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Abstract

Work on morality framing has demonstrated that emphasizing moral ideals (vs. obligations) elicits positive intergroup attitudes among Whites (Does, Derks, & Ellemers, 2011). The current research goes beyond self-reported attitudes, by examining the effect of morality framing on more automatic, less consciously controlled responses of Whites. We tested the hypothesis that morality framing affects Whites’ appraisals of equality as challenging (vs. threatening) by measuring cardiovascular reactivity. Thirty-seven native Dutch participants gave an oral presentation of social equality in terms of moral ideals versus obligations, while we measured their motivations with cardiovascular (i.e., challenge vs. threat; Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996) and behavioral (i.e., eager vs. vigilant goal pursuit; Higgins, 1997) indicators. As hypothesized, and in contrast to the obligations frame, the ideals frame was found to motivate advantaged group members to approach and view equality as more of a challenge than a threat.
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Over the years, social norms have shifted toward egalitarianism—the social philosophy advocating the removal of inequalities among people—in the United States and most Western societies (Oyamot, Borgida, & Fisher, 2006). However, the extent to which individuals consider racial equality as a central goal has been shown to depend, in part, on their group membership. Namely, compared to non-Whites, Whites are significantly less likely to rate racial equality as an important personal goal (Eibach & Ehrlinger, 2006). At the same time, research in intergroup interactions demonstrates that Whites are highly concerned with being seen as moral and non-prejudiced (Bergsicker, Shelton, & Richeson, 2010; Vorauer, 2006). Also, prior work has shown how presenting equality as a moral ideal (vs. obligation) improves Whites’ self-reported intergroup attitudes and their attitudes toward equality (Does et al., 2011).

Although morality frames of ideals versus obligations (Does et al., 2011) are both aimed at motivating advantaged group members toward social change, the ideals frame is more effective in shifting attitudes in favor of equality. It seems that emphasizing distinct moral incentives (i.e., attaining ideals vs. meeting obligations) elicits different types of motivation among Whites. Indeed, many recent studies demonstrate the importance of considering group members’ goal orientation and self-regulation in understanding intergroup processes and relations (e.g., Jonas, Sassenberg, & Scheepers, 2010; Shah, Brazy, & Higgins, 2004; Vorauer & Turpie, 2004). Therefore, the current work tests the hypothesis that morality framing shapes Whites’ behavioral (i.e., eager vs. vigilant strategies to goal attainment; Higgins, 1997) and physiological (i.e., cardiovascular [CV] responses indicating psychological challenge vs. threat; Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996) responses. The central aim of the current research is to go beyond previous examinations of the impact of morality framing on Whites’ intergroup attitudes (Does et al., 2011), by illuminating the motivational processes elicited by moral ideals versus obligations.

Inequality Framing: Affective and Attitudinal Outcomes

There is a growing body of work outlining the implications of inequality framing for individuals’ attitudinal and affective responses to intergroup inequality. For example, it has been shown that describing inequality as White advantage as...
opposed to Black disadvantage leads to lower collective esteem, less prejudice, more collective guilt, and more support for redistributive policies among Whites (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003; Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Swim & Miller, 1999). Research focused specifically on the affective route of inequality framing has shown that when discrimination is framed in terms of the advantaged in-group (i.e., discrimination by Whites) this increases collective guilt, whereas discrimination framed in terms of the disadvantaged out-group (i.e., discrimination against Blacks) leads to increases in sympathy among Whites. Importantly, although sympathy and collective guilt both increase Whites’ support for compensatory policies, only sympathy leads to support for equal opportunity policies. It has been argued that this difference between these two emotions may be due to sympathy’s other-focused rather than self-focused nature (Iyer et al., 2003). Taken together, this work demonstrates how the psychological discomforts that are associated with the recognition of the in-group’s unwarranted advantages can motivate advantaged group members toward social change.

However, these same discomforts can also motivate advantaged group members to avoid, oppose, and/or reject in-group frames of inequality. Indeed, there is work showing that framing inequality as dominant-group advantage can lead to opposition or defensive reactions among members of dominant groups. More specifically, when motivated to avoid negative psychological implications, such as collective guilt, members of advantaged groups may downplay existing status differences (Van Knippenberg, 1984), deny their group’s privileges (Lowery, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2007), or deemphasize inequality altogether (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002), all of which make social change less probable. Most recently it has thus been theorized that it may be more advantageous to describe inequality in a way which motivates advantaged group members to boost, rather than redeem, the perception of the in-group as moral (Does et al., 2011).

