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My dissertation investigates how and why passion helps people obtain support from others for issues that are important to them. Passion is an intense positive feeling about a specific issue that is important to an individual’s identity. I argue that speakers’ passion increases listeners’ support (i.e., listeners’ active participation and involvement in the issues that speakers promote) when the listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower, because listeners catch and subsequently act on the passion that speakers express. I also propose that passion decreases listeners’ support when the listeners’ epistemic motivation is higher, because listeners pay close attention to arguments, and arguments are less compelling when speakers feel passion. I test the propositions in observational and experimental studies. In Study 1A, I test whether passion exhibited by entrepreneurs on the television show Dragons’ Den is associated with venture capitalists’ investment in their companies, and find that the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support is positive, and only when listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower rather than higher. In Study 1B, I explore mechanisms that may explain the results in Study 1A and find that perception that speakers stand for their principles mediates the conditional association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. In Study 2, I test the causal effects of speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation in a 2 x 2 between-person experimental design. Contrary to expectation, there were no effects of the interaction between speakers’
passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation on listeners’ support or on perceptions that speakers stand for their principles. Overall, my dissertation suggests that speakers’ passion does not always result in positive outcomes and identifies when speakers’ passion facilitates listeners’ support and when it does not. Contributions to the literature on passion in organizations and practical implications are discussed.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Stéphane Côté, my advisor, for his supervision and guidance during my doctoral studies. His advice, encouragement and support taught me how to think, speak and write as a researcher and helped shape the scholar I became: one striving for excellence and rigour in her research.

Many thanks to my dissertation committee members, Katy DeCelles and Sanford DeVoe, for their invaluable insight, guidance, and support. I am thankful to them and to my advisor for encouraging me to look at my data from every possible angle and for pushing me to analyze it in every possible way. Your openness and appreciation for ‘messy’ data made this journey extremely enjoyable! I am also indebted and thankful to my external examiner, Laurie Barclay, who provided me with great feedback and suggestions. Special thanks to Soo Min Toh, who volunteered her time as my external-internal examiner and provided additional support, feedback and ideas for my research.

I am also very grateful to the Rotman School of Management faculty members who helped my research by providing comments and suggestions, allowing me to refine my research: Ajay Agrawal, Gary Latham, Geoffrey Leonardelli, Julie McCarthy, and Jacob Hirsh.

I would also like to thank my friends and fellow OBHRM and Rotman PhD students, without their support this journey would have been almost impossible and much less enjoyable.

I am extremely grateful to Rotman School of Management and the Lee-Chin Institute for their financial support in completing my dissertation research.

I am exceptionally thankful for my parents and sister, who have loved and supported me unconditionally during this long journey, and to my brother-in-law who devoted one long weekend to program the designated video player I used in this dissertation.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................................ 1

_The Benefit of Passion: When Epistemic Motivation is Lower, Passion is Positively Associated with Listeners’ Support_ ...................................................................................................................... 4

_The Disadvantage of Passion: When Epistemic Motivation is Higher, Passion is Negatively Associated with Listeners’ Support_ .............................................................................................................. 10

_The Overall Effects of Speakers’ Passion on Listeners’ Support_ ................................................................ 19

Methodological Approach ......................................................................................................................... 19

STUDY 1A: METHODS ............................................................................................................................... 20

Overview .................................................................................................................................................... 20
Sample Size ................................................................................................................................................ 22
Participants ................................................................................................................................................ 23
Coding Procedure ..................................................................................................................................... 24
Predictor Variable ..................................................................................................................................... 26
Mediators .................................................................................................................................................. 29
Moderator .................................................................................................................................................. 30
Outcome Variables .................................................................................................................................... 30
Control Variables ....................................................................................................................................... 32
Additional Variables for Exploratory Analyses ......................................................................................... 36

STUDY 1A: RESULTS & DISCUSSION ..................................................................................................... 36

Hypotheses Testing .................................................................................................................................... 37
Exploratory Analyses ............................................................................................................................... 41

STUDY 1B .................................................................................................................................................. 46

STUDY 1B: METHODS ............................................................................................................................... 51

Overview .................................................................................................................................................... 51
Sample Size ................................................................................................................................................ 52
Sample and Procedure ............................................................................................................................... 52
Predictor Variables .................................................................................................................................... 53
Moderator .................................................................................................................................................. 54
Mediators .................................................................................................................................................. 54
Outcome Variables .................................................................................................................................... 57

STUDY 1B: RESULTS & DISCUSSION ..................................................................................................... 58

Exploratory Analyses: Alternative Predictors ........................................................................................... 58
Exploratory Analyses: Alternative Mediators ............................................................................................ 58

STUDY 2: METHODS ............................................................................................................................... 61
Overview .............................................................. 62
Development of the Materials .................................................... 62
Sample Size ........................................................................ 65
Sample and Procedure ............................................................... 65
Manipulation Check ................................................................. 67
Mediator .............................................................................. 67
Dependent Variables .............................................................. 67

STUDY 2: RESULTS & DISCUSSION ........................................... 68
Alternative Propositions Testing .................................................. 68

GENERAL DISCUSSION ................................................................. 70
Theoretical and Practical Implications ........................................... 73
Limitations and Future Directions ............................................... 76
Conclusion .............................................................................. 79

REFERENCES ........................................................................ 80
# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Hypotheses ................................................................. 93  
Table 2. An Overview of Dissertation Key Findings ................................. 94  
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1A) ...................... 95  
Table 4. Regression Analyses Predicting Listeners’ Passion and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A) ................................................................. 96  
Table 5. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Listeners’ Passion, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1A) ......................... 98  
Table 6. Regression Analyses Predicting Elaborate Communication and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A) ................................................................. 99  
Table 7. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Elaborate Communication, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1A) ......................... 101  
Table 8. Exploring Alternative Models: The Effects of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1A) ......................... 102  
Table 9. Exploring Alternative Models: Share Size, Usability of Product, and Engineering as Alternative Moderators in the Relationship Between Speakers’ Passion and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A) ................................................................. 103  
Table 10. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1B) ....................... 104  
Table 11. Exploring Alternative Models: Perceived Extraversion and Perceived Activation as Alternative Predictors of Listeners’ Support (Study 1B) ................................................................. 105  
Table 12. Exploring Alternative Models: Regression Results of Potential Mediators in the Relationship between Speakers’ Passion, Epistemic Motivation and Listeners’ Support (Study 1B) ................................................................. 106  
Table 13. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Perceived Standing for Principle, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1B) ................................................................. 107  
Table 14. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2 Pilot) .................. 108  
Table 15. Mean Differences among Experimental Clips (Study 2 Pilot) .......... 109  
Table 16. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2) ......................... 110  
Table 17. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support (Study 2) ................................................................. 111  
Table 18. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Perceived Standing for Principle, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 2) .............. 112
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Theoretical Model ........................................................................................................ 113
Figure 2. Support was Offered as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation 114
Figure 3. Number of Supporters as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation......................................................................................................................... 115
Figure 4. Average Monetary Support as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation ................................................................................................................................ 116
Figure 5. Perceived Standing for Principle as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation ........................................................................................................................................ 117
Figure 6. Alternative Model: Speakers’ Passion, Epistemic Motivation, Perceived Standing for Principle and Listeners’ Support ........................................................................................................ 118
LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Raters’ Training Manual (Study 1A) ................................................................. 119
Appendix B. Example of Coders’ Observation Sheet (Study 1A) ........................................ 131
Appendix C. Screenshots of Actor (Study 2) ........................................................................ 132
Appendix D. Actor’s Message on EcoTraction (Study 2) .................................................... 134
Appendix E. Measures & Items Used To Validate Materials (Study 2 Pilot) ..................... 135
Appendix F. Instructions for Participants (Study 2) ............................................................ 138
Changing Behaviors One Passionate Conversation at a Time:
How Speakers’ Passion about Issues Influence Listeners’ Support

INTRODUCTION

Passion is considered by the popular press and scientists alike to be an asset that helps individuals achieve desired outcomes in organizations (e.g., Cardon, Wincent, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2009b; Stibel, 2014, Jan 3; Tsukayama, 2011, Aug 25). For example, in a Fortune interview on the hiring process at Deloitte, Deloitte’s former chief executive Joe Echevarria explained that passion is an asset in the recruiting process and stated that “[b]eyond the basic credentials and competencies, we’re looking for people who stand out. If you are a passionate person, that will stand out” (Fisher, 2013, May 14). Similarly, Jeff Stibel, an entrepreneur and business executive who was once listed as one of Business Week’s “40 under 40” CEOs, indicated that passion is helpful and claimed in a recent article in the Washington Post: “if you’ve just started a company, chances are you’re passionate about the product or service your new company is providing. In fact, passion may be your only asset. But the good news is that it can be leveraged” (Stibel, 2014, Jan 3).

Such claims, however, may be overstating the positive effects of passion and understate its negative effects. Some anecdotal evidence suggests that people can sometimes be too passionate, and that passion can result in unwanted outcomes. For example, several venture capitalists have stated that when entrepreneurs are too passionate, they describe their ideas too favorably, and these exaggerated descriptions reduce venture capitalists’ willingness to support these entrepreneurs (Dettman & Berlyne, 2012, Apr 4). For example, Barbara Corcoran, an investor on the ABC show Shark Tank, explained that passion can decrease investors’ support because “[t]oo much passion blinds an entrepreneur, just like a guy who’s madly in love …
[therefore, ] being too passionate could be bad for business” (Gourdreau, 2014, Apr 23).
Similarly, in a qualitative work on angel investors (Cardon, Sudek, & Mitteness, 2009a), investors have indicated that passion can deter them from investing because “[t]oo much passion is dangerous because it equates to tunnel vision” and that “[n]o amount of passion can make a pig fly.”

My dissertation research examines when it is useful to be passionate, and when passion might be detrimental when pitching ideas to others. I argue that passion has the potential to help or hinder a speaker’s goal of convincing others to support an issue. This research extends current work that focuses on the positive outcomes of passion for individuals and organizations, such as increased creativity (Liu, Chen, & Yao, 2011), increased sales goal-setting, and increased CEO self-efficacy (Baum & Locke, 2004).

I specifically examine how speakers’ passion is related to listeners’ support. Passion is defined as an intense positive feeling about a specific idea that is important to an individual’s identity (Cardon et al., 2009b; Chen, Yao, & Kotha, 2009; Smilor, 1997; Vallerand et al., 2003). Support is defined as listeners’ active participation and involvement in issues the speakers are pitching. More specifically, support is exhibited through behaviors that are aligned with the speakers’ ideas, such as investing money and spending time on the speakers’ ideas.

There is a paucity of research on the interpersonal effect of passion, and specifically on how speakers’ passion influences listeners’ support. Past research on the effects of passion mostly focused on the intrapersonal effects of passion – i.e., its effects on the attitudes and behaviors of the person who feels passionate. For example, past work has examined how passion influences speakers’ mental processes such as self-efficacy (Baum & Locke, 2004) and cognitive flexibility (Liu et al., 2011). Of the work that concentrated on the interpersonal effects
of passion in organizations, few studies looked at the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. Extant work on the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support mainly centers on the effect of entrepreneurial passion on venture capitalists’ decisions to support. Notably, these studies provide mixed results. For example, Chen et al. (2009; Study 1) and Cardon and colleagues (Cardon et al., 2009a; Study 2) found that speakers’ passion was not associated with listeners’ decision to invest in entrepreneurs’ ventures. Yet, speakers’ passion was found to positively associate with listeners’ investment decisions (Chen et al., 2009; Study 2) and to negatively associate with investors’ interest at the screening stage (Cardon et al., 2009a; Study 2). Thus, results of previous work provide a limited understanding of how speakers’ expressions of passion influence listeners’ support. In my dissertation, I extend previous work by developing a model that accounts for listeners’ epistemic motivation (i.e., the need to hold accurate and well-informed conclusions about a situation; De Dreu & Carnevale, 2003) to explain when and how speakers’ passion relates to listeners’ support.

Here, I develop and test a model that proposes that speakers’ passion increases listeners’ support, but only when speakers’ requests are small, because when speakers’ requests are small, listeners have lower epistemic motivation. When listeners’ epistemic motivation is low, listeners catch speakers’ passion and, in turn, become supportive because they become passionate themselves. I propose that passion decreases listeners’ support when speakers’ requests are large, because when speakers’ requests are large, listeners’ epistemic motivation is high. When listeners’ epistemic motivation is high, listeners focus on the details and logic of speakers’ arguments, and the arguments of passionate speakers lack elaboration and detail. This model is displayed visually in Figure 1.

I test the model in three studies: Study 1A, a field study, examines the association
between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support in a naturalistic context with important implications for both speakers and listeners. I test how entrepreneurs on the Canadian show *Dragons’ Den* convince venture capitalists to invest in their companies. Independent raters code entrepreneurs’ passion and communication elaboration, and venture capitalists’ caught passion and offers of monetary support. Then, Study 1B examines alternative mechanisms. Participants are assigned to watch the entrepreneurs from Study 1A and to rate their perceptions and feelings about those entrepreneurs. These ratings allow me to conduct exploratory analyses for alternative mechanisms that may account for the findings of Study 1A. Finally, Study 2, an experiment, examines causality. In the experiment, participants are assigned to a listener role and asked to watch a short clip depicting an entrepreneur pitching for an investment. In a 2 x 2 experimental design, I manipulate speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation and I measure listeners’ support.

**The Benefit of Passion: When Epistemic Motivation is Lower, Passion is Positively Associated with Listeners’ Support**

When listeners’ epistemic motivation is low, I propose that passion increases listeners’ support through an emotional expression route. Scholars have proposed that expressions of emotions convey important information to others (Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008) and that one of the central function of emotions is to influence others (Van Kleef, Van Doorn, Heerdink, & Koning, 2011). The perspective that emotions provide social information suggests that listeners’ cognitions, attitudes, and behaviour are influenced by the emotions they observe. Once listeners observe speakers’ passionate expressions the listeners are likely to pick up the social information conveyed in the expressions and respond to it (Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008).

Speakers often express their emotions non-verbally, via facial expressions (Ekman,
1993), body postures, head and eye movements, and tone of voice (Izard, 1993). Prior research on the non-verbal expressions of passion suggests that passion manifests via energetic body movements, animated facial expressions that “light up,” and a varied tone of voice and pitch (Chen et al., 2009).

Emotional expressions are important from an evolutionary perspective (Izard, 1992) and emotional expressions are readily perceived and processed by observers (e.g., Aviezer et al., 2008; Buchanan et al., 2000; de Gelder, 2006; Grandjean et al., 2005; Wallbott, 1998). Once the speakers’ expressions of passion are observed by listeners, the listeners’ emotions can become similar to the speakers’ emotions through a process of emotional contagion (Neumann & Strack, 2000) or through inferential processes (Van Kleef, 2009).

The subconscious process of emotional contagion is automatic and quick, and operates via non-verbal mimicry of others’ emotional expressions. The physiological change that occurs during mimicry (e.g., muscular and glandular responses) provides feedback to observers and is automatically processed by them. Mimicking observers interpret their physiological change as an emotional experience, and ultimately become aware of their caught emotions (Barsade, 2002; Neumann & Strack, 2000; Totterdell, 2000). Therefore, listeners who observe passionate speakers are likely to automatically mimic the speakers’ expressions of passion – mimicking that will be processed and ultimately interpreted by listeners as an indication of their own passion. Observing passionate speakers will therefore lead listeners to feel passionate about the discussed issue.

Listeners might also infer that the speakers’ passion is an indicator of the issues’ importance. The feelings-as-information principle (Clore, Schwarz, & Conway, 1994; Niedenthal, 1990; Schwarz, 1990; Schwarz & Clore, 1983) suggests that one’s feelings can be a
source of information that helps in decision making and judgment tasks. The emotion-as-social-information model (EASI; Van Kleef, 2009) extends this theory and posits that by observing speakers’ emotions, observers are able to infer information about the speakers’ attitudes. Previous work suggests that emotions elicit cognitive appraisals to deal with an emotionally-laden situation (the appraisal tendency theory; Lerner & Keltner, 2000; 2001) and that individuals in positive mood appraise the situation as important and experience a sense of agency (Frijda, Kuipers, & Terschure, 1989; Lazarus, 1991; Roseman, 2001; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Smith, Haynes, Lazarus, & Pope, 1993). Therefore, according to the EASI model, by observing emotional speakers, observers should be able to infer the speakers’ appraisals of the situation. Listeners may interpret the speakers’ displays of passion as signaling that speakers think the issue is of high importance, as well as strong sense of agency and the belief that the speakers can cause a needed positive change. In turn, these inferences likely influence the listeners’ judgements about the issue: the perceptions of importance and needed positive change can make the listeners passionate about the issue as well.

**H1: The extent of speakers’ passion about the issue increases the extent of listeners’ passion about the issue.**

Once listeners catch passion, they are more likely to support the issue. There are several reasons why the listeners’ passion will increase their support of the issue. First, the broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005) suggests that positive emotions broaden behavioral options and actions. Positive emotions broaden the scope of action and attention, allowing for more flexible and integrative mental states and lowered inhibitions (Fredrickson, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005; Rowe, Hirsh, & Anderson, 2007). For example, in an experiment examining the effect of positive mood on the breadth of individuals’
behavioral options and actions repertoire (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005), participants were shown a short film clip that elicited either positive emotions, negative emotions, or neutral emotions. After watching the clip, participants were asked to fill 20 blank lines that started with the text “I would like to ____.” The number of completed statements indicated the size of their thought and actions repertoire, with larger number indicating a larger repertoire. To understand what types of actions were elicited, two raters coded each response into type of activity categories. Supporting the broaden-and-build theory, the results showed that positive emotions produced the largest number of behavioral options and actions repertoire, compared to negative and neutral emotions. Moreover, participants feeling positive emotions reported the need to engage in active pastime activities more frequently than participants feeling neutral and negative emotions who preferred more restful activities or withdrawal behaviors. Thus, passionate listeners are more likely to respond by being active and by engaging in activities that support the issue.

