Supplementary Materials

Velias&Corr, 2016

August 2, 2016

1 Introduction

In this file you can find:

- 1. Supplementary Material 1: Study flow-chart
- 2. Supplementary Material 2: General Linear Model Tables for Risk and Delay
- 3. Supplementary Material 3: Descriptive Statistics by Threat
- 4. Supplementary Material 4: Materials Used:
 - (a) Scripts and Screenshots of videos used for Threat Induction
 - (b) Writing task for Threat Induction
 - (c) Economic Preferences in Media (filler task)
 - (d) Economic Preferences (Risk, Delay)
 - (e) Purchase Interest (High/Low Status Product)
- 5. Supplementary Material 5: Purchase Interest for Status Products

Note on Supplementary Material 4 (Purchase Interest for Status Products). The experiment reported in the main manuscript also included a section exploring preference for high-status vs low-status products (see the study flow chart for details). The findings were less clear-cut, yet may be of interest; we present full methods and results below.

2 Supplementary Materials

2.1 Study flow-chart



Figure 1: Study flow-chart.

	(1)	(2)	— Terrorism
Terrorism	0.879 (3.779)	Risk	Mortality
Mortality	0.246 (3.711)	-0.679 (3.532)	Goal-Drive Persistence
Anxiety	0.089 (0.0365)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.435^{*} \\ (0.0379) \end{array}$	Anxiety
Impulsivity	0.208 (0.124)	-0.591^{**} (0.116)	Impulsivity
Terrorism x Anxiety	0.691 (0.0527)		Terrorism x Goal-Drive Persistence
Terrorism x Impulsivity	-1.653^{**}		Terrorism x Anxiety
Mortality x Anxiety	-1.016	-1.706^{*}	Terrorism x Impulsivity
Mortality x Impulsivity	0.976	2.782*** (0.168)	Morality x Goal-Drive Persistence
Mood-GNA	0.036	-0.022	Mortality x Anxiety
Terrorism x GNA	-0.089 (0.135)	(0.0003)	Mortality x Impulsivity
Mortality x GNA	-0.208 (0.129)	-0.131	Terrorism x GNA
Dentistry	(0.125)	-0.917 (3 779)	Mortality x GNA
Dentistry x Anxiety		-0.748 (0.0527)	Mood-GNA Dentistry
Dentistry x Impulsivity		(0.002.) 1.789^{**} (0.170)	Dentistry x Goal-Drive Persistence
Dentistry x GNA		0.077	Dentistry x Anxiety
$\frac{N}{R^2}$ adi R^2	$78 \\ 0.263 \\ 0.140$	78 0.263 0.140	Dentistry x Impulsivity Dentistry x GNA
Standardized beta coeffici	ients; Standard	errors in parentheses	$\frac{N}{B^2}$

General Linear Model Tables for Risk and Delay 2.2

 $78 \\ 0.273 \\ 0.112$ 78 0.273 0.112 ____adj. \mathbb{R}^2

Standardized beta coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Standardized beta coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, **** p<0.001

(1) Delay

 $^{-0.409}_{(5.345)}$

 $\begin{array}{c}
1.278 \\
(5.086)
\end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.247 \\ (0.131) \end{array}$

 -0.418^{*} (0.0367)

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.281 \\ (0.124) \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.337 \\ (0.174) \end{array}$

 1.284^{*} (0.0527) $^{-0.317}_{(0.176)}$

 $^{-1.315}_{(0.165)}^{*}$

 $1.163 \\ (0.0589)$

 $^{-0.415}_{(0.174)}$

 $^{-1.033}_{(0.139)}$ -0.792(0.133)

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.416 \\ (0.108) \end{array}$

(2) Delay

 $\begin{array}{c}
 1.708 \\
 (5.224)
 \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.400 \\ (0.115) \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.226 \\ (0.0378) \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.128 \\ (0.124) \end{array}$