**Morality Framing: Motivational and Behavioral Outcomes**

The motivation to maintain a positive self-concept (e.g., being moral) can lead Whites to either want to restore (e.g., by supporting compensatory affirmative action policies; Iyer et al., 2003) or defend their group’s moral standing by denying or downplaying the illegitimate privileges of the in-group (Lowery et al., 2007). However, Does and colleagues (2011) established that moral concerns do not necessarily lead to defensive or restorative reactions among Whites. Namely, their work shows that presenting equality as a moral ideal (vs. moral obligation) is less threatening to Whites’ collective self-esteem, increases their support for affirmative action, and elicits more favorable attitudes toward cultural diversity within organizations. In addition, the latter was found to increase Whites’ prioritization of equality. These findings demonstrate the effectiveness of moral incentives in establishing, beyond restoration and/or compensation, positive intergroup attitudes among Whites.

Recent studies underline the importance of considering group members’ goal orientation and self-regulation in understanding intergroup processes and relations (e.g., Jonas et al., 2010; Shah et al., 2004; Vorauer & Turpie, 2004). In line with this trend, the current study examines the effects of morality framing on motivational and behavioral responses of Whites. Namely, we hypothesize that morality framing will affect how Whites pursue the goal of social equality—assessed by their choice of goal pursuit strategy (eager vs. vigilant). We base this prediction on regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), which posits that the way individuals perceive a goal—as either an ideal or an ought—determines their type of goal pursuit as either eager or vigilant, respectively. Because the morality frames tap into the ideal/ought distinction outlined by Higgins (1997), we argue that they will affect Whites’ goal pursuit strategies accordingly. Indeed, it has been found that morality framing predicts Whites’ self-reported action tendencies in terms of do’s (approach) versus don’ts (avoidance; Does et al., 2011). However, the current research will be the first step in determining whether morality framing shapes the behavioral goal pursuit strategy Whites adopt with regard to equality.

Furthermore, there may be an additional way in which the effect of morality framing on Whites is manifested: through physiological arousal. Indeed, moral values and/or concerns are considered guiding principles in people’s lives and important regulators of human behavior (Ellemers, Pagliaro, Barreto, & Leach, 2008; Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007; Schwartz, 1992; Shavell, 2002). Due to the importance people ascribe to morality, framing equality in moral terms thus “raises the stakes.” Hence, morality framing should induce arousal in advantaged group members who already have a heightened concern with being perceived as moral and unprejudiced in intergroup contexts (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Vorauer, 2006). Although we expect that both moral frames will increase Whites’ arousal (indicative of goal relevance), we hypothesize that the type of arousal, in terms of constituting threat or challenge, will differ across conditions. We base this prediction on literature describing how motivational states can be categorized along a bipolar continuum ranging from challenge to threat (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996). It is argued that it is not the objective situation per se, but rather people’s subjective appraisals of the situational demands and available resources which eventually determine physiological responses in line with threat (i.e., vigilant approach) or challenge (i.e., eager approach).

Furthermore, general framing effects have been observed in threat/challenge responses during potentially stressful situations (Seery, Weisbuch, & Blascovich, 2009; Tomaka, Blascovich, Kibler, & Ernst, 1997). For example, when a task is framed as holding potential gains (vs. losses) and is something one can take on (vs. must do), this leads to challenge (vs. threat)-related appraisals (Seery et al., 2009; Tomaka et al., 1997). Based on the above, we hypothesize that presenting equality as a moral ideal (vs. obligation) will elicit experiences of challenge (vs. threat) among Whites. Namely, we argue that the obligations frame will constitute a threat to the self, because of this frame’s emphasis on duties and thus potential negative outcomes (e.g., being perceived as prejudiced or biased). In contrast, we expect that the ideals frame will constitute a positive challenge, because of this...
frame’s emphasis on ideals and thus potential positive outcomes (e.g., being perceived as fair).