Second, positive emotions act as heuristic cues. The feelings-as-information theory posits that people use their emotional states as useful information by using a heuristic – asking themselves “how do I feel about it?” (Schwarz, 1990). Good mood indicates that the situation is benign and bad mood that it is unsafe. According to the theory, individuals in good mood are more optimistic about future events and willing to take some risks (Schwarz, 1990). In a study on the effect of emotions on employees’ effort, Foo et al. (2009) examined the venture efforts of 46 entrepreneurs during a period of twelve weeks. These entrepreneurs belonged to a variety of industries, such as manufacturing, retail, food and technical services. The authors found that consistent with the feelings-as-information perspective, positive mood increased venture efforts on new tasks beyond what was immediately required of them at the present time. This finding
indicates that because positive mood signals that things are currently going well, individuals in positive mood can think more broadly, creatively and optimistically about the future. These findings suggest that individuals in a positive mood could be more motivated to work hard in order to achieve a desired goal in the future: promoting the discussed issues. Thus, passionate listeners are likely to be more open to the issues, and thus, increase their support.

Third, the appraisal tendency theory (Lerner & Keltner, 2000, 2001), which posits that one’s felt emotions influence one’s cognitions, suggests that passionate listeners will appraise their passion as an indication for the need to act and support the issue. The appraisal tendency theory posits that emotions elicit a series of cognitive responses that facilitate individuals’ abilities to deal with different situations by harnessing cognitive functioning to better deal with the emotionally-laden situation. According to the theory, the appraisals that result from the experienced emotions influence subsequent thoughts and judgements. The theory suggests that when people experience a positive emotion their subsequent appraisals can lead them to feel agency and the need to approach and support the issue in order to facilitate a positive change (Frijda et al., 1989; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). This theory suggests that passionate listeners are likely to think that they can also bring about positive changes or implement improvements related to the issues. Based on this appraisal, listeners are likely to decide to support the issue.

Therefore, based on the broaden-and-build theory, the feelings-as-information perspective, and the appraisal tendency theory, I propose:

\[ \text{H2: The extent of listeners’ passion about the issue is positively related to listeners’ support.} \]

I expect the relationship between the listeners’ passion about the issue and the listeners’ support to be less pronounced when listeners’ epistemic motivation (the need to hold accurate
and well informed conclusions about a situation; De Dreu & Carnevale, 2003) is higher. Listeners with high levels of epistemic motivation should engage in extensive information search (De Dreu & Carnevale, 2003). They should be more vigilant and think more carefully about whether they should provide support, compared to listeners with lower epistemic motivation. They should realize that the passion they caught through contagion or are feeling as a result of inferential processes is not a good source of information and is irrelevant to their decision making. Vigilant exploration of alternative options should decrease the listeners’ reliance on their passion in making decisions, and should therefore reduce the listeners’ willingness to support passionate speakers.

Some evidence to the mitigating effect of vigilant exploration on the reliance on one’s emotional state can be found in a series of studies by Pham and Avnet (2004, 2009). The authors have looked at the effect of prevention-focus on individuals’ decision to rely on their emotions while making judgements. Prevention-focus is part of the self-regulation systems and is characterized by sensitivity to negative outcomes and a vigilant exploration that insures safety (Higgins, 1997). Pham and Avnet (2004, 2009) found that prevention focus reduced participants’ reliance on their emotions in product evaluations, social recommendations and perceptions of people. For example, in one study, the effect of experimentally manipulated target’s likeability on participants’ subsequent recommendations to date the target was mitigated by participants’ regulatory focus. Participants whose regulatory focus was manipulated to be prevention-focused were less affected by the target’s likeability when making recommendations (Pham & Avnet, 2009; Study 3). These studies demonstrate that vigilant exploration of information (which is related to prevention focus) can reduce individuals’ reliance on their emotions, and suggest that listeners with higher epistemic motivation should rely less on their
passion when deciding whether to support issues.

By contrast, listeners with lower epistemic motivation should be less vigilant in their decision making process, think less systematically about potential alternatives, and be less conscious of possible losses, compared to listeners with higher epistemic motivation. Subsequently, I expect listeners with lower epistemic motivation to rely more on their passion when deciding whether to support issues, compared to listeners with higher epistemic motivation:

\[ H3: \text{The listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the relationship between the listeners’ passion about the issue and the listeners’ support, such that when epistemic motivation is higher the relationship becomes weaker.} \]

The proposed arguments indicate that there should be an association between listeners’ passion about the issue and listeners’ support that is mediated by listeners’ passion, and this mediated association should be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation. The positive relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support should be stronger for listeners with lower epistemic motivation, compared to listeners with higher epistemic motivation, because when listeners have lower epistemic motivation, the association between listeners’ passion and their support is stronger (Figure 1, top):

\[ H4: \text{The positive relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue and the listeners’ support is mediated by the listeners’ passion about the issue. This indirect relationship is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower.} \]

**The Disadvantage of Passion: When Epistemic Motivation is Higher, Passion is Negatively Associated with Listeners’ Support**
Speakers’ passion can also influence listeners’ willingness to support issues and ideas through an elaborate communication route. I define *elaborate communication* as the extent to which the communication is detailed and produced in a logical and structured way (DePaulo et al., 2003). Specifically, detailed communication is the degree to which the communication is complete, concrete, and rich in independent pieces of information (such as descriptions of people, places, numbers, actions, objects and events). Logical and structured communication production is the degree to which the communicated statements are concise and coherent and are presented in an organized fashion, with an underlining pattern.

The effect of speakers’ passion on elaborate communication concerns the impact of passion on the speakers’ cognitions. Past work on influencing change in organizations suggested that speakers promote organizational change through conversations and by shedding light on under-discussed issues (Ford & Ford, 1995; Rouleau & Balogun, 2011). Speakers craft their communication by using a language that teaches their audience about the importance of the issue and by connecting their speech to their audience’s interest (Rouleau & Balogun, 2011). Although speakers try to tailor their speech to resonate with their listeners (Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, & Lawrence, 2001; Rouleau & Balogun, 2011), the preparations they make before conversing are not always sufficient to successfully promote the issues (Dutton et al., 2001). The speakers’ abilities to communicate well-argued arguments are influenced by what the speakers are thinking and feeling about the issue.

Different theoretical perspectives converge to propose that speakers who are more passionate produce less elaborate and persuasive arguments than speakers who are less passionate because passion increases the speakers’ heuristic information processing. In my dissertation, I concentrate on two theories: the feelings-as-information model (Schwarz, 1990)
and appraisal tendency theory (Lerner & Keltner, 2000, 2001).

The feelings-as-information model (Clore et al., 1994; Schwarz, 1990; Schwarz & Clore, 1983) posits that people form judgements based on the feelings they experience during information processing. The theory argues that positive feelings inform people that the situation is safe and, thus, that a simple information processing heuristic is sufficient. Conversely, negative feelings inform people that the situation is dangerous or entails a threat and, thus, that a systematic and detailed information processing is needed. Supporting the model, past research has demonstrated that participants used their bad mood as evidence of reduced happiness and quality of life (Schwarz & Clore, 1983).

The feelings-as-information effect can influence individuals in more complex information processing, such as constructing arguments. Indeed, in a series of studies, Forgas has demonstrated that such abstract heuristic processing leads to a decrease in concreteness and elaboration during communication production. In one experiment (Forgas, 1999), participants were randomly induced into a happy, neutral or sad mood by watching a short clip. After they observed the clip, they were asked to request a particular file from a neighboring office and to bring it to the experimenter. The authors analyzed the levels of linguistic elaboration and complexity of the requests and checked for linguistic differences between the three conditions. They found that happy participants produced requests that were the least complex and elaborate compared to controls and sad participants because happy participants used a heuristic and abstract cognitive processing. In another line of work (Forgas, 2002, 2007), student participants were induced into a happy or sad mood were then instructed to produce persuasive arguments relevant to Australian students: arguments on the issue of providing or restricting Aboriginals land rights in Australia and the proposition that student fees should be increase. The arguments
were rated by two judges on their levels of quality, persuasiveness (Forgas, 2002) and abstractness (Forgas, 2007). Happy participants produced arguments that were rated as less persuasive, more abstract, and lower in quality compare to sad participants. These studies suggest that passionate speakers should produce less elaborate communication, and specifically less detailed communication about issues.

Another relevant theory, the appraisal tendency theory (Lerner & Keltner, 2000, 2001), which extended work on cognitive appraisals (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), posits that one’s felt emotions influence one’s cognitions. In their classic paper on patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion, Smith and Ellsworth (1985) examined how different emotions differed from one another on a variety of appraisals. In that paper, the authors asked participants to recall past experiences associated with each of 15 different emotions, including happiness. For each emotion participants answered a series of questions designed to encourage them to describe the experience in as much detail as possible. Then, participants rated the experience along six appraisal dimensions. The authors found that different patterns of appraisals were associated with different emotions. They demonstrated the relationships using discriminant analyses, in which the emotions were correctly predicted on the basis of the corresponding patterns of cognitive appraisals. Specifically, participants felt happy when they were certain. Following a similar procedure, several additional studies (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988; Frijda et al., 1989; Roseman, Spindel, & Jose, 1990; Tiedens & Linton, 2001) found that joy and enthusiasm are also appraised with certainty.

Continuing this line of work, Lerner and Keltner (2000, 2001) proposed that emotions can influence cognitions, and that these cognitions, in turn, influence one’s judgement and choice. The theory argues that emotions elicit a series of physiological, behavioral and mental
responses that enable one to deal with situations one encounters in the world. The theory also argues that one’s emotion-related cognition interferes with one’s other cognitive processes, thus harnessing one’s attention and memory to better deal with emotionally-laden situations.

According to the appraisal tendency theory, the appraisal that results from one’s experienced emotion directly influences subsequent thoughts and judgements. Although none of the aforementioned papers measured the levels of certainty appraisals related to feelings of passion, I expect appraisal tendency for passion to be similar to those of other positive emotions such as joy, enthusiasm and happiness. Indeed, past work linked passion to other strong positive emotions (Chen et al., 2009). Therefore, I expect passion to result in a high certainty appraisal.

Emotions may originate in different ways, including relatively non-cognitive processes (Izard, 1993). In these cases, appraisals do not cause or create emotions, but even so, these appraisals are experienced once the emotion is felt (Lerner & Tiedens, 2006). Nevertheless, regardless if an emotion originated from cognitive appraisals, based on the abovementioned findings, speakers’ passion about issues should elicit emotion-laden appraisals – mainly, certainty appraisal – that, in turn, influence the speakers’ cognitive processes, thoughts, memories and choices.

Past research has demonstrated that a certainty appraisal leads to more stereotypic judgments, increased attention to superficial cues of the message (Bodenhausen, Sheppard, & Kramer, 1994), reduced attention to the quality of the argument (Bodenhausen et al., 1994; Rydell et al., 2008; Tiedens & Linton, 2001), increased use of accessible mental scripts (Tiedens, 2001), and reduced attention to inconsistencies (Ask & Granhag, 2007). Conversely, appraisals of uncertainty lead to a more detailed processing with an increased attention to the quality of the argument (Tiedens & Linton, 2001). More generally, certainty appraisals activate
heuristic information processing, while uncertainty appraisals activate systematic information processing (Bodenhausen et al., 1994; Lerner & Tiedens, 2006; Tiedens & Linton, 2001).

These information-processing effects are not related specifically to one emotion or another, but rather to the perceived certainty of a situation (Tiedens & Linton, 2001). Relying on previous findings regarding the medium levels of certainty of the emotion ‘sadness’ (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988), Tiedens and Linton (2001; Study 4) held the emotion constant while varying certainty levels. The authors randomly assigned participants to one of four conditions. In the first condition, Participants were asked to write about a time when they (1) felt sad and certain about what was happening and what would happen; (2) felt sad and uncertain about what was happening and what would happen; (3) a time when they felt sad; or (4) to describe the minor details of the previous day (a neutral condition). Participants were then asked to read one of two descriptions of a product and to indicate to what extent they would consider buying it. Unbeknown to the participants, one of the descriptions contained strong arguments about the product, while the second contained weak arguments. The authors created strong and weak arguments to test the extent to which participants ignore the quality of the message and heuristically process the arguments. Results showed that although the participants felt equally sad in all of the sadness conditions they processed the arguments quite differently. Those who felt sad-and-certain were less able to distinguish between weak and strong arguments than those who felt sad-and-uncertain or those who were induced to feel sad-without-appraisal-directions. These findings indicate that regardless of the felt emotion, when people feel certain they process information heuristically, while those who feel uncertain process information systematically.

Since passionate speakers are expected to experience certainty while thinking about the issues, the corresponding heuristic processing is bound to influence the speakers’ thoughts and
mental processing of the already-known facts. Moreover, these processing abilities are expected to influence the amount and type of information the speakers are able to retrieve from memory. While speakers are conversing about the issues and trying to promote listeners’ support, the speakers are using the information they are able to access. In ‘certain’ situations, such information is general, heuristic and is not expected to be elaborate. Therefore, passionate speakers are expected to converse less elaborately about the issue.

**H5: The extent of speakers’ passion about the issue is negatively related to the degree to which the speakers’ conversation about the issue is elaborate.**

The extent to which listeners provide support may depend on listeners’ conviction that speakers are coherent, convincing, and knowledgeable about the issue. Further, speakers need to persuade listeners that the issues are relevant and beneficial to listeners. Moreover, since listeners need to be influenced by the message to support issues, they also need to feel they have a clear understanding of the issue and to feel knowledgeable about it. Therefore, the extent to which speakers elaborate on the issue is likely to have an effect on listeners, such that the more detailed, structured and concrete the communication, the more likely the listeners are to support the issue. A communication that is unstructured, lacks clear flow and includes many logical jumps is harder to follow and less convincing.

Supporting the idea that detailed communication is important in influencing change in organizations, a qualitative research on the tactics that are involved in shaping organizational change revealed that when speakers used “lots of numbers and charts,” or concentrate “on financial aspect,” speakers were more likely to convince listeners of the issues’ legitimacy and the need for listeners’ support (Dutton et al., 2001). Previous work has also found that arguments that included more concrete details increased judges’ perceptions of argument quality
Moreover, research on the investment decisions of venture capitalists has found that when entrepreneurs presented their case by using coherent and logical presentations while citing facts to support their arguments, they were perceived as highly prepared by venture capitalists who were listening. Perceived preparedness was positively related to venture capitalists’ investment decisions. That is, entrepreneurs who used elaborate communication raised more funds for their venture than entrepreneurs who did not use elaborate communication (Chen et al., 2009).

Past work also suggests that detailed communication includes independent details, and not only repetitions or explanations which may neglect to mention all possible topics, such as other views and counterarguments. Indeed, Dutton and Ashford (1993) have proposed that the more speakers use two-sided arguments supporting issue claims, the greater the attention listeners invest in the issue. Some evidence to the claim that listeners’ attention can then be translated into behavior can be found in the marketing field. A meta-analysis on the effectiveness and persuasive impact of two-sided advertising found that two-sided messages increase the perceived credibility of the source, reduce negative cognitive responses and increase customers’ purchase intention (Eisend, 2006).

Logical and structured communication production is also central to speakers’ abilities to increase listeners’ decision to support the issues. A stronger story can be made while using a systematic and elaborate explanation that presents a coherent pattern of how different facts – arguments and counterarguments – relate to each other. Conversely, a communication that is unstructured, lacks clear flow and includes many logical jumps is harder to follow and less convincing. Supporting the importance of a logical and structured communication, the abovementioned qualitative research has also found that by conveying “a logical and coherent
structure” a speaker is more successful in promoting listener’s support (Dutton et al., 2001). Thus, I predicted:

H6: *The degree to which the speakers’ conversation about the issue is elaborate positively relates to listeners’ support for the issue.*

I expect that elaborate communication increases listeners’ support, because when speakers converse using more explanations, arguments and counterarguments, listeners are better able to construct a coherent picture of the issue. This effect may be more pronounced when listeners’ epistemic motivation is high. Individuals with high levels of epistemic motivation engage in extensive information search and systematic cognitive processing (De Dreu & Carnevale, 2003). The motivation to be accurate and well informed is higher when personal consequences are important or when one is held accountable for one’s decisions (De Dreu, Koole, & Steinel, 2000). Listeners’ high motivation to learn about the issue and to better understand how well the speaker is familiar with the issue increases the listeners’ need for elaborate communication when deciding whether to support the issue:

H7: *Epistemic motivation moderates the relationship between speakers’ elaboration about the issue and listeners’ support, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, the relationship becomes stronger.*

Hypotheses 5-7 are reflected in moderated-mediation in which the listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the indirect relationship between the speakers’ passion about the issue and the listeners’ support through the speakers’ elaboration about the issue. The negative relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support should be stronger for listeners with higher epistemic motivation, compared to listeners with lower epistemic motivation (Figure 1, bottom):
H8: The negative relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue and the listeners’ support is mediated by the speakers’ conversation elaboration. This indirect relationship is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is higher.

The Overall Effects of Speakers’ Passion on Listeners’ Support

To conclude, I theorize that speakers’ passion about the issue increases listeners’ support when listeners have lower epistemic motivation. Speakers’ passion decreases listeners’ support when listeners have higher epistemic motivation. In the model that I developed, the listeners’ epistemic motivation is a critical factor that determines whether passion has a favourable or an unfavourable effect on listeners’ decision to support issues.

Methodological Approach

I began my investigation into the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support with Study 1A, a field study in which I observed entrepreneurs’ pitches on the television show Dragons’ Den. The show centers on entrepreneurs who pitch their business ideas to a panel of five venture capitalists. This study allowed me to test my hypotheses in a real-life setting by observing speakers with varying levels of passion about their venture ideas, and listeners’ real decisions of whether to support those ventures. I chose this setting because the entrepreneurs have the opportunity to communicate with listeners, and entrepreneurs who participate in the show vary in how much passion they express during their pitches. Due to the public nature of the entrepreneurs’ communication with the investors, I was able to measure the constructs that are in my model: speakers’ and listeners’ passion, elaborate communication, listeners’ epistemic motivation and listeners’ support.