 $^{-1.645^{**}}_{(0.153)}$

 $^{-0.120}_{(0.0596)}$

-0.069(0.174)

 $\begin{array}{c} 0.110 \\ (0.117) \end{array}$

 $\substack{+0.254\\(0.0873)\\0.427\\(5.345)}$

 $\begin{array}{c} -0.360 \\ (0.174) \\ -1.391^* \\ (0.0527) \\ 0.343 \\ (0.176) \\ 0.901 \\ (0.139) \end{array}$

Measure			F			
		Dentistry	Terrorism	Mortality		
	1 00	32.55	31.61	31.61	0.15	
	Age	(7.65)	(7.67)	(7.67)	0.15	
	Sex (Male)*	0.47	0.52	0.43	0.38	
	Annual					
	Household	50.26	45.00	44.00	0.10	
	Income (1000's	(30.39)	(35.40)	(30.60)	0.19	
	Euros)					
Mood						
	General Positive	19.27	19.61	21.24	0.47	
	Affect (GPA)	(7.44)	(6.54)	(8.39)	0.47	
	General Negative	16.32	20.09	16.52	2.54	
	Affect (GNA)	(5.45)	(6.49)	(7.02)	2.54	
RST-PQ Personalit	y Factors:					
	Fight-Flight-	22.22	22.17	21.88		
	Freeze System	(5.82)	23.17	(7.00)	0.77	
	(FFFS)	(3.83)	(0.01)	(7.00)		
	Behavioral	61.09	50 78	57.28		
	Inhibition System	(14.83)	(16.27)		0.67	
	(BIS)	(14.85)	(10.27)	(13.34)		
	Reward Interest	19.36	19.39	19.32	0.01	
	(BAS-RI)	(3.84)	(3.75)	(4.37)	0.01	
	Goal-Drive	21.68	20.78	18 88		
	Persistence	(3.83)	(4.85)	(4.76)	2.38	
	(BAS-GDP)	(5.05)	(1.05)	(1.70)		
	Reward	28.18	28.52	26.88		
	Reactivity (BAS-	(5.75)	(4.75)	(5.61)	0.62	
	RR)	(5.75)	(1.75)	(3.51)		
	Impulsivity	19.36	18.96	20.20	0.50	
	(BAS-I)	(3.85)	(4.76)	(4.56)	0.50	

Note. FFFS = Flight-Fight-Freeze System; BAS = Behavioral Approach System; RI = Reward Interest; GDP = Goal-Drive Persistence; RR= Reward Reactivity; I = Impulsivity * = 5 people preferred not to declare sex (at least one in each Threat group)

Figure 2: Descriptive Statistics by Threat.

2.3 Descriptive Statistics by Threat

Note on the Order and Schedule of Economic Preference tasks. Due to a technical glitch in the algorithm that allocated participants to four groups to counterbalance order and schedule – one group was smaller than other three. Including controls for Order and Schedule into analysis did not change the reported results much.

2.4 Materials Used

(a) Scripts and Screenshots

Dentistry

Source:

BBC One. (2015). The truth about...your teeth [Video webcast]. Retrieved September 16, 2015, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b05y3953

PRESENTER 1: There is something rotten in the state of Britain's teeth. PRESENTER 2: Today millions of people are living with tooth decay, gum disease, broken teeth and bad breath.

PRESENTER 1: And for some people the problem has got out of control

PRESENTER 2: We want to do something about it. So we've set up our own special clinic in one of the busiest hospitals in the UK – King's college hospital in London.

PRESENTER 1: Over the next six months out team of top consultants and dental specialists will help to face Britain's teeth.

SOFT MUSIC

PRESENTER 2: DENISE has spent much of her life terrified of the dentist. She's been hoping that all her teeth fall out, so she never has to return. But today she tackled her fear and come to our clinic to meet so meet SERPIL. This time – for treatment.

DENISE: Still that fear of going into that chair, of actually still having the teeth pulled, of the noise of drilling, that kind of stuff that I am most fearful of.

