely on their emotional reactions for decisions about whether to help but to rely on reason for decisions about how to help.

Background
There is an ongoing debate whether emotions or analytical thinking is preferable for decision making in helping situations (e.g. Vohs et al, 2007; Loewenstein & Small, 2007; Slovic, 2007).

Emotions are preferable:
• Priming people to focus on their feelings or providing high cognitive load and time pressure increase helping intentions (Dickert et al., 2011; Rand et al., 2012; 2014, but see Tinghög et al., 2013).
• Inducing a deliberative mindset reduce helping to identified victims (Small & Loewenstein & Slovic, 2007).
• Deliberation, and specifically calculation, crowd out moral intuitions and make people share less in dictator games (Zhong, 2011; Wang et al., 2013).

Analytic thinking is preferable:
• People are sensitive when primed with calculation but insensitive when primed with feelings (Hsee & Rottenstreich, 2004).
• Only people with high emotional understanding display the singularity effect bias (Hasford et al., 2015).
• Feeling compassion toward specific victims can make us disregard grand-scale consequences and fairness aspects in helping situations (Batson et al., 1995; Oceja, 2008).

Importantly, there are several types of decisions related to helping: A) Likelihood: Whether to help or not?, B) Magnitude: How much to help?, C) Allocation: How to divide resources among victims? Most research emphasizing the positive aspects of emotion focus on likelihood & magnitude. Most research emphasizing the negative aspects of emotion focus on allocation.

Predictions
1. People primed with emotion will be more willing to donate money to charity than people primed with calculation.
2. People primed with calculation will allocate money in a more rational "utilitarian" manner than people primed with emotion.

Priming emotion & calculation
We primed participants with an emotional or a calculative mindset (Study 1a, 2) or with an emotional or a calculative concept (Study 1b; Bargh & Chartrand, 2000).

The priming task was unrelated to the subsequent helping decisions meaning that the induced mindset/concept was incidental rather than integral. Also, the priming was perceptible rather than subtle. Participants was thus conscious of the induced mindset and could easily attribute it to a specific task.

Study 1 - Results

1a (Mindset-priming)
Previous research has shown that the personal characteristics of the handwriting appears the most when the writer is emotionally moved by something and experiencing strong emotions directed at someone else (think very objectively and not consider their own feelings too much). Therefore, we want you to think of a situation in your life when you felt strong emotions for any other living creature. Describe the situation and try to put into words the feelings you experienced. In your own words, describe how you arrive at the answer to the following question: A restaurant bill is made up of the following: 132.50 SEK for an appetizer, main dish for 283.50 SEK and 87 SEK for dessert, plus 15% tax. How large is the total bill? (Study 1a, 2)

1b (Concept-priming)
Your task is to transcribe (copy) the paragraph below by hand. Compassion is the feeling of empathy for others. The etymology of "compassion" is Latin, meaning "co-suffering." Compassion commonly gives rise to an active desire to alleviate another's suffering. Compassion is considered in almost all traditions as amongst the greatest of virtues. Rationality is the quality or state of being reasonably based on facts or reason. A rational decision is one that is not just reasoned, but is also optimal for achieving a goal or solving a problem. Rationality is considered in almost all traditions as amongst the greatest of virtues.

Study 1a - Results

N = 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entourage</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages: No donation = 55%, 1 donation = 45%

Study 1b - Results

N = 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages: No donation = 65%, 1 donation = 35%

Study 2 - Method
Same as Study 1, but instead of having a chance to win money, participants (n = 105) were told that 10 SEK would be donated to charity on their behalf.

Page 1: Same as in Study 1a (mindset-priming)

Page 2: Overtly an obligatory break before the personality test. During the break participants were asked to choose which organization they wished to donate their 10 SEK to.

The “utilitarian” choice was “The world infection fund” – a Swedish charity organization focusing their efforts on the infectious diseases of the world’s poor. The “non-utilitarian” choice was the Swedish equivalent of Make-a-wish foundation, focusing their efforts on a few identified children in Sweden.

Page 3: Same as Study 1. Same funnelled debriefing as in Study 1. Participants who guessed the hypothesis were excluded (n = 4).

Study 2 - Results

N = 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entourage</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages: No donation = 68%, 1 donation = 32%

Table 1. Results from the manipulation-check in the three studies.

Figure 1. Number of participants induced with emotional or calculating mindset intending to donate something to charity in Study 1a.

Figure 2. Number of participants induced with an emotional concept or a calculating concept intending to donate something to charity in Study 1b.

Figure 3. Number of participants induced with an emotional or calculating mindset allocating to World infection fund and Swedish Make-a-wish foundation in Study 2.