Following this initial study, I conducted Study 1B, in which I investigated post-hoc
alternative mechanisms that may explain the findings of Study 1A, including some mechanisms that I could not code by observing the videos. Complementing the objective coding conducted by independent raters in Study 1A with participants’ perceptions allowed me to test the effect of several psychological constructs on the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. In addition, I explored whether speakers’ passion explained variance in listeners’ support or whether alternative constructs produced spurious associations in Study 1A. Participants observed the speakers from Study 1A and rated their perceptions of the speakers’ attitudes and personalities.

Finally, I conducted Study 2, an experimental test of the causal relationships between speakers’ passion, listeners’ epistemic motivation and listeners’ support, and to test another mechanism, speakers’ perceived tendency to stand for their principles. The experimental approach allowed me to independently manipulate epistemic motivation through the size of the monetary investments request by the speakers and the levels of speakers’ passion. Moreover, this setting allowed me to measure the listeners’ subjective perceptions of speakers’ tendency to stand for their principles, complementing Studies 1A and 1B.

**STUDY 1A: METHODS**

**Overview**

In Study 1A I observed entrepreneurs’ pitches on the Canadian television show *Dragons’ Den*. The show centers on entrepreneurs who pitch their business ideas and products to a panel of five Canadian investors, also known as the dragons. The show has been on the air since October, 2006 and was in the middle of its 8th season during data collection. At the time, 113 episodes\(^1\) with entrepreneurs’ pitches have aired, with an average of 7.9 pitches per episode;

---

\(^1\) At time of data collection, 123 episodes have aired, but ten of those were ‘special’ episodes and followed different themes or rules. For example, on episode 21 in season 4, three entrepreneurs competed for a 100,000CAD funding
resulting in approximately 864 entrepreneurs’ pitches by the time that data collection took place. This study allowed me to test my hypotheses by observing speakers with varying levels of passion about their venture ideas, and listeners’ real decisions of whether to support those ventures. I chose this setting because of its inherent structure which included entrepreneurs with varied levels of passion who had the opportunity to express their passion to potential supporters. Due to the public nature of the entrepreneurs’ communication with the investors I was able to observe actual displays of listeners’ support. This method allowed me to test my hypotheses in a setting where actual investment decisions were being made.

The listeners’ assessment of the size of the requested investment (amount of money) the speakers need should influence the listeners’ motivation to learn more about the issue, to fully grasp what the issue related activities entail, and to better understand how well the speaker is familiar with the different aspects of the issue. A larger request requires a larger commitment and involvement from investors. Investors are held accountable for their decisions based on either the process that led to the decision or the outcome of the decision (de Langhe, van Osselaer, & Wierenga, 2011). Moreover, there is always a possibility that an investment will not yield a positive return; a larger request may be perceived as more risky and signal to listeners that there is a lot at stake if they decide to support the speaker. Therefore, a decision about a larger investment, which should make listeners more conscious of potential losses, should increase listeners’ need for developing accurate conclusions about the investment relative to a decision about a smaller investment (Dunegan, 1993). Listeners who consider larger requests should have a higher desire to develop and hold accurate and well informed conclusions about the speaker and the investment than listeners who consider smaller requests. The size of the
speakers’ request should influence listeners’ epistemic motivation, with larger requests leading
to relatively higher epistemic motivation and smaller requests leading to relatively lower
epistemic motivation. For that reason, I measured the amount of money requested by the speaker
as an indication of listeners’ epistemic motivation in this study (see below).

**Sample Size**

I used power analyses to decide on the appropriate sample size to test the hypotheses.
There are currently no tools that calculate the needed sample size or power for moderated-
mediation models. Therefore, I calculated the power and sample size in other, similar, statistical
models as approximations for the sample size I needed to test the proposed model. First, using
G*Power (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996), I calculated the needed sample size for a
multivariate linear regression with 4 independent variables (speakers’ passion, communication
elaboration, listeners’ passion, and listener’s epistemic motivation) assuming a medium effect
size (using a conservative approach based on the effect sizes found by Chen et al., 2009; \(f^2 = .15\), or \(d = .039\); Cohen, 1988), coefficient alpha of .05, and a power of .80. The results of this
analysis indicated that I needed a sample size of at least N= 85 speakers.

Second, I tested the sample size needed in order to detect a mediated effect, using the
analysis made by Fritz and MacKinnon (2007). Assuming a medium effect size (\(f^2 = .15\), or \(d = .039\); Cohen, 1988) for each path and using a bias-corrected bootstrapping method, the needed
sample size for a power of .80 was N= 71 speakers (see Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007, Table 3).

Finally, I used calculations made by Shieh (2009) to estimate the minimum sample size
needed for a moderated multiple-regression with continuous variables as predictors and
moderators. It is important to specifically calculate the sample size of a model with a continuous
moderator (as opposed to a dichotomous one), because the total sample size is the focal issue in
determining power when the moderator is a continuous variable (Aguinis & Gottfredson, 2010). To estimate the sample sizes required for testing whether the interaction is significantly different from zero, Shieh (2009) assumed\(^2\) alpha = 0.05 and power = 0.90. In these tests, the predicted sample size also relied on the predicted correlation between the independent variable and the moderator. When the correlation between the predictors was equal to zero, the sample size was estimated to be somewhere between 174 and 203 (depending on the distribution of the interaction coefficient; See Table 3 in Shieh, 2009). These were the largest sample size estimations of the simulations. Therefore, the most conservative sample size to observe the conditional effect is N = 203.

Based on these three power analyses, for my proposed model it seems that a conservative sample of approximately 200 speakers was needed.

**Participants**

*Speakers.* Two hundred entrepreneurs who participated in the reality television show *Dragons’ Den* (Canada) were chosen as participants. I randomly picked those speakers from the 864 pitches made on the show, using a random number generator (www.random.org). Twenty-two out of the 200 speakers were not taken seriously by the listeners. One speaker had too little footage (less than 2.5s) to code. Therefore, these speakers were removed from the sample. The data set for analysis included 177 participants (33% female). The majority of the speakers were Caucasian (91%), while 4% were Asian, 2% Black, 2% Hispanic, and 1% belonged to other ethnic groups.

*Listeners.* Each entrepreneur presents the issue he/she was passionate about to a panel of five investors who listened to the entrepreneurs’ pitches. Each one of the investors could decide

---

\(^2\)To estimate the sample size the author also assumed that either (1) the predictors are symmetrically and normally distributed; or that (2) the predictors are not normally distributed and are not symmetric. The results of the latter were more conservative – and predicted a larger sample size – and was the one I used.
whether or not to support the issue or product the entrepreneur (speaker) presented, and to what extent to invest in the venture. Although the panel constituted of 5 investors each season, a total of 9 investors listened to the speakers throughout the 8 seasons of the show. Two of them (Kevin O’Leary, Jim Treliving) participated in all 8 seasons, one (Arlene Dickinson) in 7 seasons, one (Robert Herjavec) in 6 seasons, two (Brett Wilson, Bruce Croxon) in 3 seasons, two (Laurence Lewin, David Chilton) in 2 seasons, and one (Jennifer Wood) in 1 season. Each panel of 5 listeners constituted of 1 female and 4 males. All listeners were Caucasian.

**Coding Procedure**

Each clip displays at least one entrepreneur, or representative from one venture, who communicated with the panel of investors (listeners). Because each episode showed several independent speakers who asked the investors for an investment in separate pitches, I edited the episodes and created separate clips. Each clip only included one such interaction and started at the moment the speaker greeted the investors (usually by using the phrase “hello dragons!”) and ended when any of the following happened: speakers said goodbye to the investors, speakers turned and walked out of the room, speakers stated that they accept a deal offered by the investors, the investors asked the speakers to leave, or the investors informed the speakers none of them would invest.

Of the entire length of the video clip, approximately half (56% of the clip, on average) was dedicated to the speakers’ pitch. In the pitch, the entrepreneurs talked about their company, product, and business plan and explained why they needed the listeners’ investment. The pitch’s starting time was when the clip started and its ending time was when the listeners started to talk to the speakers, or started deliberating between themselves without giving the speaker the opportunity to continue communicating. Therefore, the pitch ended when listeners interrupted
the speakers’ pitches and either stated that they would like to make an investment offer or explained why they would not do so. These interruptions differ from when the listeners ask clarifying questions. The first question appeared, on average, 44 seconds after the pitch started ($SD = 33$ seconds) and the pitch ended 2:28 minutes, on average, after it started ($SD = 1:29$ minutes). The clips’ length ranged from 33 seconds to 12:01 minutes, and averaged 4:25 minutes ($SD = 2:40$ minutes).

I trained six raters to code the clips for this study (see Appendix A for a training manual). The rates were kept unaware of the study’s hypotheses and conducted their coding independently. All six raters were trained using the passion and elaborate communication scales developed by Chen et al. (2009), and one rater was also trained to use the mood expression scale developed by Bartel and Saavedra (2000) as part of a validation test of the Chen and colleagues’ (2009) measure.

Each of the six raters coded different variables for this study. Rater 1 coded speakers’ passion, listeners’ passion, listeners’ support, elaborate communication, and the speakers’ gender and ethnicity. Rater 2 coded speakers’ passion, listeners’ passion, listeners’ support, elaborate communication, and the speakers’ gender and ethnicity. Rater 3 coded speakers’ passion and listeners’ passion. Rater 4 coded speakers’ passion, listeners’ passion, and listeners’ support. Rater 5 coded speakers’ passion, listeners’ passion, listeners’ support, elaborate communication, and the speakers’ gender and ethnicity. Rater 6 participated in the validation of the passion measure, and coded epistemic motivation, share size, industry, listeners’ support, elaborate communication, and the speakers’ gender and ethnicity. The author also coded several of the study’s variables. The author participated in the validation of the passion measure, and coded industry, usability of product, and whether the product belonged to the engineering field.
Raters coded each clip in five separate phases. In Phase 1, raters coded emotional expressions by watching the speakers’ and listeners’ passion every 5 seconds at the prompting of a video player developed specifically for this study (the player automatically paused at the end of each 5s segment). The 5s segments were aggregated across the pitch and across the raters in order to create a composite that represented speakers’ passion and listeners’ passion.

In Phase 2, one rater coded the size of investment requests by copying the information from the show’s website (http://www.cbc.ca/dragonsden/).

In Phase 3, raters watched the clips they coded in Phase 1 from the moment the pitch ended, and coded the listeners’ support, by indicating whether the speaker received (1) at least one investment offer, (2) the number of listeners who made an offer, and (3) the extent of average monetary support.

In Phase 4, raters were randomly assigned to clips they did not code in the previous phases and rated the speakers’ overall communication elaboration using the scale developed by Chen et al. (2009).

In Phase 5, raters watched the clips they coded in Phase 4 and coded the demographic information (i.e., gender, ethnicity) of the speakers.

**Predictor Variable**

*Speakers’ passion.* Five raters coded speakers’ passion by recording the speakers’ facial expressions, body postures and vocal patterns using Chen et al.’s (2009) perceived passion scale. The behavioral indicators in the scale are “the speaker…” “has energetic body movement,” “has rich body language,” “shows animated facial expression,” “is using gestures,” “face lights up,” and “talks with varied tone and pitch.” A designated video player, developed specifically for this study’s purposes, played each clip and automatically paused every 5s to
allow consistent coding. Once the clip paused, indicating the end of the segment, the raters
coded the clip by placing check marks on a scoring sheet next to the indicators they observed
during each segment (see Appendix B for a screen shot of observation sheet). Forty seven
percent of the clips (N= 83) were randomly assigned and coded by rater-pairs, to establish inter-
rater agreement on the scale. I added up the number of the six behavioral indicators for each
segment to calculate the speakers’ overall passion in each segment. Interrater agreement for
speakers’ passion was high, ICC(1, 2) = .84, indicating substantial agreement between raters.
The remaining 94 clips were randomly divided between four raters who continued to code them
using the same measure. Passion ratings ranged from 0 to 6 in each segment, with an average of
2.16 (SD = 1.41). The passion scale was found to be moderately reliable (a = .52). I averaged
the overall passion scores across all segments in each pitch to calculate the speakers’ overall
passion during the pitch. Speakers’ passion ranged from .30 to 4.00 in each pitch (M = 2.04, SD
= .68, a = .50 3).

Using the footage from the speakers’ communication with the listeners, raters coded the
observable expressions of passion the speakers displayed throughout the interaction. It seems
reasonable to assume that the speakers’ internal emotional feelings about the products or ideas
they discussed were visible to those observing them (Barsade, 2002; Bartel & Saavedra, 2000)
and were captured on film. The observational measures developed by Chen et al. (2009) allowed

3 Two items reduced the reliability of the measure: “shows animated facial expression” and “face lights up.”
Removing these items increased the reliability to a = .67. Results from supplemental analyses where these items
were removed from the variable were similar to those with all the items. Therefore, I report the results of the
analyses of the variable with all 6 items.
It should be noted that a scale’s reliability is influenced by the number of possible response categories, and that
scale items with two categories (yes/no) yield lower reliabilities than scales with more than two categories
(Peterson, 1994). This could explain why past research, which used a 7-point rating scale, reported a higher
reliability for the scale. It could be that when raters use a 7-point scale their ratings of each of the items are
influenced by an overall impression of the speaker. It could also be that speakers have a tendency to display their
passion more strongly via some routes more than others (e.g., using many gestures while talking but not smiling a
lot), a tendency that is captured by the rigorous coding procedure used in this study.
me to accurately and systematically document these behavioral indicators of speakers’ passionate state. The observer’s instrument allowed observers to successfully discern and interpret behavioral evidence of people's emotional state. Chen et al. (2009) found a high within-rater Cronbach’s alpha of .95 for their passionate expressions measure, demonstrating high reliability of the measure when participants rated speakers’ passion on a 7-point Likert scale.

To establish the convergent and discriminant validities of Chen et al’s (2009) instrument, two raters (the author and a research assistant) coded speakers’ passionate and emotional expressions using the Chen et al’s (2009) observed passion measure and the Bartel and Saavedra (2000) mood observation measure. Sample behavioral indicators from Bartel and Saavedra’s (2000) measure include “arched eyebrows,” “active hands,” “varied inflection,” and “smile with teeth showing.” A comparison of observers' and self-reported mood ratings in past research has landed strong support for the construct validity of the measure, indicating that it is possible to observe and capture the emotional states of observed individuals (Bartel and Saavedra, 2000; $r_{high\ activation} = .68; r_{active\ pleasant} = .70; r_{activated\ unpleasant} = .80$). A reliability of the Bartel and Saavedra (2000) measure was not provided in the paper, but later research reported a within-rater Cronbach’s alpha of .82 and an ICC inter-rater reliability of .77 (Barsade, 2002) when using a 5-point Likert scale, thus demonstrating high reliability of the measure.

The raters coded 6 randomly selected segments (30 seconds) from 30 randomly selected clips that were not coded in the main study. Interrater agreement was adequate for all scales: ICC(2, 2) = .88 for speakers’ passion, .84 for high activation mood, .84 for active pleasant mood, .91 for pleasant mood, and .72 for active unpleasant mood. I added up the relevant behavioral indicators for each segment to calculate the speakers’ overall passion ($M = 2.03$, $SD$
= 1.44; α = .61), high activation emotions ($M = 1.98$, $SD = 1.12$; $α = .41$), activated pleasant emotions ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.12$; $α = .40$), pleasant emotions ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.88$; $α = .68$), and activated unpleasant emotions ($M = .29$, $SD = .48$; $α = .12$), in each segment.

To establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the passion scale I correlated the passion scale developed by Chen et al. (2009) with four of the mood scales developed by Bartel and Saavedra (2000), namely: high activation, activated pleasant, pleasant and activated unpleasant. Convergent validity tests the extent to which two independent measures assess the same construct, while discriminant validity tests the extent to which two independent measures assess different constructs (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). I expected modest to large (Cohen, 1988) positive correlations between the passion scale and each of the positive mood scales (high activation, activated pleasant, and pleasant). I expected a negative, weak or insignificant correlation between the passion scale and the activated unpleasant scale. As expected, the passion scale positively and strongly correlated with each of the positive mood scales ($r_{\text{high activation}} = .65$, $r_{\text{active pleasant}} = .57$, and $r_{\text{pleasant}} = .76$; all $ps < .001$), lending support to the convergent validity of the scale. Also as expected, the passion scale did not correlate significantly with the activated unpleasant scale ($r_{\text{active unpleasant}} = -.04$; $p = .56$). The lack of correlation with the activated unpleasant scale lends preliminary evidence of the discriminant validity of the passion scale.

Mediators

Listeners’ passion. Listeners’ passion was coded and calculated similarly to speakers’ passion. For each pitch, raters coded passion expressions of each of the five listeners separately. Accounting for the fact that the clips usually display, at any given time, only one or two of the listeners on the screen, I coded the overall expressions of passion that were displayed by all five
listeners throughout the pitch in 5s segments. Interrater agreement for the listeners’ passion composite indicated adequate agreement between coders, ICC(1, 2) = .60. Listeners’ passion averaged .34 (SD = .76) across the segments, and the passion scale was moderately reliable (α = .61). Similarly to the speakers’ passion variable, I averaged listeners’ passion levels across the segments to calculate the listeners’ overall passion during each pitch. Listeners’ passion ranged from .08 to .78 in each pitch (M = .35, SD = .14; α = .34).