DENISE: It's gonna happen, it's something I've got to do. I just wanna get it done now

PRESENTER 2: And she even agreed to having her teeth extracted without being sedated

SERPIL: You are doing really well.

PRESENTER 2: To reduce the chance of infection, SERPIL first has to do a thorough deep clean.

NOISE OF DENTAL EQUIPMENT

SERPIL: Ok, all done. Do you need a little breezer?
DENISE: No, I'm cool
SERPIL: Sure?
DENISE: That's an achievement
SERPIL: That's brilliant
DENISE's FRIEND: You haven't cussed no-one yet?
ALL LAUGH
SERPIL: Oh, was that on the cards?
DENISE's FRIEND:Anything is possible with this one
ALL LAUGH
SERPIL: Let's take the teeth out, shall we? Yes? Shall I tell you a little secret?
Look, one's come out already. Alright? You did not feel that did you?

Terrorism

Source:

Bloomberg Business. (2015). Dozens Killed in Islamic Militant Attacks in Four Countries - [Video webcast]. Retrieved September 16, 2015, from http://www. bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-26/dozens-killed-from-tunisia-to-france-on-caliphate-

PRESENTER 1: We have almost 60 people killed in terror attacks in four countries today. US officials are investigating but they say there is no evidence that these attacks were coordinated. Indonesia: gunmen open-fired a beach resort popular with Europeans. At least 27 people were killed and the government says most were tourists. One suspect has been arrested there. In south-Eastern France attackers targeted a factory owned by the American company Air Products and Chemicals. Police say the attackers decapitated a man and then drove at high speed into the plant hitting gas canisters. One suspect has been arrested.

BERNARD GAZENUEVE (french interior minister): I would also like to say



Figure 3: Screenshots of Dentistry video.

that all over the national territory under mine and local officials responsibility a powerful deployment to protect religious sites and central establishments has been activated to ensure protection of the French that have been especially hit by terrorist acts.

PRESENTER 1: In Somalia Islamist group says that it attacked peacekeepers, at base at least, and killed more than thirty troops. The group Al-Shabib is trying to overthrow western-backed government in Somalia. And over in Kuwait a bomb exploded in a Shiite mosque during Friday prayers. At least 16 people were killed days ago. Islamic state called for terror attacks to happen during this period the, Muslim holy month of Ramadan. Again, US officials are saying that there is no evidence that these attacks were coordinated.

PRESENTER 1: Michael, do you believe, even though there is no evidence right now, that these attacks may have been coordinated?

MICHAEL CHERTOFF (former U.S. secretary of homeland security): Well, as you say, there is no evidence of coordination, but there is evidence of inspiration. Meaning that part of what ISIS has done is that is has counseled or advised people who believe in its ideology to go and carry out those attacks. It's not a coincidence, it reflects some kind of commonality of ideology behind those attacks.

PRESENTER 2: Michael Chertoff, talk about France. It has been site many terror-related attacks.

MICHAEL CHERTOFF: Well the French have a significant population of people who've immigrated from the Middle East or parts of Africa. Some... part of that population, small part, but still a a significant part, Is either radicalized or at least sympathetic to radicalization - and we've seen some of these people to carry out these attacks, both in Carlie Hebdo case and in what we saw today. And in fact, according to news reports authorities were actually monitoring one of the perpetrators of today's attack over a period of time several years ago. And I think this reflects the concern that many Western countries have that ISIS will use people who are citizens or residents of those countries as being part of the attack vector against innocent civilians.



Figure 4: Screenshots of Terrorism video.

Mortality

Source:

BBC Horizon. (2008). How much is your dead body worth? [Video webcast]. Retrieved September 16, 2015, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/sn/tvradio/programmes/ horizon/broadband/tx/bodyparts/

PRESENTER: Do you care what happens to your body after you die? There are a growing number of people who do. Because dead bodies have become a big business.