To examine these motivational responses to morality framing, we assess indicators specified by the biopsychosocial (BPS) model of arousal regulation (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996). This model identifies specific patterns of CV responses associated with psychological challenge and threat. According to the BPS model, both threat and challenge are marked by activation of the sympathetic adrenal medullary (SAM) axis, enhancing cardiac performance and decreasing systemic vascular resistance. However, in the case of threat, there is an increased activation not only of the SAM axis, but also of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis, which inhibits decreases in systemic vascular resistance. Thus, while challenge is marked by enhanced cardiac performance and decreased systemic vascular resistance, threat is marked by enhanced cardiac performance and increased systemic vascular resistance. The use of these CV measures allows for an innovative examination of morality framing’s effect on how Whites experience equality goals—as either challenging or threatening.

Current Study

To determine whether morality framing shapes Whites’ motivational responses, participants are asked to give an oral presentation addressing equality in terms of moral ideals or obligations. Videotapes of participants’ presentations are coded for behavioral cues of eagerness versus vigilance. Throughout, we examine changes in cardiac output (CO: the amount of blood pumped by the heart per minute) and total peripheral resistance (TPR: the amount of overall vasoconstriction or vasodilation occurring in the periphery). Because CV measures are less sensitive to deliberate distortion than self-report data (Mendes, Blascovich, Lickel, & Hunter, 2002), these measures provide a valuable addition to earlier work that focused on the (self-reported) attitudinal consequences of morality framing (Does et al., 2011).

Method

Participants and Design

After excluding three participants, the sample consisted of 37 native Dutch students (11 males, \( M_{\text{age}} = 21.24, \text{SD}_{\text{age}} = 2.20 \)) who were randomly assigned to the moral ideals or moral obligations condition.

Procedure

Upon arrival in the University’s psychophysiological laboratory, participants were asked to read and sign a consent form, which stated that physiological as well as video data would be gathered and that participation could be terminated at any time during the experiment. After granting their informed consent, participants were seated behind a computer in a closed off cubicle. To measure the impedance cardiographic signals (ICG) and electrocardiographic signals (EKG), six electrodes were placed on participants’ torsos by the experimenter. Two sensors were placed on the chest (approximately at the level of the heart) and ribs, two at the back of the neck, and two on participants’ upper backs. The blood pressure wristband was attached to participants’ nonpreferred hand. After reading a short overview of the experiment, participants were instructed to sit very still for six minutes in order to assess baseline CV levels. A clock appeared on the screen, which counted down the six minutes. However, in order to prevent the inclusion of participants’ anticipation of the final minute (e.g., physiological arousal) in the baseline measurements, the baseline assessment stopped after five minutes.

Following the baseline period, self-esteem was assessed using the 12 items of the core self-evaluations scale (CSES; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003), and each item scored from 1 (absolutely disagree) to 7 (absolutely agree; e.g., “I generally succeed when I try to do something”; Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .78 \)). Inclusion of this measure enabled us to later control for these dispositional differences in the analyses of threat/challenge responses. Next, participants were asked to carefully read a (bogus) newspaper article about a study done by the Central Bureau for Statistics (CBS; see also Does et al., 2011), which they would later be requested to answer some questions on via webcam. The newspaper article stated that a recent study by CBS showed that native Dutch employees with a master’s degree are systematically paid more and are promoted more often at their jobs than nonnative Dutch employees with the same educational background. The article included a graph showing the increasing differences in salary over a 10-year period between native and nonnative Dutch employees with the same educational level. The article also contained a picture depicting a middle-aged, White male as the fictitious senior CBS researcher. The article included paraphrases from the CBS researcher who stated—in both conditions—that these intergroup disparities were unfair and unjust and stated that (depending on condition): “Working in a culturally diverse organization can help native Dutch employees to attain (vs. meet) their ideals (vs. obligations) in terms of fairness and equality.”

Speech task. To create a motivated performance situation as specified by the BPS model (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996), participants were asked to give an oral presentation via webcam about equality in terms of ideals (vs. obligations), and how they could personally contribute to attaining the ideal (vs. meeting the obligation) of social equality. Participants were able to end the recording of their presentation by clicking the “next button” which was made available two minutes into the presentation. The speech time was automatically ended after three minutes. After completion, all physiological recording devices were removed by the experimenter. Finally, participants were debriefed, thanked, and rewarded with course credits or money.