**Elaborate communication.** Five raters rated speakers’ communication elaboration using a 5-item scale (Chen et al., 2009; α = .87 in past research). Raters indicated the extent to which the speakers’ communication was detailed, logical and structured, on a scale ranging from 1 (to a small extent) to 7 (to a large extent). The items were “the presentation content had substance,” “the presentation was thoughtful and in-depth,” “the presentation was coherent and logical,” “the speaker articulated the relationship between the business plan and the broader context” and “the speaker cited facts to support his/her arguments.” Interrater agreement for elaborate communication indicated high agreement between coders, ICC(1, 2) = .90. The items were averaged to form a composite score (M = 4.31, SD = 1.61; α = .98).

**Moderator**

**Epistemic motivation.** One rater recorded the size of the requested investment (the amount of funding sought by the speaker) from the show’s website (www.cbc.ca/dragonsden/) by coding the amount of money the speakers requested (in Canadian Dollars, CAD). Requests ranged from 3K CAD to 5M CAD (M = 228.14K, SD = 444.48K). The size of the request is listed on the show’s website, stated explicitly on the show and in some clips it is also written on the screen.

**Outcome Variables**
It is important to measure the listeners’ overall support for all listeners combined, because one listener can influence other listeners’ decisions to support the speakers. In some cases on the show, the listeners explicitly stated that they decided to invest and make an offer when they observed another listener showing support. In other cases, the listeners stated that they would make an offer if one of the other listeners would join in. Yet another way in which the listeners showed that they are affected by their peers was that in some cases when an offer was made by one listener, another listener would ask if he/she can join the offer that was already made.

Five raters coded whether support was offered, the number of supporters and the average monetary support.

Support was offered. Based on the show’s rules, the speaker has to convince the listeners to invest an amount that is equal to or larger than the speaker’s request. Such an offer enables the speaker to make a deal with the investor for an actual monetary support. Raters coded the variable as “1” (listeners offered support) when the speaker had at least one such deal to consider, and as “0” (listeners did not offer support) otherwise (κ = 1.00). Forty one per cent of the speakers received listeners’ support. The information about an offer of support by the listeners is stated explicitly on the show. Therefore, this variable is based on factual accounts and indicates high construct and criterion validities.

Number of supporters. During each pitch, the speaker can convince up to five listeners to support the speaker’s company or product. When listeners decide to support the speaker and make an offer, at times they do so independently and make unique offers to the speaker, and at other times they make an offer together with other listeners. Sometimes the listeners compete with each other for the opportunity to invest in the speaker’s idea, and sometimes they offer to
invest together, as a team. Support ranged from 0 (none of the listeners offered to make a deal) to 5 (maximum number of supporters: all listeners made an offer) and averaged .98 per pitch (SD = 1.47; κ = 1.00). A larger number of listeners who make an offer indicates higher support because when more listeners decide to make an offer and invest in the speaker it means that more people were influenced by the speaker and convinced that the speaker should be supported. As in the variable ‘support was offered,’ the information about which of the listeners, and how many of them, made an offer is explicitly stated on the show. Therefore, this variable is also based on factual information.

*Average monetary support.* The extent to which speakers gained monetary support was captured by the average amount of money offered by each of the listeners. In some cases that amount equaled zero; in other cases a single listeners made an offer that equaled the amount requested by the speaker; in others the listeners made an offer that exceeded the amount the speaker asked for; and yet in several cases the speakers received more than one offer (15% of the speakers). I calculated the average monetary support by averaging the final offers made by each of the listeners at the end of the pitch. The average monetary support across all pitches was 95.07K CAD (SD = 201.74K). Same as with the two other dependent variables, this variable was coded based on factual information that was explicitly mentioned on the show.

**Control Variables**

There could potentially be several relevant control variables in this study. Below I present each of them and test whether I need to control for them in my tests of the hypotheses:

*Season.* Of the 177 pitches randomly chosen for this study, 3% were from season 1, 11% from season 2, 9% from season 3, 15% from season 4, 17% from season 5, 19% from season 6, 17% from season 7, and 8% from season 8. The season in which the speakers pitched their ideas
to the listeners may have influenced the type of speakers who applied to the show, or the ones who were chosen by the show’s directors. It may be the case that earlier seasons attracted more passionate people, who were willing to take the risk of presenting their products and ideas on television without knowing anything about the investors they will speak with or the show. Another possibility is that exactly an opposite effect occurred, and that later seasons had more passionate individuals that already observed some of the negative reactions other entrepreneurs received from the listeners but that were still excited and motivated to appear on the show for the possibility of getting support from the listeners. Moreover, some of the listeners changed throughout the seasons, which may have affected the speakers’ abilities to gain support for some ventures. Further, speakers in later seasons may have had a harder time gaining support for ventures similar to those the listeners supported in previous seasons. For these reasons, it is potentially important to control for the season in which the speakers pitched their ideas. Because adding 7 dummy variables to the model increases the power needed to find an effect, I first conducted a MANOVA test with season as the fixed factor and ‘support was offered,’ ‘number of supporters’ and ‘average monetary support’ as the dependent variables. The results of the test were insignificant, F(21, 482.96) = , p = .15, Wilk's lambda = .85, confirming that season did not account for listeners’ support. Therefore, I did not control for season.

**Industry.** Industry types were identified using the Fama and French classifications (1997). Two independent raters coded the speaker’s affiliated industry based on the Fama and French five industry classification (i.e., FF05; [http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french](http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french)): (1) consumers: consumer durables, consumer non-durables, and shops (75% of the pitches); (2) manufacturing: manufacturing, energy and utilities (3%); (3) hi-tech: business equipment and telecommunication (7%); (4) health: healthcare, medical equipment, and drugs (2%); and (5)
other: mines, construction, building management, transportation, hotels, entertainment, finance, and everything else (13%). Inter-rater agreement was substantial ($\kappa = .63$), indicating consistency across raters (Landis & Koch, 1977). Discrepancies in classifications were mutually resolved through discussion. It is potentially important to control for the type of industry because some industries may be more engaging for the listeners than others, with specific industries therefore attracting more support. Each of the listeners is known for the type of industries they are experts in, an expertise that may lead them to support a specific product. When speakers request investments for a product or idea that belong to an industry the listeners are not experts in, the listeners may be reluctant to invest. Indeed, in some cases the listeners stated on the show that they don’t know enough about the industry and cannot help the speaker. Not only can the industry potentially correlate with support decisions, the industry may also influence the speakers’ monetary needs and size of investment requests (Pollack, Rutherford, & Nagy, 2012). Because adding 4 dummy variables to the model increases the power needed to find an effect, I first conducted a MANOVA test with industry as the fixed factor and ‘support was offered,’ ‘number of supporters’ and ‘average monetary support’ as the dependent variables. The results of the test were insignificant, $F(12, 452.72) = , p = .95$, Wilks’s lambda = .97, confirming that industry did not account for listeners’ support. Therefore, I did not control for industry.

**Gender.** I coded the speaker’s gender as “1” when the main speaker during the pitch was a female (33%), and as “0” when the main speaker was a male. Past research has demonstrated that men and women use different communication styles (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003) which can affect their ability to influence others (Carli, 1990): venture capitalists invest less money when females pitch their ideas, compared to when males deliver a pitch (Brooks,
Huang, Kearney, & Murray, 2014). Females also tend to explicitly reference their emotions more than men do while they speak (Mulac, Bradac, & Gibbons, 2001) which may make their emotional state more salient for the listeners and influence the listeners’ emotional reactions more strongly than males’ emotional states. Moreover, the norms for expression of positive emotion are gender differentiated and women are expected to express positive emotions toward other people. Therefore, I expected the listeners to react differently to passionate displays by female speakers compared to male speakers. Because adding a dummy variable to the model increases the power needed to find an effect, I first conducted a MANOVA test with speakers’ gender as the fixed factor and ‘support was offered,’ ‘number of supporters’ and ‘average monetary support’ as the dependent variables. The results of the test were insignificant, $F(3, 174) = .44$, $p = .15$, Wilks's lambda = .97, confirming that speakers’ gender did not account for listeners’ support. Therefore, I did not control for speakers’ gender.

**Social responsibility.** Five independent raters coded whether speakers explicitly referred to their product or organization as socially responsible (8%) based on Mueller et al.’s definitions of corporate social responsibility (Mueller, Hattrup, Spiess, & Lin-Hi, 2012). Listeners may choose to invest in socially responsible companies because these social actions maximize their market value (Mackey, Mackey, & Barney, 2007), thus making the company more attractive to potential investors. Because adding a dummy variable to the model increases the power needed to find an effect, I first conducted a MANOVA test with social responsibility as the fixed factor and ‘support was offered,’ ‘number of supporters’ and ‘average monetary support’ as the dependent variables. The results of the test were significant, $F(3, 174) = 3.32$, $p = .02$, Wilks's lambda = .95, confirming that speakers’ social responsibility accounted for listeners’ support. Therefore, I controlled for social responsibility in subsidiary analyses below.
Additional Variables for Exploratory Analyses

I collected data on three additional variables for subsidiary data analysis (see below):

*Share size.* One rater recorded the share size offered by the speaker (in exchange for an investment) from the show’s website ([www.cbc.ca/dragonsden/](http://www.cbc.ca/dragonsden/)) by coding the percent of the company the speakers offered. Offers ranged from 0% to 100% ($M = 28.00\%, \, SD = 15.40\%$).

*Usability of product.* One rater coded the usability of the product as “1” when the product the speaker discussed was a functional and serviceable product (40%), and as “0” when the product was not.

*Engineering.* One rater coded the product or company the speaker discussed as “1” when the product belonged to the engineering field (18%) and as “0” when it did not.

**STUDY 1A: RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

Table 2 provides an overview of key findings. Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the observed variables and Tables 4-7 report results of hypotheses testing. The outcome variable ‘support was offered’ is a binary variable, thus, I used logistic regression analyses in models predicting whether ‘support was offered.’ The outcome variable ‘number of supporters’ is a count variable as it was calculated based on the number of listeners who offered support at the end of each pitch. Although Poisson regression is appropriate to model count data, my data indicated some over-dispersion, violating a basic assumption of the Poisson estimator (Hausman, Hall, & Griliches, 1984). Thus, I used negative binomial regression analyses in models predicting ‘number of supporters.’ Finally, the mediators ‘listeners’ passion’ and ‘elaborate communication’ and the outcome variable ‘average monetary support’ are continuous variables. Thus, I used linear regression analyses in models where they were the outcomes.
Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1, predicting that speakers’ passion about the issue is positively associated with listeners’ passion about the issue, was not supported (Table 4, Model 1, \( b = .02, p = .14 \)). Hypothesis 2, predicting that listeners’ passion about the issue is positively associated with listeners’ support, was partially supported. Listeners’ passion was positively related to whether support was offered (Table 4, Model 3, \( b = 3.65, p < .01 \)) but not to number of supporters (Table 4, Model 7, \( b = -2.32, p < .01 \)) or to the average monetary support (Table 4, Model 11, \( b = -223.66, p < .05 \)).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that epistemic motivation moderates the positive association between listeners’ passion about the issue and listeners’ support; such that when epistemic motivation is higher the association becomes weaker. The interaction was not significant for number of supporters (Table 4, Model 8, \( b = .00, p = .35 \)), marginally significant for whether support was offered (Table 4, Model 4, \( b = .01, p < .10 \)), and significant for average monetary support (Table 4, Model 12, \( b = 1.07, p < .05 \)). I probed the interactions by conducting a simple slope analysis (Aiken & West, 1991). I tested the associations between listeners’ passion and listeners’ support at higher (1 SD above the mean) and lower (smallest possible value\(^4\)) levels of epistemic motivation for the models predicting whether support was offered and average monetary support. Contrary to the hypothesis, there was a negative association between listeners’ passion and whether support was offered when epistemic motivation was lower, \( b = -\).

\(^4\) Normally I would use the 1 SD below the mean, but in this data set this value is out of the sample’s range. Therefore, I used the smallest possible value in this sample (as recommended by Hayes, 2013).
5.26, $SE = 1.64$, 95% CI = [-8.48, -2.04], $p = .001$. By contrast, there was no association between listeners’ passion and whether support was offered when epistemic motivation was higher, $b = .00$, $SE = 2.35$, 95% CI = [-4.62, 4.60], $p = .98$. Similarly, also contrary to the hypothesis, there was a negative association between listeners’ passion and average monetary support when epistemic motivation was lower, $b = -364.61$, $SE = 114.19$, 95% CI = [-589.98, -139.24], $p = .002$. By contrast, there was marginally significant positive association between listeners’ passion and average monetary support when epistemic motivation was higher, $b = 351.43$, $SE = 190.77$, 95% CI = [-25.09, 727.94], $p = .07$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the positive association between speakers’ passion about an issue and the listeners’ support is mediated by the listeners’ passion about the issue and that this indirect association is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the association is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower. I tested the conditional indirect effects using the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013)\(^5\). This procedure uses bootstrap methods to generate confidence intervals (CIs) that test the significance of the indirect effect at the two possible values of the moderator. Ninety-five percent CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples. Results are presented in Table 5. CIs for the conditional indirect effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support included zeros for lower levels of epistemic motivation (support was offered: $b = -.13$, $SE = .12$, 95% CI = [-.43, .05]; number of supporters: $b = -.05$, $SE = .04$, 95% CI = [-.17, .01]; and average monetary support: $b = -8.69$, $SE = 8.17$, 95% CI = [-45.62, .48]) and for higher levels of epistemic motivation (support was

---

\(^5\) Hayes’ (2013) PROCESS procedure is able to test mediated moderation for models with either binary or continuous outcomes. Currently, there are no tools that use the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimates for models predicting count variables. Therefore, and so that I would be able to test conditional indirect effects, I treated ‘number of supporters’ as a continuous variable in the tests of Hypotheses 4 and 8.
offered: $b = -.03, SE = .11, 95\% CI = [-.36, .12]$; number of supporters: $b = -.04, SE = .08, 95\% CI = [-.30, .03]$; and average monetary support: $b = 8.39, SE = 18.55, 95\% CI = [-14.17, 68.70])$. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported.

I also tested hypotheses 1-4 controlling for whether the pitch focused on social responsibility. The results were virtually the same as the ones reported above. Full results are reported in Tables 4-5.

Hypothesis 5, predicting that speakers’ passion about the issue is negatively associated with how much the speaker’s conversation about the issue is elaborate, was not supported (Table 6, Model 1, $b = .77, p < .001$). Hypothesis 6, predicting that speakers’ elaborate conversation about the issue is positively associated with listeners’ support, was partially supported. Speakers’ elaborate conversation was negatively related to whether support was offered (Table 6, Model 3, $b = -1.15, p < .001$) but positively to number of supporters (Table 6, Model 7, $b = .68, p < .001$) and to average monetary support (Table 6, Model 11, $b = 47.30, p < .001$).

Hypothesis 7 predicted that epistemic motivation moderates the positive association between speakers’ elaboration about the issue and listeners’ support, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, the association becomes stronger. The interaction was not significant for whether support was offered (Table 6, Model 4, $b = .00, p = .46$) and number of supporters (Table 6, Model 8, $b = .00, p = .19$), but was significant for average monetary support (Table 6, Model 12, $b = .31, p < .001$). I probed the interaction by conducting a simple slope analysis...
(Aiken & West, 1991). I tested the association between elaborate communication and average monetary support at higher (1 SD above the mean) and lower (smallest possible value) levels of epistemic motivation. There was no association between elaborate communication and average monetary support when epistemic motivation was lower, $b = -12.52$, $SE = 8.49$, 95% CI = [-29.30, 4.26], $p = .14$. By contrast, consistent with the prediction, there was a positive association between elaborate communication and average monetary support when epistemic motivation was higher, $b = 208.47$, $SE = 16.54$, 95% CI = [175.79, 241.14], $p < .001$. Therefore, hypothesis 7 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 8 predicted that the negative association between speakers’ passion about an issue and listeners’ support is mediated by the speakers’ elaborate communication. This indirect association is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the negative association is stronger when epistemic motivation is higher. I tested the conditional indirect effects using the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013). Results are presented in Table 7. Contrary to the predictions, the CIs for the conditional indirect effect of elaborate communication on listeners’ support yielded intervals with positive values for higher levels of epistemic motivation in models predicting whether support was offered ($b = .75$, $SE = .50$, 95% CI = [.09, 1.87]), number of supporters ($b = .37$, $SE = .19$, 95% CI = [.10, .84]), and average monetary support ($b = 161.75$, $SE = 51.55$, 95% CI = [82.26, 298.38]). For lower levels of epistemic motivation, the intervals in models predicting whether support was offered ($b = .99$, $SE = .34$, 95% CI = [.45, 1.73]) and number of supporters ($b = .39$, $SE = .12$, 95% CI = [.17, .65]) were positive, while intervals in the model predicting average monetary support included zero ($b = -7.53$, $SE = 7.47$, 95% CI = [-27.37, 3.69]). Therefore, hypothesis 8 was not supported.

I also tested hypotheses 5-8 controlling for whether the pitch focused on social
responsibility. The results were virtually the same as the ones reported above. Full results are reported in Tables 5-6.

Exploratory Analyses

Overall, the results provided limited support for hypotheses 1-8 (see Table 2 for an overview of the results). The association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support was not mediated in the predicted direction by listeners’ passion and speakers’ elaborate communication, and those indirect associations were not moderated by epistemic motivation. Nevertheless, there was a small positive association between speakers’ passion and listener support (see Table 3). Therefore, I conducted an exploratory analysis where the direct relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support was conditional on listeners’ epistemic motivation. I predicted, post-hoc, that listeners would be more influenced by speakers’ passion when epistemic motivation was lower, rather than higher. When request size is large, and epistemic motivation is high, there is a lot at stake for the listeners who need to fully understand the situation and to hold accurate and well-informed conclusions about it. Listeners with high epistemic motivation may be more vigilant about their information search and therefore skeptical about how informative the speakers’ expressions of passion are to their decision of support. Conversely, listeners with low epistemic motivation may treat the passion they observe as more informative when making their decisions and therefore weigh it more heavily when evaluating pieces of information. Listeners with low epistemic motivation conduct a more general and less systematic information search, and, thus, should regard the speakers’ passion as an informative indicator in their decision to support the speaker. Moreover, listeners who observe speakers’ passion are likely to make inferences about the passion they observe; inferences that could influence listeners’ support decisions, and, thus, explain the positive
association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. For example, it could be that speakers’ passion is interpreted by listeners as a signal that the speakers are committed to their cause and as such will stand for their principles when facing obstacles, which should increase listeners’ support. This association could be dependent on epistemic motivation because listeners with high epistemic motivation should be more vigilant in evaluating the sources of their information and pay less attention to speakers’ passion as an indication of their tendency to stand for their principles, compared to listeners with low epistemic motivation. Although I did not have the data to test the existence of mechanisms, I did test my prediction about the conditional association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support.