PERSON 1: I have read recently that a body could be worth up to 250 thousand dollars.

PRESENTER: A medical revolution has meant that more and more parts of your body can be useful after you are dead.

MEDIC 1: There is the graft going through a knee joint.

PRESENTER: It's created an insatiable demand for human tissues.

MEDIC 2:We are going to harvest skin off this donor's back and long bones from the legs arms.

PRESENTER: With not enough bodies to go round a lucrative black market has emerged.

PERSON 2: By then about this area there was a pallet that had a torso that was laying down on it, defrosting.

PRESENTER: And there are some people who will do almost anything to get their hands on your body.

PERSON 3: Gentleman said we have some of your son's body parts in our morgue. I said, my son Jim died over a year ago, I don't know what you are talking about.

EERIE MUSIC PRESENTER: Grave robbing is nothing new. People have been making a living stealing and selling bodies for three hundred years. The Royal College of Sergeants in Edinburgh houses some of the world's oldest anatomical



Figure 5: Screenshots of Mortality video.

specimens.Some of the exhibits date to early 18-th century. They are a record of how early anatomists mapped interior geography of the human body. But to do this work doctors needed a supply of corpses, and they were prepared to pay handsomely to get them.

DAWN KEMP: It was obviously very important to get fresh bodies, and so bodies had to be supplied very soon after they had been put in a grave. During the 1820-s the cost was various, between 7 to 10 pounds ordinarily for a body. There is a recorded case of twenty five pounds being given. To compare that in some ways, a laborer at that time would be earning up to sixpence a week.

(b) Writing task for Threat Induction

1. List at least five words that best describe your emotions from watching the video (feel free to add any more).

2. How close was this video to your own experience with (dentistry/terrorism/mortality)?

- very close
- somewhat close
- $\bullet\,$ not at all

3. How interested would you be to see a more detailed video?

- very
- somewhat
- not at all

4. Think of how you imagine (a visit to the dentist/a terrorist attack/what happens to body after death) – are the scenes you have in mind different from those in the video?

• very

- somewhat
- $\bullet\,$ not at all

5. Imagine that you are talking to your friend about the topic of (dentistry/terrorism/mortality), and your thoughts and emotions related to it. Write down some key words, bullet points, or full sentences you would be using.

(c) Economic preferences in media (filler)

Which of the following news sources you follow on a weekly basis? (tick as many as appropriate)

o The Guardian o Bloomberg o BBC o Daily Mail o Spectator o Economist o Financial Times o Evening Standard o Others How much would y

How much would you pay monthly to use the following media, information and social network channels if they were not free?

BBC o nothing, I would not use it o $\notin 1-5$ o $\notin 5\text{-}10$ o more than $\notin 10$

Wikipedia o nothing, I would not use it o $\pounds 1 - 5$ o $\pounds 5 - 10$ o more than $\pounds 10$

Twitter o nothing, I would not use it o $\pounds 1 - 5$ o \pounds 5-10 o more than $\pounds 10$

Facebook o nothing, I would not use it o $\notin 1-5$ o $\notin 5-10$ o more than $\notin 10$

(d) Economic Preferences

Risk-Seeking

Participants made eleven dichotomous choices for the following question: "Do you want a 50% chance of getting \notin 800 OR get \notin ______ for sure?" The sure amount ranged systematically from \notin 100 to \notin 600 in \notin 50 increments.

Delay-Impatience

Participants made seven dichotomous choices for the following question: "Do you want to get $\notin 100$ tomorrow OR get $\notin _$ 90 days from now?". The amount of money that could be received in 90 days ranged systematically from $\notin 110$ to $\notin 170$ in $\notin 10$ increments. The order of tasks was counterbalanced. The order of questions was counterbalanced.

