**Study 3**

**Additional results**

As mentioned in the main text, we also tested whether each task (reading an excerpt of “Bossypants” by Tina Fey, watching a singing audition from “The X-Factor” and reading a popular gossip column) was chosen at a lower rate when paired with the prosocial task (i.e., in the Random Task 1 spot). We report those results below, followed by our analyses of the individual difference measures.

 **Choice of random task 1 broken down by task.** For all three non-prosocial tasks (reading an excerpt of “Bossypants” by Tina Fey, watching a singing audition from “The X-Factor” and reading a popular gossip column), we calculated the frequencies at which each task was expected to be selected from the Random Task 1 spot. First, we calculated overall frequency of each choice out of the total non-prosocial choices (e.g. 105 chose the “Bossypants” task out of 260 who did not choose the prosocial option in the No Avoidance condition; 105/260 = .4038). Next, we multiplied those numbers by the expected percent frequency of Random Task 1 choice (28.05%, see main text), yielding the expected percent frequency of choice for each task from that slot (see Table 1). Comparing those three frequencies (11.33% for Bossypants, 9.49% for X-Factor, and 7.23% for Gossip Column) to the observed frequencies (6.44%, 5.08%, 4.75% respectively) revealed a consistent decrease in frequencies for each choice, suggesting that the effect was not driven by any single option. That is, people who preferred Bossypants, X-Factor, or the Gossip Column were all driven away from that choice when it was paired with the prosocial option.

Table 1.

Expected vs. observed frequencies of each non-prosocial task in the “Random Task 1” slot.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Overall Frequency of non-prosocial option from No Avoidance Opportunity condition | Expected Frequency of choice from “Random Task 1” slot | Observed Frequencies Avoidance Opportunity(Two Choice Sets) |
| Bossypants | 40.38% | 11.33% | 6.44% |
| X-Factor | 33.85% | 9.49% | 5.08% |
| Gossip Column | 25.77% | 7.23% | 4.75% |

 **Individual differences**

We used binomial logistic regressions to assess main and interactive effects of these scales with Avoidance Opportunity condition on the prosocial task choice outcome.

***Moral self-importance*.** We separately analyzed the effects of the internalized (α =.84) and symbolized moral self-importance subscales (α =.86), as they have been found to lead to different types of behavior (Aquino & Reed, 2002).

We regressed internalized moral self-importance, Avoidance condition, and their interaction on likelihood of choosing the prosocial task. We found a main effect of internalized moral self-importance on the prosocial task choice, B = .48 [.15, .87], SE = .18, p = .008, such that higher internalized moral self-importance led to more people choosing to complete the prosocial task. The main effect of Avoidance Opportunity condition remained marginal, B = -.24 [-.51, .02], SE = .13, p = .071. The interaction was not significant, B = -.51 [-.62, .11], SE = .37, p = .164.

 We regressed symbolized moral self-importance, Avoidance Opportunity condition, and their interaction on likelihood of choosing the prosocial task. There was no main effect of symbolized moral identity on prosocial choice, B = .02 [-.17, .21], SE = .10, p = .85. The main effect of Avoidance Opportunity condition remained significant, B = -.29 [-.54, -.04], SE = .18, p = .02. The interaction was not significant, B = -.05, SE = .10, p = .55.

 ***Guilt: Negative Behavior Evaluation (NBE).*** We regressed negative-behavior-evaluation (NBE; α =.76), Avoidance Opportunity condition and their interaction on prosocial choice. We found a main effect of NBE on prosocial choice, B = .24 [-.03, .46], SE = .11, p = .028 such that those with higher NBE were more likely to select the prosocial choice. The main effect of Avoidance condition on prosocial choice remained nearly significant, B = -.25 [-.51, .00], SE = .13, p = .052. Their interaction was not significant, B = -.13 [-.34, .08], SE = .11, p = .237.
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