---------------------------------------
Insert Table 8 about here
---------------------------------------

The interaction between speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation was significant for whether support was offered (Table 8, Model 1, $b = -.002$, $SE = .001$, 95% CI = [-.0035, -.0001], $p < .05$), number of supporters (Table 8, Model 3, $b = -.002$, $SE = .001$, 95% CI = [-.0038, -.0005], $p < .01$), and average monetary support (Table 8, Model 5, $b = -.21$, $SE = .07$, 95% CI = [-.34, -.08], $p < .01$). I probed the interactions by conducting simple slope analyses (Aiken & West, 1991). I tested the associations between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support at higher (1 SD above the mean) and lower (smallest possible value) levels of epistemic motivation. When epistemic motivation was lower there was a positive association between speakers’ passion and whether support was offered ($b = .85$, $SE = .32$, 95% CI = [.22, 1.48]), number of supporters ($b = .84$, $SE = .24$, 95% CI = [.36, 1.32]), and average monetary support ($b = 53.21$, $SE = 24.62$, 95% CI = [4.61, 101.81]). By contrast, when epistemic motivation was
higher there was no association between speakers’ passion and whether support was offered ($b = -0.38, SE = .31, 95\% CI = [-1.25, .53]$), and number of supporters ($b = -0.38, SE = .31, 95\% CI = [-0.99, .23]$). There was a negative association between speakers’ passion and average monetary support ($b = -85.05, SE = 35.80, 95\% CI = [-155.71, -14.39]$). Therefore, the post-hoc alternative model was supported (see Figures 2-4). A robustness check with social responsibility as a control demonstrated consistent results.

Some might hypothesize that the mixed findings from previous work are a result of curvilinear relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support and propose an inverted U-shape relationship between the variables. This line of reasoning suggests that very low and very high levels of passion yield low support, while medium levels of passion yield high support. To address this concern and test this alternative model, I conducted a post-hoc analysis where listeners’ support was regressed on speakers’ passion and speakers’ passion squared. Results indicated non-significant relationships between speakers’ passion squared and the three support outcomes (all $p s > .10$, and averaged .59). These findings suggest that there is no curvilinear relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. However, it could also be that this setting did not allow for conditions in which a curvilinear relationship could emerge. It could be that this setting does not encourage speakers to display very high levels of passion. Indeed, although the coding scheme used in this study allowed for speakers’ passion to range between .00 and 6.00, in reality the sample contained a smaller range (.30-4.00). More than ninety percent of the speakers displayed passion smaller than 3.00. Thus, speakers in this
setting did not convey very high levels of passion. It could be that a curvilinear relationship will emerge under conditions in which speakers are encouraged to display higher levels of passion.

Some might also be concerned with the fact that epistemic motivation, operationalized as the size of the request made by the speaker, is correlated with the share size offered to listeners \((r = .20, p < .001)\) and with the usability of the product \((r = .15, p < .01)\), and that therefore share size and usability could alternatively moderate the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. Some might also be concerned with the fact that the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support could be influenced by the type of the product, rather than the amount of money requested by the speaker. Therefore, I conducted alternative analyses in which share size, usability of product, and whether the product belongs to the engineering field independently moderated the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. As can be seen in Table 9, the CIs for the interactions with these potential moderators included zeros; these alternative variables did not moderate the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support.

As described above, a MANOVA test indicated that speakers’ gender did not account for listeners’ support. However, because only 33\% of the speakers were female, some may be concerned with how speakers’ gender interacted with speakers’ passion to predict listeners’ passion, elaborate communication, and listeners’ support. I conducted subsidiary analyses to test these relationships. The interaction between speakers’ passion and speakers’ gender was significant for predicting elaborate communication \((b = -.95, SE = .44, p = .03)\). Tests of the simple slopes revealed a positive association between speakers’ passion and elaborate communication for men \((b = 1.00, SE = .24, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.53, 1.48])\), but no association for women \((b = .05, SE = .36, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.66, .77])\). The interaction between speakers’ passion and

speakers’ gender was not significant for predicting listeners’ passion ($b = .04, SE = .04, p = .25$), whether support was offered ($b = -.94, SE = .53, p = .08$), the number of supporters ($b = -.49, SE = .38, p = .20$), or the average monetary support ($b = -29.95, SE = 51.09, p = .56$).

---------------------------------------

Insert Table 9 about here

---------------------------------------

The results of Study 1A did not support the proposed model but did provide support for the post-hoc prediction that the link between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support is moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation. Specifically, when epistemic motivation was lower, speakers with higher levels of passion, as compared to speakers with lower levels of passion, had a better chance of receiving a supportive offer, gained a larger number of supporters, and tended to receive, on average, higher monetary support. Conversely, when epistemic motivation was higher, levels of passion did not associate with receiving a supportive offer or with the number of supporters. In these situations, however, speakers with higher levels of passion, as compared to speakers with lower levels of passion, tended to receive, on average, lower monetary support.

Although Study 1A provides insights into the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support, these findings should be taken with caution, as the analysis I performed was conducted based on post-hoc reasoning. Moreover, it is still unclear what mechanism explains the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support when listeners’ epistemic motivation is low. There could be alternative mechanisms that account for the conditional association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. To address this limitation, and build upon Study 1A exploratory findings, Study 1B will examine other potential mechanisms.
STUDY 1B

Because Study 1A utilized objective coding of listeners’ behaviors, I was unable to measure their perceptions of the speakers and the situations. I designed a study in which participants observed the speakers from Study 1A and measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ attitudes and the situations. This study allowed me to capture the perceptions I was unable to measure in Study 1A, and to test alternative models. Below, I describe various alternative predictors and mediators that could alternatively explain Study 1A findings.

Alternative Predictors

*Perceived extraversion.* Although my interest was in the joint influence of speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation on listeners’ support, speakers’ expressed passion can be perceived by observers as an indication of an extraverted personality. Individuals who score high on extraversion appear outgoing, sociable, talkative, and active (Barrick & Mount, 1991). This suggests that expressions of passion might be perceived by observers as extraversion. Therefore, I explored the possibility that extraversion accounted for my findings in Study 1A by testing whether speakers’ extraversion and listeners’ epistemic motivation interact to predict listeners’ support.

*Perceived activation.* Expressions of passion entail six distinct characteristics, namely: rich body language, animated facial expression, using gestures, face lighting up, talking with varied tone and pitch, and energetic body movements (Chen et al., 2009). It could be that observers pay the most attention to the aspects that are energetic, lively, and active in the speakers’ behaviors, such as energetic body movements or using gestures, and the least attention to other important aspects in the expressions of passion, such as a speech with varied tone and pitch or animated facial expression. I wanted to rule out the possibility that the effect I found in
Study 1A was entirely due to perceived speakers’ activation rather than to the overall behavioral indicators that make the passion construct. Therefore, I explored the possibility that activation accounted for my findings in Study 1A and tested whether speakers’ activation and listeners’ epistemic motivation interact to predict listeners’ support.

**Alternative Mediators**

Study 1A failed to support the hypotheses that listeners’ passion and elaborate communication mediated the effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support. Therefore, I propose, based on post-hoc reasoning, several alternative plausible mechanisms that could explain the interactive association of speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation with listeners’ support.

*Perceived standing for principle.* Passionate individuals tend to show tenacity in the face of opposition to their ideas (Baum & Locke, 2004). The ability to stand for one’s ideas, to persist and to consistently advocate one’s principles and the decisions made for the venture is very important in the entrepreneurial world, where entrepreneurs are faced with constant obstacles (Cardon et al., 2009b). Listeners who observe passionate speakers are likely to infer that they will stand for their principles as their venture grows. Speakers who stand for their principles are more likely to receive listeners’ support, compared to speakers who do not stand for their principles, because the former can be expected to prevail while facing obstacles. Moreover, I propose that listeners with lower epistemic motivation are likely to pay more attention to speakers’ passion as a reliable indicator of speakers’ ability to stand for their principles because they are less vigilant and their information processing is more heuristic. Conversely, listeners with higher epistemic motivation are likely to perceive that the stakes are too high to rely on the speakers’ passion in order to infer the likelihood that they will persist.
while facing obstacles. Therefore, I expect the mediated association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support to be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, standing for principle, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.

**Perceived flexibility.** Positive emotions facilitate flexible and adaptive thinking and improve open-mindedness and careful consideration of multiple options (Isen, 2002). Thus, by extension, speakers who are more passionate are likely to be seen as more open-minded to information and data, to show cognitive flexibility, and to be willing to change their actions if a careful consideration of various factors is necessary for the situation. Investors are likely to expect the entrepreneurs they invest in to listen to them, be receptive to advice, and accept guidance when investors believe the entrepreneurs are headed in a wrong direction (Fried & Hisrich, 1994). Listeners who observe passionate speakers are more likely to infer that they will be open-minded, willing to change their minds, and flexible, than less passionate speakers. Speakers who are perceived as more flexible are more likely to receive listeners’ support, compared to speakers who are less flexible, because the former can be expected to be receptive to listeners’ guidance, thus allowing listeners a greater control in the company. Moreover, I propose that listeners with lower epistemic motivation are likely to pay more attention to speakers’ passion as a reliable indicator of speakers’ flexibility. Conversely, listeners with higher epistemic motivation are likely to rely less on the speakers’ passion in order to infer speakers’ flexibility. Therefore, I expect the mediated association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support to be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, flexibility, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.
**Perceived humility.** Speakers who show high levels of passion about an issue demonstrate high positive self-oriented emotion, as they discuss their company and their product and identify strongly with the venture (Cardon et al., 2009b). Those observing speakers’ displays of passion might interpret the emotion as a signal of an inflated view of the self (Davis et al., 2011). A speaker with a perceived inflated view of the self, in turn, is viewed as less humble (Davis et al., 2011). Past work has shown that managers’ modesty and humility elicit positive investor reactions (Ridge & Ingram, 2014), suggesting that speakers with high levels of humility are more likely to receive listeners’ support, compared to speakers with low levels of humility. Moreover, I propose that listeners with lower epistemic motivation are likely to pay more attention to speakers’ passion as a reliable indicator of speakers’ reduced humility. Conversely, listeners with higher epistemic motivation are likely to rely less on the speakers’ passion in order to infer speakers’ reduced humility. Therefore, I expect the mediated association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support to be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, humility, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.

**Perceived ethicality.** Speakers with high levels of passion about an issue are likely to be seen as more strongly committed to the issue, compared to speakers with low levels of passion, because their identity would be more strongly tied to the issue. This strong commitment, and the speakers’ need to reach their goal of creating a successful venture and obtaining an investment for it, may lead those who are more passionate to do whatever they can to get the best results for the issue, even if they would need to ‘cut corners.’ Passionate speakers, therefore, may be seen by observers as being less ethical. Speakers with high levels of integrity and ethicality are more likely to receive listeners’ support, compared to speakers with low levels of ethicality (Fried &
Hisrich, 1994), because listeners can better predict the speakers’ future behavior and know that the speakers’ future actions are less likely to cause judicial problems. Moreover, I propose that listeners with lower epistemic motivation are likely to pay more attention to speakers’ passion as a reliable indicator of speakers’ unethicality, because higher epistemic motivation reduces the listeners’ trust in the speakers to take the proper actions for the issue so that the speakers’ actions advance the issue in the right direction. Conversely, listeners with higher epistemic motivation are likely to rely less on the speakers’ passion in order to infer speakers’ unethicality. Therefore, I expect the mediated association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support to be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, and, in turn, trust. When epistemic motivation is higher, trust decreases, and ethicality, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.

**Perceived objectivity.** As explained above, speakers who are more passionate are likely to be more open-minded to facts and information, and to carefully consider several avenues and factors that are necessary for implementing actions that promote the issue. Thus, speakers who are more passionate are more likely to objectively consider all the facts they have access to, compared to speakers who are less passionate. Passionate speakers are more likely to make judgements based on an analysis of all the facts they have access to. Thus, I expect speakers with high levels of passion to make rational and objective decisions and to be more realistic when making their decisions, compared to speakers with low levels of passion. Speakers with high levels of objectivity are more likely to receive listeners’ support, compared to speakers with low levels of objectivity (Fried & Hisrich, 1994). I propose that listeners with lower epistemic motivation are likely to pay more attention to speakers’ passion as a reliable indicator of speakers’ objectivity. Conversely, listeners with higher epistemic motivation are likely to rely
less on the speakers’ passion in order to infer speakers’ objectivity. Therefore, I expect the mediated association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support to be moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, objectivity, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.

*Perceived appropriate emotional display.* Listeners’ epistemic motivation may change their expectations of observing specific emotional displays from the speakers, with higher epistemic motivation increasing expectations for more professional, business-like display rules that are emotionally neutral. Conversely, when epistemic motivation is lower, listeners’ expectations of emotional neutrality should decrease. Speakers’ passion expressions conveyed to listeners may not be seen as appropriate in every situation. When epistemic motivation is higher, and, thus, expectations for *neutral display rules* are high, speakers’ passionate expressions may be perceived by observers as less appropriate to the situation. However, when epistemic motivation is lower, and, thus, expectations for *neutral display rules* are low, speakers’ passionate expressions may be perceived by observers as more appropriate to the situation. When the emotions displayed are more appropriate, listeners are more likely to think positively of the speaker and to support the issue. Therefore, I expect appropriate emotional displays to mediate the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support; this mediated association is moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, and, in turn, by neutral display rules. When epistemic motivation is higher, the need for neutral display rules increases, and appropriate emotional display, and, in turn, listeners’ support are more weakly related to speakers’ passion.

**STUDY 1B: METHODS**

**Overview**
The primary goal of Study 1B was to investigate post-hoc alternative models, as Study 1A did not support the hypotheses. In this study, I aimed to explore whether it was speakers’ passion, rather than alternative constructs (extraversion and activation) that predicted listener support when listener epistemic motivation was lower in Study 1A. Moreover, I aimed to perform additional exploratory analysis to test for potential mechanisms underlying Study 1A’s findings.

Overall, this study used data from two sources (independent raters and participants) to (a) test alternative explanations to Study 1A’s findings (b) unpack the indirect effects that explained the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support; and (c) uncover how the moderating effect of epistemic motivation acts on these indirect pathways.

**Sample Size**

Following Koppensteiner (2013), I aimed to collect 15 responses for each of the 177 speakers/clips used in Study 1A. Each participant watched and rated 3 clips. Therefore, a sample of approximately 890 participants was needed.

**Sample and Procedure**

I solicited adult U.S. residents to participate in an online experiment using Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Data obtained using such participants is considered to be of high quality (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011), and these samples tend to be more representative of the population than convenience samples (Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). Of the 891 participants who participated, 71 spent too little time on the survey and their answers were deemed unusable. The appropriate duration was calculated based on piloting and the amount of time it takes to play each clip and to read and answer the survey questions. Of the 820 participants providing usable data, 67 percent were female, and mean age was 37.51 (SD =
The majority of the speakers were Caucasian (81%), while 10% were African-American, 5% Hispanic, 5% Asian, and 1% indicated another ethnic group (participants could choose more than one category). Participants were paid $1 for their participation in the experiment.

I randomly assigned participants to watch 3 of the 177 clips used in Study 1A. After watching each clip, participants completed measures of perceived extraversion, perceived activation, perceptions that the speaker stands for principle, perceived speaker flexibility, perceived speaker humility, perceived speaker ethicality, perceived trust, perceived speaker objectivity, perceived appropriate emotional display, and perceived neutral display rules. I counterbalanced the order of the clips, the measures, and the items within each measure. Ratings were aggregated across raters for each clip in order to create a composite that represents the overall impression of each speaker; \( r_{wg(j)} \) values, indicating the consensus between participants in ratings of the items in each measure (LeBreton & Senter, 2008), ranged from .55 to .94 and averaged .82 (see below). Finally, participants completed demographic measures and were debriefed.

**Predictor Variables**

*Speakers’ passion.* I used the coding of speakers’ passion that was conducted in Study 1A for the analysis in Study 1B (\( M = 2.04, SD = .68 \)).

*Perceived extraversion.* I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ extraversion with the 20-item scale from Goldberg (1992). I instructed participants to rate their agreement with the statement “the speaker appears to be …” on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items were “extraverted,” “talkative,” “assertive,” “verbal,” “energetic,” “bold,” “active,” “daring,” “vigorous,” “unrestrained;” and the reverse coded items were “introverted,” “shy,” “quiet,” “reserved,” “untalkative,” “inhibited,” “withdrawn,” “timid,”
“bashful,” and “unadventurous.” Average $rwg(j) = .94$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 4.99$, $SD = .66$; $\alpha = .99$).

**Perceived activation.** I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ activation with a 9-item scale adapted from Thayer (1978, 1989). I instructed participants to rate their agreement with the statement “the speaker appears to be …” on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The items were “activated,” “active,” “alert,” “energetic,” “full-of-pep,” “lively,” “peppy,” “quick,” and “vigorous.” Average $rwg(j) = .91$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 5.00$, $SD = .72$; $\alpha = .99$).

**Moderator**

**Epistemic motivation.** I used the coding of listeners’ epistemic motivation, by documenting the speakers’ request size, that was conducted in Study 1A for the analysis in Study 1B ($M = 228.14$, $SD = 444.48$).