Purchase-Interest for High/Low Status Products

Participants see two advertisements, each on separate page:

- Luxury BMW
- BMW family hatchback

After each ad, the individual answers three questions on a 7-point Likert scale. For example, the questions for the BMW advertisement are:

1. How effective did you find this advertisement? (Effectiveness)

2. After seeing this advertisement, how interested are you in buying a luxury car? (Interest)

3. If you were thinking about buying a luxury car, how likely would you be to purchase a BMW new 7 Series? (Purchase Intentions)

The three measures were collapsed into one of Product Interest. Cronbach alphas were estimated to ensure internal consistency of the scales.

2.5 Purchase Interest for Status Products

Literature Review

Arndt, Solomon, Kasser, & Sheldon (2004) suggested that the 6% surge in consumption in the U.S. in the months following the 9/11 could be a form of self-protection from existential anxieties through the pursuit of culturally desired commodities. Increased consumption of branded products has been consequently linked to higher degree of fear of becoming a terrorist victim (Griskevicius, Tybur, Delton, & Robertson, 2011).

In more general research linking anxiety and consumer choice, Mandel and Heine (1999) used the experimental procedure of the Terror Management Theory (TMT) to explore the effect of mortality salience on consumer choice, finding increased attraction to status-affirming products (such as high-status Lexus car and Rolex watch), and a small, but significant reduction in interest towards lowor non-status products (Chevrolet car and Pringles crisps). Mortality salience has also been associated with coping with the increased anxiety through bolstering self-esteem, in particular, through reduced self-regulation in consumer choice (Ferraro, Shiv, & Bettman, 2005), higher expectations for future consumption of clothing and entertainment and immediate greed for resources (in a game context) materialistic interests (Kasser & Sheldon, 2000). Arndt, Greenberg, and Cook (2002) argued that high-status or branded products in particular can be seen as central to an individual's self-worth, and once the threat was present, individuals increased self-esteem by higher consumption of them. These findings are consistent with the more general ones on existential insecurity motivating greater attachment to brands (Rindfleisch, Burroughs, & Wong, 2009).

In this part of the study, we examine whether it is justified to treat effects of terrorism threat on status-preferences as identical to those of mortality threat. In addition, and for the first time, we relate the motivation/emotion systems of RST to explore if they can help explain heterogeneity in behavioural effects of terrorism and mortality threat.

Specifically, we hypothesize:

1. Following the evidence from Life History studies and Terror Management Theory, we expected that the individuals with personality factors closer to a 'faster' life history strategy (low goal-drive persistence and high impulsivity scores on BAS scale) would prefer higher-status product especially under mortality salience than individuals with personality factors closer to a 'slower' strategy (high goal-drive persistence and low impulsivity). In line with the predictions about risk-seeking and delay-discounting, we tentatively hypothesised that the effects of terrorism threat should be expected to be similar to mortality salience.

2. In addition, given that terrorism causes changes in behaviour through provoking anxiety and uncertainty, it should be expected that individual differences in the BIS should be associated with individual differences in product interest, and to a greater extent than mortality salience. In line with the literature, we expected that higher levels of the BIS would lead to behavioural caution and, thus, lower levels of high-status product interest – however, it could well be argued that BIS-related caution would express itself in terms of enjoying luxurious products when opportunity arises, - which in our tasks would express itself as higher levels of high-status of product interest. In either case, BIS would be associated with the measure of economic preference under terrorism threat.

Materials

Following Mandel and Heine (1999), a Product Interest measure was taken by asking participants to rate advertisements of same-brand consumer item (BMW car) of two types: Economy and Luxury. Each advertisement was presented on a separate page and contained a photo of the car reinforced by a short ad text highlighting low-status ('compact family hatchback', 'affordable package') and high-status ('luxury sedan', 'refined design', 'exclusivity') properties respectively. Following each advertisement, participants rated on a 7-point Likert scale: "How effective did you find this advertisement?" (Effectiveness); "After reading this advertisement, how interested are you in buying a luxury (economy) car?" (Interest); "If you were thinking about buying a luxury (economy) car, how likely would you be to purchase a BMW series 7 Lux (Series 3 Economy)?" (Purchase Intentions). Participants were asked to assume that they earned a comfortable salary that allowed them to afford either of these products, but at a trade off with other purchases.