Measures

CV measures. CV measures were assessed continuously and noninvasively following accepted guidelines (Sherwood et al., 2009).
As predicted, there was a significant effect of morality framing on participants’ speech rate, $F(1, 32) = 4.31, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .12$. Participants in the moral–obligations condition spoke significantly slower ($M = 1.86, SD = 0.31$) than those in the moral ideals condition ($M = 2.12, SD = 0.42$), in line with the predicted increase in self-monitoring. Combined with the results on the CV reactivity responses outlined above, these results show that among Whites, addressing equality in terms of ideals (vs. obligations) leads to less vigilant behavior, and more appraisals related to relative challenge as indicated by its CV correlates.

**General Discussion**

Previous work has shown that presenting equality as a moral ideal versus obligation elicits positive intergroup attitudes among Whites (Does et al., 2011). The findings reported here provide support that the positive intergroup attitudes found in earlier work (Does et al., 2011) are not mere lip service, but instead, manifestations of a genuine shift caused by morality framing. By demonstrating that the moral ideals frame elicits more relative challenge (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996) and less vigilant (Higgins, 1997) responses than the moral obligations frame, the current research provides evidence that morality framing could be an effective way to not only impact positive intergroup attitudes (Does et al., 2011) but also significantly shape Whites’ motivational strategies to goal attainment.

**Potential Underlying Mechanism**

Although the current examination does not provide direct evidence of this, it seems plausible to assume that the morality frames induce different regulatory foci (Higgins, 1997), which in turn affect appraisals of relative challenge versus threat. Namely, it is likely that the focus on moral ideals may cause participants to become focused on attaining potential gains...
associated with equality, and a focus on moral obligations likely causes participants to become concerned with avoiding losses associated with equality. Consequently, these distinct goal orientations and their associated goal pursuit strategies of eagerness versus vigilance result in CV responses consistent with relative challenge versus threat, respectively. This rationale is supported by the work of Seery and colleagues (2009) which shows similar CV patterns in examining outcome framing (i.e., potential for gain vs. loss). Furthermore, these authors argue that from a functional perspective, the CV pattern of challenge (i.e., increased blood flow) is aimed at potential psychological activity that might be necessary for eager goal pursuit, and the CV pattern of threat (i.e., decreased blood flow) is aimed at inhibition of action or even potential withdrawal (Seery et al., 2009).

**Directions for Future Research**

In addition to providing more direct evidence of the theorized underlying mechanism outlined above, future research might illuminate the effects of morality framing on intergroup interactions. Certainly, the current findings brought us closer to understanding how morality framing impacts Whites’ motivational states when asked to consider egalitarian beliefs. Yet, the next important step is to examine how morality framing affects Whites’ responses during an inter-racial interaction, requiring them to act in accordance with those beliefs. If, in line with the current findings, the ideals (vs. obligations) frame also leads to less vigilant responses in intergroup interaction, then, based on the literature, these responses will likely be associated with less (vs. more) anxiety, avoidant behavior (Plant & Devine, 2003), and a greater (vs. lesser) quality of the interaction (Plant & Butz, 2006).

**Conclusion**

In recent years, there has been a “major paradigm shift” in research on intergroup relations (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2011, p. 242). Whereas the traditional focus has been on intergroup antipathy and prejudice (e.g., Allport, 1954), novel approaches in intergroup research have established the importance of understanding and finding meaningful ways to establish positive intergroup relations (e.g., Mallett & Wilson, 2010; Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, Alegre, & Siy, 2010). The current study suggests means for the latter as it demonstrates that Whites can be encouraged to approach and view equality as more of a challenge than a threat by presenting equality as a moral ideal rather than an obligation.
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**Notes**

1. One participant was excluded due to failure to deliver a speech, one due to suspicion, and one due to misreading the manipulation as indicated by comments she made during her speech.  
2. Self-esteem—a variable known to influence threat/challenge responses (e.g., Blascovich, 2008)—was entered as a covariate in the CV analyses; cardiac output (CO): $F(1,34) = 6.11$, $p < .05$, $η_p^2 = .15$; total peripheral resistance (TPR): $F(1,34) = 23.37$, $p < .001$, $η_p^2 = .41$. Self-esteem was assessed with the CSE scale (Judge et al., 2003) prior to the manipulation, and there was no effect of condition on CSES, $F(1,35) < 1$, confirming a successful randomization of participant assignment to conditions.
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