**Mediators**

**Perceived standing for principle.** I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle with a 4-item scale adapted from Oreg (2003). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The items were “the speaker is someone who appears to change his/her mind often” (reverse coded), “the speaker is someone who doesn’t appear to change his/her mind easily,” “once the speaker has come to a conclusion or a decision, it seems unlikely he/she change their mind,” and “the speaker’s views appear to be very consistent over time.” Average $rwg(j) = .84$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 4.79$, $SD = .43$; $\alpha = .85$).
Perceived flexibility. I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ flexibility with a self-developed 3-item scale. I instructed participants to make a series of judgments about the speaker, and ratings were made on scales ranging from 1 to 7. The items were: closed minded–open minded, very inflexible–very flexible, and unwilling to change his/her behavior–willing to change his/her behavior. Average \( rwg(j) = .87 \), indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score (\( M = 4.45, SD = .74; \alpha = .97 \)).

Perceived humility. I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ humility with a 5-item scale adapted from Davis and colleagues (2011). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items were “the speaker appears to have a humble character,” “the speaker appears to be a truly a humble person,” “most people would probably consider the speaker a humble person,” “it seems that the speaker’s close friends would consider him/her humble,” and “even strangers would probably consider the speaker humble.” Average \( rwg(j) = .80 \), indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score (\( M = 4.35, SD = .73; \alpha = .99 \)).

Perceived ethicality. I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ ethicality with a 10-item scale adapted from Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005). I instructed participants to rate their agreement with the statement “the speaker appears to be a person who…” on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items were “listens to what other have to say,” “disciplines those who violate ethical standards,” “conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner,” “has the best interests of employees and investors in mind,” “makes fair and balanced decisions,” “can be trusted,” “discusses business ethics or values with employees and investors,” “sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics,” “defines success not just by results but also the way that they are obtained,” “when making decisions,
asks ‘what is the right thing to do?’” Average $r_{wg}(j) = .94$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 4.63, SD = .59; \alpha = .98$).

**Perceived trust.** I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ trustworthiness with a 4-item scale adapted from Mayer and Davis (1999). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). The items were “if I were in a partnership with the speaker, I wouldn’t let the speaker have any influence over issues that are important to me” (reverse coded), “if I were in a partnership with the speaker, I would be willing to let the speaker have complete control over the future of the company,” “if I were in a partnership with the speaker, I would really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on the speaker” (reverse coded), and “if I were in a partnership with the speaker, I would be comfortable giving the speaker a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her actions.” Average $r_{wg}(j) = .55$, indicating low agreement between raters, thus, I was unable to code for this variable successfully and the variable was removed from further data analysis ($M = 3.96, SD = .74; \alpha = .94$).

**Perceived objectivity.** I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ objectivity with a 7-item scale adapted from Armor (1999; items available in Uhlmann & Cohen, 2007). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). The items were “the speaker’s view of the business’ potential success was realistic,” “the speaker was objective when making judgments and decisions,” “the speaker was even-handed when weighing evidence that is relevant to his/her decisions,” “the speaker tried to act in accordance with what seems like the reasonable and logical thing to do,” “when forming an opinion, the speaker tried to objectively consider all of the facts he/she has access to,” “the speaker’s judgments were based on a logical analysis of the facts,” and “the speaker’s decision
making was rational and objective.” Average $r_{wg}(j) = .87$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 4.55$, $SD = .85; \alpha = .99$).

**Perceived appropriate emotional display.** I measured participants’ perceptions of the appropriateness of the speakers’ emotional displays with a self-developed 5-item scale. I instructed participants to rate their agreement with the statement “the speaker’s emotional displays appear to be …” on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items were “appropriate to the situation,” “as one would expect in the situation,” “as required in the situation,” “reasonable for the situation,” and “relevant to the situation.” Average $r_{wg}(j) = .86$, indicating high agreement between raters. The items were averaged to form a composite score ($M = 5.17$, $SD = .67; \alpha = .99$).

**Perceived neutral display rules.** I measured participants’ perceptions of the appropriateness of neutral display rules during the pitch with a 3-item scale adapted from Trougakos, Jackson, and Beal (2011). Participants rated their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items were “in the situation where the speaker was, he/she should maintain a neutral facial expression at all times,” “it is important that the speaker does not express any emotions while presenting his/her business,” and “presenting the business to investors requires the speaker to be neutral in his/her expressions.” Average $r_{wg}(j) = .55$, indicating low agreement between raters, thus, I was unable to code for this variable successfully and the variable was removed from further data analysis ($M = 3.30$, $SD = .47; \alpha = .94$).

**Outcome Variables**

**Support was offered.** I used the coding for whether support was offered that was conducted in Study 1A for the analysis in Study 1B ($M = .41$, $SD = .49$).
Number of supporters. I used the coding for number of supporters that was conducted in Study 1A for the analysis in Study 1B ($M = .98, SD = 1.47$).

Average monetary support. I used the coding for the average monetary support that was conducted in Study 1A for the analysis in Study 1B ($M = 95.07K, SD = 201.74K$).

**STUDY 1B: RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

Table 10 reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables, Table 11 reports results of exploratory analysis of plausible alternative predictors, and Tables 12-13 report results of exploratory analysis of plausible mediators. Table 2 provides an overview of key findings. For moderated-mediation analyses, I tested the conditional indirect effects using the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013). I calculated the 95% CIs using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples.

---------------------------
Insert Tables 10-13 about here
---------------------------

**Exploratory Analyses: Alternative Predictors**

To address possible concerns that it was not speakers’ expressions of passion, but rather perceived extraversion or perceived emotional activation (arousal) that influenced listeners’ support, I conducted alternative analyses in which extraversion and activation independently interacted with epistemic motivation to predict listeners’ support. Passion correlated $r = .34$ with perceived extraversion and $r = .36$ with perceived activation. There were no interactions with these alternative predictors (see Table 11; all but one CI included zeros).

**Exploratory Analyses: Alternative Mediators**

I tested whether each of the alternative mediators independently mediated the
relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue, epistemic motivation, and listeners’ support. The interaction between speakers’ passion and epistemic motivation significantly predicted perceptions that speakers stand for principle (Table 12, $b = -.0003$, $p < .05$). I probed the interaction by conducting a simple slope analysis (Aiken & West, 1991). I tested the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support at higher (1 $SD$ above the mean) and lower (smallest possible value) levels of epistemic motivation. There was a positive association between speakers’ passion and perceptions that speakers stand for principle when epistemic motivation was lower, $b = .17$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI = [.05, .28]. By contrast, there was a no association between speakers’ passion and perceptions that speakers stand for principle when epistemic motivation was higher, $b = -.04$, $SE = .09$, 95% CI = [-.21, 13].

Because the interaction was significant, I tested the conditional indirect effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support using the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013). Results are presented in Table 13 (Models 1-3). For lower levels of epistemic motivation, the CIs for the conditional indirect effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support did not include zeros in models predicting the probability that support was offered ($b = .21$, $SE = .09$, 95% CI = [.06, .44]), number of supporters ($b = .11$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI = [.03, .24]), and average monetary support ($b = 19.34$, $SE = 9.22$, 95% CI = [6.30, 45.33]). For higher levels of epistemic motivation, the intervals in models predicting the probability that support was offered ($b = -.05$, $SE = .18$, 95% CI = [-.56, .17]), number of supporters ($b = -.03$, $SE = .09$, 95% CI = [-.31, .08]), and average monetary support ($b = -4.86$, $SE = 15.15$, 95% CI = [-47.01, 12.82]) included zero. The conditional effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support was fully mediated by perceptions that speakers stand for principle, as the CIs of the direct effects of speakers’ passion
on listeners’ support included zeros in models predicting the probability that support was offered \( (b = .37, SE = .24, 95\% CI = [-.11, .84]) \), number of supporters \( (b = .26, SE = .16, 95\% CI = [-.06, .58]) \), and average monetary support \( (b = 11.31, SE = 22.03, 95\% CI = [-32.17, 54.78]) \). Therefore, this post-hoc prediction was supported (see Figures 5-6).

Contrary to the finding that perceptions that speakers stand for principle mediated the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support, there was no support for the post-hoc propositions regarding the other mediators. The interactions between speakers’ passion and epistemic motivation did not predict the proposed mediators \( (ps \text{ ranged from } .07 \text{ to } .92 \text{ and averaged } .37; \text{ see Table 12 for results}) \).

The results from the alternative analyses of Study 1B provide some support for the interpretation of the findings in Study 1A. Contrary to the findings for speakers’ passion, speakers’ extraversion and speakers’ activation did not interact with listeners’ epistemic motivation to predict listeners’ support. Moreover, of the several plausible mechanisms proposed in this study, only perceptions that speakers stand for principle mediated the association between speakers’ passion and (1) whether support was offered, (2) number of supporters, and (3) average monetary support. Moreover, perceptions that speakers stand for principle fully mediated the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. This mediated association was moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation, such that when epistemic motivation was lower, perceived tendency of speakers to stand for principle was positively associated with speakers’ passion, and, in turn, with listeners’ support. Conversely,
when epistemic motivation was higher, there was no association between speakers’ passion and perceived tendency of speakers to stand for principle, and, thus, between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support.

These results provide insights into the psychological mechanism underlying the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. However, given that I measured the participants’ perceptions of the speakers, and not the listeners’, I do not know with certainty that the listeners in Study 1A perceived the speakers in the same way. Furthermore, I explored several alternative models in this study, using post-hoc theorizing. By measuring several alternative models in this study I increased the potential of a type I error. The results that perceptions that speakers stand for principle mediated the relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support should be taken with caution until replicated. Finally, because the designs of Studies 1A and 1B were cross-sectional, the data do not provide conclusive proof of the proposed causal relationship between speakers’ passion, perceptions that speakers stand for principle, listeners’ epistemic motivation, and listeners’ support. To address these limitations, I designed Study 2 – an experiment in which I independently manipulated speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation, and then asked participants about their perceptions’ of the speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle and listeners’ support.

**STUDY 2: METHODS**

I designed Study 2 with several objectives. First, I wished to replicate the findings of Studies 1A and 1B that were proposed post-hoc. Second, by assigning participants to the roles of listeners I was able to measure listeners’ perceptions of speakers’ tendency to stand for their principles and listeners’ support. Finally, by conducting an experiment in which I manipulated speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation and randomly assigning participants to
conditions, I strengthened my ability to test the causal nature of the proposed mechanism.

Overview

Studies 1A and 1B relied on natural occurrences of the phenomenon, which increases the external validity of the results, but cannot determine causality. Therefore, it is important to conduct an experiment in which speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation are manipulated. The primary goal of Study 2 was to replicate the findings from Studies 1A and 1B in a controlled experiment to determine causality. Complementing data from the real-life setting used in Studies 1A and 1B with an experiment afforded me to test the proposed alternative model (Figure 6) in a controlled setting. In this study, participants were randomly assigned to observe a clip of an entrepreneur pitching and asking for an investment in the product and the company. The clips were created based on data from Study 1A, and the message recited by the speaker was copied from one of the pitches used in that study.

Development of the Materials

To create the materials for Study 2, I recruited an actor to produce videos portraying an entrepreneur pitching her product – EcoTraction – to potential investors in the hopes of gaining their support. In a preliminary training session, I went over the six behavioral indicators in the Chen et al. (2009) passion scale (“energetic body movement,” “rich body language,” “animated facial expression,” “using gestures,” “face lights up,” and “talks with varied tone and pitch”) with the actor, defined them, and played clips with several exemplars as references. Following this training session, I conducted several rehearsal sessions with the actor before we filmed the final clips.

I created two clips: one portraying the actor pitching with high levels of passion and another portraying the actor pitching with low levels of passion. I instructed the actor to show
various indicators of passion to a large (or to a small) extent in each of the clips, while the message (the words used during the pitch) was the same in each clip. To control for any contextual effects, I used one (female) actor, wearing the same clothes in the same physical setting, to deliver the pitch. The message spoken by the actor was a realistic one, about a product named EcoTraction, an eco-friendly alternative to road salt, and was adapted from one of the pitches used in Study 1A (see Appendix C for screenshots of actor and Appendix D for the message).

To validate these materials and to make sure that the clips only differ on the constructs of interest, but not on others, I conduct a pilot study. I solicited 53 adult U.S. residents, who did not participate in Study 1B, to participate in an online experiment using MTurk. Of the participants, 58 percent were female, and mean age was 35.08 (SD = 12.83). The majority of the speakers were Caucasian (91%), while 6% were African-American, 4% Asian, and 2% indicated another ethnic group (participants could choose more than one category). Participants were paid $.50 for their participation in the pilot.

Participants were randomly assigned to watch one of the two clips. I informed participants that the clip portraits “a speaker who presents her business to a panel of investors, aiming to gain an investment for her company.” Participants in the high passion condition then saw a clip in which the actor shows many of the behavioral indicators from Chen et al. (2009), while those in the low passion condition saw a clip in which the actor shows few of the behavioral indicators. After watching the clip, participants completed measures of: speakers’ passion (α = .93; adapted from Chen et al., 2009), speakers’ believability (α = .88; adapted from Beltramini, 1988), speakers’ portrayal of importance of the product EcoTraction (α = .93; adapted from Barden & Petty, 2008) and the investment (α = .93; adapted from Ashford,
Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998; Kronrod, Grinstein, & Wathieu, 2012), evaluation of the speakers’ presentation (α = .85; adapted from Chinander & Schweitzer, 2003), speakers’ pride (α = .90; Tracy & Robins, 2007), speakers’ happiness (α = .93; which is highly related to passion, another positive emotion; Bartel & Saavedra, 2000), speakers’ negative affectivity (α = .90; Watson,Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), and the authenticity of the speakers’ emotional displays (α = .89; adapted from Côté, Hideg, & van Kleef, 2013; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005). See Appendix E for full measures. Table 14 reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the pilot’s variables.

To determine the validity of the two clips I tested the assumptions that the high passion clip led to higher perceived speakers’ passion, than the low passion clip. Because passion is defined as an intense positive emotion, and due to Study 1A’s validation test that indicated that passion was correlated with positive mood, I also tested whether the high passion clip also led to higher perceived speakers’ happiness compared to the low passion clip (manipulation checks). I also tested the assumptions that the high passion and low passion clips did not convey different levels of: speaker’s believability, importance of EcoTraction, importance of investment, evaluation of presentation, speaker’s pride, speaker’s negative affectivity, and speaker’s authentic emotional displays. To test these assumptions I conducted independent samples t-tests (see Table 15). There was a significant difference in perceived speakers’ passion between the low passion (M = 3.00, SD = 1.20) and high passion (M = 5.36, SD = .94) conditions; t = 8.00, p<.001. There was also a significant difference in perceived speakers’ happiness between the
low passion ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.28$) and high passion ($M = 5.34$, $SD = .92$) conditions; $t = 3.06$, $p < .01$. Participants in the high passion condition rated the speaker as more passionate, and happier, than participants in the low passion condition. Conversely, and as predicted, there was no significant difference between the high passion and low passion conditions in: perceived speakers’ believability (low passion condition: $M = 5.35$, $SD = 1.09$; high passion condition: $M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.15$), $t = .40$, $p = .69$; speakers’ portrayal of importance of the product EcoTraction (low passion condition: $M = 5.78$, $SD = 1.01$; high passion condition: $M = 6.06$, $SD = 1.00$), $t = 1.01$, $p = .32$; speakers’ portrayal of importance of the investment (low passion condition: $M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.27$; high passion condition: $M = 5.57$, $SD = 1.38$), $t = .90$, $p = .37$; evaluation of the speakers’ presentation (low passion condition: $M = 5.13$, $SD = 1.12$; high passion condition: $M = 5.64$, $SD = 1.03$), $t = 1.72$, $p = .09$; speakers’ pride (low passion condition: $M = 5.29$, $SD = .91$; high passion condition: $M = 5.62$, $SD = .80$), $t = 1.42$, $p = .16$; speakers’ negative affectivity (low passion condition: $M = 1.82$, $SD = 1.16$; high passion condition: $M = 1.95$, $SD = .86$), $t = .46$, $p = .65$; and the authenticity of the speakers’ emotional displays (low passion condition: $M = 5.16$, $SD = .96$; high passion condition: $M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.13$), $t = -.65$, $p = .52$. These results indicate that the two clips manipulate speakers’ passion as intended, and that the clips do not differ from one another on other potentially relevant dimensions. Therefore, I decided to use these materials in Study 2.

**Sample Size**

I used power analyses to decide on the appropriate sample size to test the hypotheses. Assuming a small effect size, power of .80 and alpha = .05, I determined that a sample size of at least 300 participants (Cohen, 1992) was needed.

**Sample and Procedure**
I solicited adult U.S. residents, who did not participate in Study 1B or the pilot for Study 2, to participate in an online experiment using MTurk. Of the 446 participants who participated, 72 spent too little time on the survey and their answers were deemed unusable. The appropriate duration was calculated based on piloting and the amount of time it took play the clips and to read and answer the survey. Of the 374 participants providing usable data, 47 percent were female, and mean age was 34.27 (SD = 12.00). The majority of the speakers were Caucasian (77%), while 7% were African-American, 6% Hispanic, 9% Asian, and 4% indicated another ethnic group (participants could choose more than one category). Participants were paid $.50 for their participation in the experiment.

Trying to closely follow the previous studies, in which speakers were entrepreneurs seeking an investment and listeners were venture capitalists considering investing in the speakers, I designed a two-by-two between-subjects experiment. I randomly assigned participants to either a low or high epistemic motivation condition, and either a low or high passion condition.