An average of the three questions was collapsed into a single dependent measure of the participant Product-Interest ranging from 0 to 6. We also constructed a variable Status-Preference by calculating the difference between Product-Interest(High-Status) and Product-Interest(Low-Status) scores for each participant.

We estimated three types of models: repeated measures GLM with Product-Interest(High-Status/Low-Status); one-way univariate GLM with Product-Interest(High-Status) as the outcome variable and Product-Interest(Low-Status) used as covariate; and one-way univariate GLM with Status-Preference as outcome variable - which all yielded similar results. We report the model with Status-Preference, as a more straight-forward one: predictors for person having a preference for high status product, compared to low-status one.

Results

A one-way univariate ANOVA/GLM was conducted with Threat as a single fixed factor. There was no significant difference between mean Status-Preference scores in the three Threat groups, F(2, 67) = 2.15, p = .124. Adding the six RST-PQ measures as covariates, and then treating them as continuous predictor variables, revealed significant main effects of three personality measures on Status-Preference: BAS-GDP F(1, 61) = 5.68, p = .020 – the zero-order positive correlation between BAS-GDP and Status-Preference is r = .105, p = .39 (see Table 1); BAS-RI F(1, 61) = 5.67, p = .020 – the zero-order negative correlation between BAS-RI and Status-Preference is r = .11, p = .36 (see Table S1); and BAS-Imp, F(1, 61) = 7.63, p = .008 – the zero-order positive correlation between BAS-Imp and Product-Interest(High-Status) is r = .326, p = .006 (see Table S1). The effect of Threat on Status-Preference was approaching significance, F(2, 61) = 2.56, p = .085.

Our prediction was that the status-preference would differ between Threat conditions, and for high and low levels of Impulsivity, Goal-Drive Persistence and BIS. Two-way interactions were computed for Threat and the six RST factors. The model revealed a significant interaction for Threat x BAS-RR, F(2, 49) =7.29, p = .002. The model also revealed a significant interaction for Threat x BAS-Imp, F(2, 49) = 5.23, p = .009.

In this model there were also significant main effect of BAS-GDP, F(1, 49) = 4.55, p = .038. Main effects of BAS-RI and BAS-RR were approaching significance, p_{j} .1.

To decompose these interactions, we regressed Status-Preference on the six RST factors (since there were many significant predictors in the model, we decided not to discriminate among them).

Impulsivity

We estimated a significant negative effect of BAS-Imp on Status-Preference in Dentistry, $\beta = -0.90$, p = .033; and a significant positive effect in Terrorism, $\beta = 0.65$, p = .024 (Figure S1); the effect in Mortality was also an approaching significance positive, $\beta = 0.46$, p = .08. Following Aiken and West's (1991) procedure, there was a significant difference of BAS-Imp on Status-Preference in Mortality compared to Dentistry, $p \downarrow .01$; and in Terrorism compared to Dentistry, $p \downarrow .01$. Furthermore, there was difference between the slope in Terrorism compared to Mortality, $p \downarrow .01$, (Figure 7).

Reward-Reactivity

We estimated a significant positive effect of BAS-RR on Status-Preference in Dentistry, $\beta = 1.21$, $p \downarrow .01$; and an approaching significance negative effect in Terrorism, $\beta = -0.43$, p = .06; there was no evidence of significant effect in Mortality, p = .21. Following Aiken and West's (1991) procedure, there was an approaching significant difference of BAS-RR on Status-Preference in Mortality compared to Dentistry, p = .08; and a significant difference in Terrorism compared to Dentistry, p = .01. Furthermore, there was difference between the slope in Terrorism compared to Mortality, p = .02, (Figure 8).

Reward-Interest

We estimated a significant negative effect of BAS-RI on Status-Preference in Mortality, $\beta = -0.71$, p = .01; but there was no evidence of significant effect in Dentistry, p = .55, or in Terrorism, p = .99. Following Aiken and West's (1991) procedure, there was an approaching significant difference of BAS-RI on Status-Preference in Mortality compared to Dentistry, p = .08. There was also an approaching significance difference between the slope in Terrorism compared to Mortality, p = .07, (Figure 9).

Discussion

The link between higher impulsivity and higher interest towards the highstatus BMW is consistent with the past evidence on heightened consumption after the 9/11 events, and suggests that the impulsivity aspect of personality may be one of the driving forces behind it. Reward-interest was associated with lower interest towards the high-status BMW when mortality was salient, which is unexpected in the context of the past research on the links between MS and consumption of brands within the TMT framework. It has been suggested that individuals may choose different strategies to transcend death, including those of reaffirming their moral values and charitable intentions. In this study the only option to express their preference was through showing their opinion on a BMW car, which may have led to expressing a lower interest. Further research on the role of the personality dimension responsible for general interest towards appetizing stimuli can help clarify this relationship.

2.6 References

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Positive affect										
Negative affect	.35**									
3. FFFS	01	.35**								
4. BIS	01	.39**	.42**							
5. BAS-RI	.17	.05	20	18						
6. BAS-GDP	.14	.17	.01	09	.28*					
7. BAS-RR	.27*	.34**	.34**	.13	.31**	.23				
8. BAS-I	.13	.23	.26*	.35**	.24*	13	.50**			
9. Purchase interest (High-status)	.24*	.22	.03	.01	.08	.17	.32**	.27*		
10. Purchase interest (Low-status)	.10	.10	10	09	.19	.07	.20	-0.04	.55**	
11. Status-Preference	.14	.13	.14	.10	11	.10	.17	.33**	.48**	46**

Figure 6: Bivariate Correlations.



Figure 7: Effect of BAS-Imp on Status-Preference, by Threat Group.



Figure 8: Effect of BAS-RR on Status-Preference, by Threat Group.



Figure 9: Effect of BAS-RI on Status-Preference, by Threat Group.

Arndt, J., Greenberg, J., & Cook, A. (2002). Mortality salience and the spreading activation of worldview-relevant constructs: exploring the cognitive architecture of terror management. Journal of Experimental Psychology. General, 131(3), 307–324. http://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.131.3.307

Arndt, J., Solomon, S., Kasser, T., & Sheldon, K. M. (2004). The Urge to Splurge: A Terror Management Account of Materialism and Consumer Behavior. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14(3), 198–212. doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1403_2

Ferraro, R., Shiv, B., & Bettman, J. R. (2005). Let Us Eat and Drink, for Tomorrow We Shall Die Effects of Mortality Salience and SelfEsteem on SelfRegulation in Consumer Choice. Journal of Consumer Research, 32(1), 65–75.http://doi.org/10.1086/429601

Griskevicius, V., Tybur, J. M., Delton, A. W., & Robertson, T. E. (2011). The influence of mortality and socioeconomic status on risk and delayed rewards a life history theory approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100(6), 1015–1026. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022403

Kasser, T., & Sheldon, K. M. (2000). Of Wealth and Death: Materialism, Mortality Salience, and Consumption Behavior. Psychological Science, 11(4), 348–351. http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00269

Mandel, N., & Heine, S. J. (1999). Terror Management and Marketing: He Who Dies With the Most Toys Wins. Advances in Consumer Research, 26, 527–532. Retrieved from http://www.acrwebsite.org/search/view-conference-proceedings.aspx?Id=8314

Rindfleisch, A., Burroughs, J. E., & Wong, N. (2009). The Safety of Objects: Materialism, Existential Insecurity, and Brand Connection. Journal of Consumer Research, 36(1), 1–16. http://doi.org/10.1086/595718