I told participants that I was interested in how people imagine themselves in new roles and how they think and act in those new roles. I instructed participants to imagine themselves as a head of an investment company that is interested in investing in a new business. Participants also read that they have 5 years of experience in the field and that their company is well known, and that over the years they noticed that the average investment request people tend to make is approximately $228,000. (See Appendix F for instructions). Participants in the high epistemic motivation condition read (before the clip started playing) “the speaker you will see is asking for $600,000, a relatively large investment in her company,” while those in the low epistemic motivation condition read “the speaker you will see is asking for $35,000, a relatively small
investment in her company.” After displaying this information, the clip started playing.

Participants in the high passion condition watched a speaker using many of the behavioral indicators mentioned in Chen et al.’s (2009) measure, while participants in the low passion condition watched a speaker using few of the behavioral indicators mentioned in the measure.

After watching the clip, participants completed measures of perceived speaker’s tendency to stands for principle and listeners’ support. Finally, participants completed a manipulation check and demographic measures and were debriefed.

**Manipulation Check**

*Epistemic motivation manipulation check.* I measured participants’ epistemic motivation with the item “relatively to the size of investment speakers usually request in these situations, the speaker's request for EcoTraction is…” Ratings on the item ranged from *relatively very small* to *relatively very large* ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.74$).

**Mediator**

*Perceived standing for principle.* I measured participants’ perceptions of speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle with the 4-item scale (Oreg, 2003) that was also used in Study 1B ($M = 5.61, SD = .92; \alpha = .78$).

**Dependent Variables**

*Support was offered.* I measured participants’ willingness to support the speaker using the item “as an investor, would you invest in EcoTraction, the product and company the pitch was about?” I coded participants’ willingness to support the speaker as “1” and “0” otherwise. Seventy three per cent of the participants supported the speaker ($SD = .44$).

*Average monetary support.* I measured the extent to which participants supported the speaker by using the item “the speaker asked for a [$35,000 or $600,000 depending on
condition] investment. How much would you invest in EcoTraction?” Participants’ monetary support ranged from zero to 1 million dollars ($M = 200.25K, SD = 274.67K).

**STUDY 2: RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

To test whether my manipulation of epistemic motivation was successful, I conducted independent samples t-tests, which showed that participants in the high ($M = 4.69, SD = 1.15$) versus low ($M = 2.24, SD = 1.30$) epistemic motivation condition were significantly different ($t = 19.22, p < .001$), as expected. Therefore, the manipulation was successful. The pilot study indicated that the manipulation of speakers’ passion was also successful.

Table 16 reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables, Table 17 reports results of the effects of speakers’ passion and epistemic motivation on listeners’ support, and Table 18 reports results of moderated-mediation analysis. Table 2 provides an overview of key findings. For moderated-mediation analyses, I tested the conditional indirect effects using the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013) and 1000 bootstrapping samples.

----------------------------------

Insert Tables 16-18 about here
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**Alternative Propositions Testing**

I tested two propositions in this study. First, I tested the proposition that listeners’ support in response to speakers’ passion varied as a function of epistemic motivation (an alternative analysis from Study 1A). The interaction between speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation was not significant for whether support was offered (Table 17, $b = .55, SE = .52, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.48, 1.57]$) or average monetary support (Table 17, $b = 14.57, SE = 45.83, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-75.55, 104.70]$). Therefore, the first alternative prediction was not supported.
Then, I tested whether perceptions that speakers stand for principle mediated the relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue, epistemic motivation, and listeners’ support (an alternative analysis from Study 1B). The interaction between speakers’ passion and epistemic motivation did not predict perceptions that speakers stand for principle (Table 18, Model 1, \( b = -0.18, SE = 0.19, 95\% \text{ CI} = [ -0.56, 0.20 ] \)). Perceived speaker tendency to stand for principle did predict whether support was offered (\( b = 0.73, SE = 0.14, 95\% \text{ CI} = [ 0.45, 1.00 ] \)) and average monetary support (\( b = 37.43, SE = 15.32, 95\% \text{ CI} = [ 7.31, 67.55 ] \)). Although perceived speaker tendency to stand for principle was positively associated with listeners’ support, speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation did not interact to predict perceptions that speakers stand for principle, and the second alternative prediction was not supported.

The results from the alternative analyses of Study 2 failed to provide support for the findings in Studies 1A and 1B. Speakers’ passion did not interact with listeners’ epistemic motivation to predict listeners’ support, failing to replicate the findings from Study 1A. Moreover, perceptions that speakers stand for principle did not mediate the association between the interaction of speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation and listeners’ support, failing to replicate the findings from Study 1B.

My inability to replicate the findings from the previous studies does not allow me to unambiguously conclude that speakers’ passion is positively related to listeners’ support, but only when listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower, and that this relationship is mediated by speakers’ tendency to stand for their principles. However, this study has some limitations that suggest that additional research is needed to investigate these relationships. First, in this study I asked participants to imagine themselves as the head of an investment company and to decide whether to invest in EcoTraction. However, participants did not make real investment decisions.
in the study and did not really invest their money in the speaker. Moreover, although I asked participants to imagine what it would be like to be an investor, participants may not have been able to understand the psychological state that investors experience in such situations, limiting my ability to infer from their decisions to real-life investors’ decision making processes. Second, the venture depicted in the clips participants watched is EcoTraction, a socially responsible, eco-friendly, alternative to road salt. Data from Study 1A suggested that socially responsible ventures are more likely to receive listeners’ support. Participants may have been more inclined to support this venture due to its social responsibility regardless of the levels of passion displayed by the speaker or the listeners’ epistemic motivation. Indeed, the majority of participants (73%) chose to support the speaker. It could be that social responsibility has a strong and fixed effect of listeners’ support decisions and hence speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation have limited impact on listeners’ support, resulting in a relatively limited room for improvement above and beyond the effect social responsibility had on listeners’ support. Third, although the pilot for this study showed that the two passion conditions did not differ on several relevant factors (e.g., perceived speaker’s believability, importance of EcoTraction, importance of investment, and speaker’s authentic emotional displays), it could be that the conditions differed on factors that I did not measure and that influence participants’ reactions above and beyond the speakers’ levels of passion and listeners’ levels of epistemic motivation. Therefore, this study’s results could be unrepresentative of the true effect of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

In this dissertation, I developed and tested a model of how and why passion helps people obtain support from others about issues that are important to them. I investigated the
relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support in three studies. Study 1A, an observational study, investigated the association between entrepreneurial passion and venture capitalists’ investment decisions on the television show *Dragons’ Den*. Results indicated that overall, my theoretical model was not supported. However, subsidiary analysis revealed that the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support was positive when listeners’ epistemic motivation was lower. Conversely, generally, speakers’ passion had no association with listeners’ support when listeners’ epistemic motivation was higher. In particular, when listeners’ epistemic motivation was lower, an increase in speakers’ passion was associated with a higher probability to receive an offer of support, a larger number of supporters, and a higher average of monetary support. By contrast, when listeners’ epistemic motivation was higher, an increase in speakers’ passion was associated with a lower average of monetary support, and was not associated with a probability to receive an offer of support or number of supporters. Given that I found an association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support but was unable to uncover the mechanisms underlying the relationship, I conducted additional exploratory analyses in Study 1B.

Study 1B expanded on Study 1A’s findings by focusing on several perceptions and psychological constructs that were gauged by measuring participants’ perceptions of the speakers from Study 1A. This study used data from independent raters and participants to rule out spurious associations based on speakers’ perceived extraversion and perceived activation, and to unpack the mechanisms that explained the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support when listeners’ epistemic motivation was low. Several plausible mechanisms were proposed in a post-hoc exploratory analysis, namely: perceived speakers’ tendency to stand for their principles, perceived speaker flexibility, perceived speaker humility, perceived
speaker ethicality, perceived speaker objectivity, and perceived appropriate emotional display. For example, perceived speakers' tendency to stand for their principles was suggested as a potential mechanism because listeners who observe passionate speakers are likely to infer that the speakers will stand for their principles and prevail while facing obstacles as their venture grows, which should increase listeners’ willingness to support the speakers. The exploratory analyses suggested that perceptions that speakers stand for their principles, but not the other constructs, mediated the association between the predictor speakers’ passion, the moderator listeners’ epistemic motivation and the outcome listeners’ support. In particular, when epistemic motivation was lower, speakers’ passion was positively associated with perceptions that speakers stand for their principle, which was, in turn, associated with a higher probability to receive an offer of support, a larger number of supporters, and a higher average of monetary support. By contrast, when listeners’ epistemic motivation was higher, there was no association between speakers’ passion and speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle.

I built on these findings and continued my investigation in Study 2 by independently manipulating listeners’ epistemic motivation and speakers’ passion and assigning participants to the roles of investors. I measured participants’ resultant perceptions of speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle and willingness to support the speakers. Study 2 was unsuccessful in replicating the findings of studies 1A and 1B. The interaction between speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation did not predict listeners’ support. Moreover, although perceived speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle was positively associated with listeners’ probability of offering support and their average monetary support, perceived speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle was not related to the interactive association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ epistemic motivation. These non-significant findings did not
support my predictions. It could be that the nature of the task, making an investment decision as the head of an investing company, was too hypothetical for participants who had trouble perceiving themselves in that role while making a hypothetical investment. Moreover, the venture presented to participants in Study 2 was a socially responsible venture, and participants may have been more inclined to support that venture due to its eco-friendliness, regardless of the speakers’ levels of passion. Indeed, more than seventy percent of participants chose to support the speakers in Study 2.

In conclusion, although Study 2 failed to do so, my first two studies provided some evidence for how listeners’ epistemic motivation is likely to influence the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support. They also suggest that the conditional association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support is mediated by perceived speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

My dissertation contributes to the research on passion in organizations, and extends current understanding of its interpersonal effects. First, extant research on the interpersonal effects of passion has been scarce and its findings have been mixed. Field studies on entrepreneurs’ passionate expressions have found negative (Cardon et al., 2009a), positive (Chen et al., 2009), and null (Cardon et al., 2009a) effects on listeners’ support. Specifically, one field study (Chen et al., 2009; Study 2) looked at entrepreneurs who participated in an annual business plan competition. The entrepreneurs presented their business plan to a panel of investors from various venture capitalists firms, banks, and financial companies. The investors evaluated, amongst other things, the entrepreneurs’ passion expression and whether or not they were willing to invest $100,000 worth of financial awards in the ventures. In this study,
entrepreneurial passion was positively related to venture capitalists’ decision to invest in their companies. Another study investigated the effect of speakers’ passion in a large US angel investment group (Cardon et al., 2009a; Study 2). The study centered on the screening presentations of 59 entrepreneurs who presented their ventures to an investment group in hopes to gain their interest and to receive an investment. The presentations were videotaped by the investment group and were later coded by independent raters. In this study, entrepreneurial passion was negatively related to angels’ interest at the screening stage and not related to whether angels invested at the funding stage. My dissertation adds to these findings by investigating when speakers’ passion influences listeners’ support. I found in exploratory analyses (Study 1A) that speakers’ passion was associated with listeners’ support in a particular way: speakers’ passion was positively related to listeners’ support when listeners’ epistemic motivation was lower, but not when listeners’ epistemic motivation was higher.

Second, another exploratory analysis (Study 1B) found some evidence for a mechanism by which speakers’ passion influenced listeners’ support. Speakers’ passion expressions were perceived as an indication of the speakers’ tendencies to stand for their principles when listeners’ epistemic motivation was lower. In contrast, speakers’ passion did not change perceptions of speakers’ tendencies to stand for their principles when listeners’ epistemic motivation was higher. Standing for principle, in turn, increased listeners’ support. These findings shed light on the mechanisms underlying the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support, as the only mechanism that was found in past research was that perceived passion mediated the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support (Cardon et al., 2009a).

Third, this dissertation extends our understanding of the effect speakers’ passion have on
venture growth. Previous work demonstrated that speakers’ characteristics, such as speakers’ self-efficacy (Baum & Locke, 2004) and speakers’ network centrality (Ho & Pollack, 2014), mediated the relationship between speakers’ passion and the ventures’ financial performance. Adding to this line of work, in my dissertation I found a direct association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ monetary support and suggested that standing for principle mediated this association.

Finally, while previous work investigated the effects of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support in the screening (Cardon et al., 2009a) and funding (Cardon et al., 2009a; Chen et al., 2009) stages, support decisions were conceptualized in both papers as a dichotomous variable (i.e., support was offered, support was not offered). My dissertation contributes to extant work by broadening the definition of listeners’ support to include additional conceptualizations of the construct: number of supporters and average monetary support. In my dissertation the findings were robust across ways to operationalize support, in that speakers’ passion was associated with a higher probability to receive an offer of support, a larger number of supporters, and a higher average of monetary support.

Given the exploratory nature of my findings, implications should be taken with caution. Nevertheless, tentative suggestions for practical implications can be made. First, it has practical implications for speakers in organizations who are interested in promoting an issue that is important to them. Understanding that one’s passion may be interpreted differently by listeners with different levels of epistemic motivation can help speakers who are preparing for their conversation with their listeners. These results suggest that when one is expressing passion to listeners with lower epistemic motivation, one facilitates listeners’ perceptions of one’s tendency to stand for one’s principles and, in turn, facilitates listeners’ support. However, when
listeners’ epistemic motivation is higher, one’s passion is not associated with listeners’ support. Thus, speakers who are considering suppressing their passion because of “the danger of emphasizing emotional expression” (Chen et al., 2009, p. 210) in such situations should be aware that such suppression would not benefit them. Mainly, it will hurt their efforts when listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower and will probably have no effect when listeners’ epistemic motivation is higher. Moreover, speakers who are contemplating enhancing their passion expressions should only do so when listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower; enhancing one’s passionate expressions when listeners’ epistemic motivation is higher will most likely not help in securing listeners’ support. Speakers can use this knowledge by influencing listeners’ epistemic motivation during the conversation: speakers can frame their request in a way that positions it as either high or low when deciding whether to enhance their passion expressions during the pitch.

Second, my dissertation has practical implications for those who are in the role of listeners in organizations, such as angel investors and venture capitalists. By advising listeners about the process and situations that influence their support decisions, listeners can make more informed decisions. Investment firms that are interested in increasing (reducing) listeners’ dependence on speakers’ passion when making investment decisions can change their employees’ (i.e., the listeners’) epistemic motivation; for example, by reframing what constitutes a lower (higher) speakers’ request size.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

There are several limitations to my inferences and methods that must be noted. First, I only tested my theory in one type of setting – the entrepreneurial world – and looked at specific listeners: investors. Indeed, entrepreneurs tend to ask listeners for specific type of support –
monetary investments – and listeners in these settings are usually “serial listeners” who make repeated support decisions for a large number of speakers. Thus, my findings are likely influenced by these facts. It could be that the type of the request (monetary) or the listeners’ job (making repeated support decisions), makes the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support especially likely in this setting. Future research should investigate how passion conveyed by other speakers in organization (e.g., potential recruits interviewing for a new position, sales representatives, or employees in a R&D firm) might relate to listeners’ support. Moreover, future work should investigate how requests for other type of support, such as for listeners to volunteer their time to support the issue, influence these dynamics.

Second, I originally theorized that speakers’ passion influenced listeners’ support through two competing routes: emotional expression route and elaborate communication route. However, the results of Study 1A did not support this model. I conducted subsidiary analyses in Studies 1A and 1B that showed that the association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support was conditional on listeners’ epistemic motivation, and that standing for principle was the mechanism that accounted for this association. Given that these analyses were based on post-hoc theorizing, these results should be taken with caution and replications of these results are needed. Indeed, Study 2 was not successful in replicating these findings. However, the fact that in Study 1B the results held with all three conceptualizations of listeners’ support (i.e., whether support was offered, number of supporters, and average monetary support) increases confidence in my findings. Moreover, although Study 2 was conducted partly to replicate these findings, listeners in Study 2 were participants who were asked to play the role of investors. Previous work that employed similar methods (Chen et al., 2009) also failed to find an association between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support when participants played the role
of investors (Study 1) but managed to do so when listeners were real investors (Study 2). My dissertation’s results suggest that when listeners know that their decision is only theoretically supporting, their decision making process differs from that of real listeners, and is probably not affected by speakers’ passion. Future work should replicate my dissertation’s research findings in another real-life setting of listeners’ support.

Finally, the effects of speakers’ passion on listeners’ support were supported using cross-sectional research designs (Studies 1A and 1B), but not an experimental design (Study 2). This design did not allow me to determine causality. However, it should be noted that data were obtained using objective coding by independent raters of separate sources – speakers (entrepreneurs) and listeners (real investors) – rather than by relying on self-reports. It should also be noted that the speakers in this situation made their request and conversed with the listeners before listeners decided whether to support the speakers, suggesting that it is unlikely that listeners’ support influenced speakers’ passion. Nevertheless, future work should reexamine the proposed alternative model using an experimental design to determine causality. Moreover, in Study 2 I manipulated epistemic motivation by indicating to listeners whether the speakers’ request was high (i.e., telling participants that the speaker is asking for “$600,000, a relatively large investment”) or low (“$35,000, a relatively small investment”). I did so to closely follow Studies 1A and 1B, theorizing that such information will influence listeners’ perceptions that the situation is more (or less) risky and that a lot (little) is at stake, and, thus, influence their epistemic motivation. Indeed, past work has linked the framing of outcomes as losses (rather than as gains) to high epistemic motivation (De Dreu & Carnevale, 2003; Dunegan, 1993). Previous work also successfully manipulated epistemic motivation using other operationalizations, such as by making participants accountable for their decisions (De Dreu et
al., 2000; Scholten, Van Knippenberg, Nijstad, & De Dreu, 2007), or by putting participants in a low power (rather than high power) position (Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004). It could be that although Study 2 participants understood that the speakers’ request is considered high (or low), that information did not influence their epistemic motivation. That is, it could be that my manipulation of epistemic motivation did not work as intended. Future work should use different manipulations when reexamining the proposed alternative model – such as by explicitly informing participants that they will be accountable for their decisions (e.g., Tetlock, 1983), or by giving participants information about alternative investment options the speakers have access to (e.g., Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004).

Conclusion

Contributing to the sparse literature on the interpersonal consequences of speakers’ passion in organizations, my dissertation suggests that speakers’ passion is associated with listeners’ support, but in a particular way. Speakers’ passion is positively associated with listeners’ support when listeners’ epistemic motivation is lower, but not when it is higher. By being aware of the hindering and facilitating effects of epistemic motivation, speakers will be able to deliver more effective pitches and better understand how their expressions of passion influence listeners’ decisions.
REFERENCES


Table 1. Summary of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>The extent of speakers’ passion about the issue increases the extent of listeners’ passion about the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>The extent of listeners’ passion about the issue is positively related to listeners’ support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>The listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the relationship between the listeners’ passion about the issue and the listeners’ support, such that when epistemic motivation is higher the relationship becomes weaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>The positive relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue and the listeners’ support is mediated by the listeners’ passion about the issue. This indirect relationship is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>The extent of speakers’ passion about the issue is negatively related to the degree to which the speakers’ conversation about the issue is elaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>The degree to which the speakers’ conversation about the issue is elaborate positively relates to listeners’ support for the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Epistemic motivation moderates the relationship between speakers’ elaboration about the issue and listeners’ support, such that when epistemic motivation is higher, the relationship becomes stronger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>The negative relationship between speakers’ passion about an issue and the listeners’ support is mediated by the speakers’ conversation elaboration. This indirect relationship is moderated by epistemic motivation, such that the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. An Overview of Dissertation Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis / Post-Hoc Proposition</th>
<th>Study 1A</th>
<th>Study 1B</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: Speakers’ passion increases listeners’ passion</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: Listeners’ passion is positively related to listeners’ support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td>support no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>: The listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the positive relationship between listeners’ passion and listeners’ support; the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower</td>
<td>no support no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong>: Listeners’ passion mediates the positive relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support, and this relationship is moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation; the positive relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower</td>
<td>no support no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong>: Speakers’ passion is negatively related to speakers’ conversation elaboration</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong>: Speakers’ conversation elaboration is positively related to listeners’ support</td>
<td>no support support</td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong>: The listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the positive relationship between conversation elaboration and listeners’ support; the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is higher</td>
<td>no support no support</td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8</strong>: Speakers’ conversation elaboration mediates the negative relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support, and this relationship is moderated by listeners’ epistemic motivation; the negative relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is higher</td>
<td>no support no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong>: The listeners’ epistemic motivation moderates the positive relationship between speakers’ passion and listeners’ support; the relationship is stronger when epistemic motivation is lower</td>
<td>support support</td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2</strong>: Perceived speakers’ tendency to stand for their principle mediates the association between the predictor speakers’ passion, the moderator listeners’ epistemic motivation, and the outcome listeners’ support</td>
<td>support support support</td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 1B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2</strong> (see above, Study 1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong> (see above, Study 1A)</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2</strong> (see above, Study 1B)</td>
<td>no support no support</td>
<td>no support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Listeners’ passion</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elaborate communication</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>228.14</td>
<td>444.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support was offered *</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of supporters</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average monetary support</td>
<td>95.07</td>
<td>201.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Season 1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Season 2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Season 3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Season 4</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Season 5</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Season 6</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Season 7</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Industry: Consumer</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Industry: Manufacturing</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Industry: HiTech</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Industry: Health</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gender (Female)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Social responsibility *</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Share Size</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Usability of product *</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Engineering *</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.13†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No = 0, Yes = 1
†p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 4. Regression Analyses Predicting Listeners’ Passion and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 a</th>
<th>Model 2 a</th>
<th>Model 3 b</th>
<th>Model 4 b</th>
<th>Model 5 b</th>
<th>Model 6 b</th>
<th>Model 7 c</th>
<th>Model 8 c</th>
<th>Model 9 c</th>
<th>Model 10 c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listeners’ passion</td>
<td>Support was offered d</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.30*** (.03)</td>
<td>.31*** (.03)</td>
<td>- .90* (.43)</td>
<td>1.30* (.58)</td>
<td>- .77† (.44)</td>
<td>1.15† (.59)</td>
<td>.74* (.29)</td>
<td>.89* (.40)</td>
<td>.61* (.30)</td>
<td>.75† (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>3.65** (1.18)</td>
<td>-5.29* (1.65)</td>
<td>3.54** (1.20)</td>
<td>-5.05** (1.66)</td>
<td>-2.32** (1.82)</td>
<td>-2.94** (1.12)</td>
<td>-2.22** (1.84)</td>
<td>-2.82* (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>3.65** (1.18)</td>
<td>-5.29* (1.65)</td>
<td>3.54** (1.20)</td>
<td>-5.05** (1.66)</td>
<td>-2.32** (1.82)</td>
<td>-2.94** (1.12)</td>
<td>-2.22** (1.84)</td>
<td>-2.82* (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.01† (.00)</td>
<td>.01 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>-.05 (.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.06† (.59)</td>
<td>.96 (.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82* (.34)</td>
<td>.82* (.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses.

a Linear regression analysis
b Logistic regression analysis
c Negative binomial regression analysis
d Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
(cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 11 *</th>
<th>Model 12 *</th>
<th>Model 13 *</th>
<th>Model 14 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average monetary support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>173.50 ***</td>
<td>176.76 ***</td>
<td>166.85 ***</td>
<td>171.91 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.84)</td>
<td>(43.26)</td>
<td>(40.66)</td>
<td>(44.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion</td>
<td>-223.66 *</td>
<td>-367.83 *</td>
<td>-215.63 *</td>
<td>-360.15 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(105.22)</td>
<td>(114.83)</td>
<td>(105.75)</td>
<td>(115.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion * Epistemic</td>
<td>1.07 *</td>
<td>1.06 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54.18)</td>
<td>(47.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses.*

- Linear regression analysis
- Logistic regression analysis
- Negative binomial regression analysis
- Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

† p < .10  
* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
Table 5. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Listeners’ Passion, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support was offered[^d]</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td>Average monetary support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.29 (.75)</td>
<td>143.75 (47.23)</td>
<td>.92 (.50)</td>
<td>.74 (.49)</td>
<td>184.73 (61.15)</td>
<td>180.25 (61.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.19, 1.76]</td>
<td>[50.41, 237.09]</td>
<td>[-.07, 1.90]</td>
<td>[-.23, 1.71]</td>
<td>[64.03, 305.44]</td>
<td>[58.28, 302.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.56 (.26)</td>
<td>-22.12 (18.50)</td>
<td>.36 (.17)</td>
<td>.35 (.16)</td>
<td>-2.73 (20.38)</td>
<td>-2.92 (20.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.04, 1.08]</td>
<td>[-58.68, 14.45]</td>
<td>[.03, .69]</td>
<td>[.03, .67]</td>
<td>[-42.96, 37.49]</td>
<td>[-43.23, 37.39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion</td>
<td>-5.60 (1.77)</td>
<td>-12.87 (8.96)</td>
<td>-2.05 (.97)</td>
<td>-1.74 (.95)</td>
<td>-375.99 (118.50)</td>
<td>-368.28 (119.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-.002 (.002)</td>
<td>-1.12 (.12)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>-.14 (.12)</td>
<td>-.14 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeners’ passion * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.006 (.005)</td>
<td>.31 (.03)</td>
<td>.000 (.003)</td>
<td>.000 (.003)</td>
<td>1.09 (.37)</td>
<td>1.08 (.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>.31 (.03)</td>
<td>1.08 (.38)</td>
<td>1.32 (.83)</td>
<td>1.32 (.83)</td>
<td>26.98 (48.02)</td>
<td>-67.81, 121.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.25, .37]</td>
<td>[.25, .37]</td>
<td>[.32, 1.83]</td>
<td>[.32, 1.83]</td>
<td>[-67.81, 121.77]</td>
<td>[-67.81, 121.77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td>.56 (.26)</td>
<td>.36 (.17)</td>
<td>.35 (.16)</td>
<td>-2.73 (20.38)</td>
<td>-2.92 (20.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.04, 1.08]</td>
<td>[.03, .69]</td>
<td>[.03, .67]</td>
<td>[-42.96, 37.49]</td>
<td>[-43.23, 37.39]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional indirect effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td>-13 (.12)</td>
<td>-.05 (.04)</td>
<td>-.04 (.04)</td>
<td>8.69 (8.17)</td>
<td>-8.70 (8.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 3K)</td>
<td>[-.43, .05]</td>
<td>[-.17, .01]</td>
<td>[-.16, .01]</td>
<td>[-45.62, .48]</td>
<td>[-39.81, .80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 672.62K)</td>
<td>-.03 (.11)</td>
<td>-.04 (.08)</td>
<td>-.05 (.07)</td>
<td>8.39 (18.55)</td>
<td>8.53 (18.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.36, .12]</td>
<td>[-.30, .03]</td>
<td>[-.26, .03]</td>
<td>[-14.17, 68.70]</td>
<td>[-13.88, 61.64]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013)

[^a]: Logistic regression analysis
[^b]: Linear regression analysis
[^c]: The PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013) was unable to calculate the slopes and their CIs for this model
[^d]: Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1
Table 6. Regression Analyses Predicting Elaborate Communication and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborate communication</td>
<td>Support was offered</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.71***</td>
<td>2.62***</td>
<td>5.32***</td>
<td>-3.25***</td>
<td>-3.78***</td>
<td>-3.24***</td>
<td>-3.77***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.15***</td>
<td>1.26***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate communication *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>- .32</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.41)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses.

*aLinear regression analysis
*bLogistic regression analysis
*cNegative binomial regression analysis
*dSupport was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 11 *</th>
<th>Model 12 *</th>
<th>Model 13 *</th>
<th>Model 14 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average monetary support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-93.94*</td>
<td>109.97**</td>
<td>-94.02*</td>
<td>110.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.38)</td>
<td>(37.90)</td>
<td>(46.57)</td>
<td>(38.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speakers’ passion

| Elaborate communication        | 47.30***   | -15.63†    | 47.38***   | -16.06†    |
|                                | (10.08)    | (8.67)     | (10.26)    | (8.80)     |
| Epistemic motivation           | -1.13***   | -1.14***   |            |            |
|                                | (.12)      | (.12)      |            |            |
| Elaborate communication *      |            |            | .31***     | .31***     |
| Epistemic motivation           |            |            | (.03)      | (.03)      |

Control:

| Social responsibility          | -2.57      | 11.61      |
|                                | (55.28)    | (37.07)    |

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses.

*Linear regression analysis
*Logistic regression analysis
*Negative binomial regression analysis
*Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 7. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Elaborate Communication, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 *</th>
<th>Model 2 **</th>
<th>Model 3 b</th>
<th>Model 4 b</th>
<th>Model 5 b</th>
<th>Model 6 b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support was offered  d</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td>Average monetary support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-5.38 (.30)</td>
<td>-5.39 (.30)</td>
<td>-95 (.46)</td>
<td>-94 (.46)</td>
<td>143.75 (47.23)</td>
<td>143.97 (47.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-7.92, -2.84]</td>
<td>[-7.93, -2.84]</td>
<td>[-1.87, -0.04]</td>
<td>[-1.85, -0.03]</td>
<td>[50.41, 237.09]</td>
<td>[50.31, 237.62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>-31 (.37)</td>
<td>-32 (.37)</td>
<td>-07 (.18)</td>
<td>-05 (.18)</td>
<td>-22.12 (18.50)</td>
<td>-21.89 (18.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.03, .40]</td>
<td>[-1.04, .41]</td>
<td>[-.43, .29]</td>
<td>[-.41, .30]</td>
<td>[-58.68, 14.45]</td>
<td>[-58.61, 14.84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate communication</td>
<td>1.30 (.25)</td>
<td>1.29 (.25)</td>
<td>.51 (.09)</td>
<td>.49 (.09)</td>
<td>-12.87 (8.96)</td>
<td>-13.25 (9.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.81, 1.79]</td>
<td>[.80, 1.78]</td>
<td>[.34, .68]</td>
<td>[.31, .66]</td>
<td>[-30.57, 4.82]</td>
<td>[-31.25, 4.74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.002 (.003)</td>
<td>.002 (.003)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.003, .007]</td>
<td>[-.009, .007]</td>
<td>[-.002, .003]</td>
<td>[-.002, .003]</td>
<td>[-1.12 (.12)]</td>
<td>[-1.13 (.12)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborate communication * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
<td>.000 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.002, .001]</td>
<td>[-.002, .001]</td>
<td>[.31 (.03)]</td>
<td>[.31 (.03)]</td>
<td>[.25, .37]</td>
<td>[.25, .37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>.30 (.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60 (.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.51 (37.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.01, 1.61]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.11, 1.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-63.74, 82.76]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td>-31 (.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07 (.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-22.12 (18.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.03, .40]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.43, .29]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-58.68, 14.45]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional indirect effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 10K)</td>
<td>.99 (.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39 (.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.53 (7.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.45, 1.73]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.17, .65]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-27.37, 3.69]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 720.06K)</td>
<td>.75 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37 (.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>161.75 (51.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.09, 1.87]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.10, .84]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[82.26, 298.38]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013)

*Logistic regression analysis
**Linear regression analysis
*The PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013) was unable to calculate the slopes and their CIs for this model
4Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1
Table 8. Exploring Alternative Models: The Effects of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 *</th>
<th>Model 2 *</th>
<th>Model 3 *</th>
<th>Model 4 *</th>
<th>Model 5 *</th>
<th>Model 6 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support was offered a</td>
<td>-2.38 (.73)</td>
<td>-2.41 (.74)</td>
<td>-2.02 (.57)</td>
<td>-2.17 (.59)</td>
<td>-75.63 (54.85)</td>
<td>-75.97 (54.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monetary support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.38 (.73)</td>
<td>-2.41 (.74)</td>
<td>-2.02 (.57)</td>
<td>-2.17 (.59)</td>
<td>-75.63 (54.85)</td>
<td>-75.97 (54.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([-3.81, -1.94])</td>
<td>([-3.85, -1.96])</td>
<td>([-3.51, -1.22])</td>
<td>([-3.57, -1.22])</td>
<td>([-183.90, 32.64])</td>
<td>([-184.41, 32.47])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.85 (.32)</td>
<td>.83 (.32)</td>
<td>.85 (.25)</td>
<td>.86 (.25)</td>
<td>53.83 (24.74)</td>
<td>52.79 (24.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.22, 1.49])</td>
<td>( [.20, 1.47])</td>
<td>( [.40, 1.46])</td>
<td>( [.42, 1.48])</td>
<td>(5.00, 102.67)</td>
<td>(3.79, 101.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.01 (.00)</td>
<td>.005 (.002)</td>
<td>.005 (.002)</td>
<td>.005 (.002)</td>
<td>.73 (.17)</td>
<td>.72 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.00, .01])</td>
<td>( [.000, .009])</td>
<td>( [.001, .010])</td>
<td>( [.002, .010])</td>
<td>( [.39, 1.06])</td>
<td>( [.38, 1.05])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-0.002 (.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.001)</td>
<td>-.21 (.07)</td>
<td>-.20 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [-.0035, -.0001])</td>
<td>( [-.003, -.000]0)</td>
<td>( [-.0038, -.0005])</td>
<td>( [.004, -.001])</td>
<td>( [.34, -.08])</td>
<td>( [.34, -.07])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.04 (.58)</td>
<td>.89 (.34)</td>
<td>33.66 (47.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.09, 2.18])</td>
<td>( [.06, 1.50])</td>
<td>( [-60.94, 128.25])</td>
<td>( -.6094, .12825)</td>
<td>( [.34, 100.93])</td>
<td>( [.34, 100.93])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 3K)</td>
<td>.85 (.32)</td>
<td>.83 (.32)</td>
<td>.84 (.24)</td>
<td>.85 (.25)</td>
<td>53.21 (24.62)</td>
<td>52.17 (24.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.22, 1.48])</td>
<td>( [.20, 1.46])</td>
<td>( [.36, 1.32])</td>
<td>( [.37, 1.34])</td>
<td>(4.61, 101.81)</td>
<td>(3.41, 100.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 672.62K)</td>
<td>-.38 (.31)</td>
<td>-.31 (.45)</td>
<td>-.38 (.31)</td>
<td>-.49 (.31)</td>
<td>86.21 (35.71)</td>
<td>85.05 (35.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [-1.25, .53])</td>
<td>( [-1.18, .57])</td>
<td>( [-.99, .23])</td>
<td>( [-1.10, .12])</td>
<td>( [-156.69, .1572])</td>
<td>( [-155.71, .1439])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013).

*Logistic regression analysis
*Negative binomial regression analysis
*Linear regression analysis
*Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1
Table 9. Exploring Alternative Models: Share Size, Usability of Product, and Engineering as Alternative Moderators in the Relationship Between Speakers’ Passion and Listeners’ Support (Study 1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alternative moderator</th>
<th>Share Size</th>
<th>Usability of product</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Support was offered a,b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17 (1.28)</td>
<td>-2.03 (.72)</td>
<td>-1.48 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-2.68, 2.34]</td>
<td>[-3.43, -.63]</td>
<td>[-2.62, -.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34 (.55)</td>
<td>.40 (.33)</td>
<td>.52 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.75, 1.42]</td>
<td>[-.24, 1.04]</td>
<td>[.01, 1.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04 (.04)</td>
<td>2.45 (1.19)</td>
<td>.70 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.12, .04]</td>
<td>[.12, 4.78]</td>
<td>[-1.82, 3.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Alternative moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00 (.02)</td>
<td>-.22 (.54)</td>
<td>-.20 (.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.03, .04]</td>
<td>[-1.28, .83]</td>
<td>[-1.45, 1.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Number of supporters c</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74 (1.09)</td>
<td>-2.16 (.71)</td>
<td>-.91 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.39, 2.84]</td>
<td>[-3.92, -1.15]</td>
<td>[-2.33, .05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06 (.46)</td>
<td>.72 (.34)</td>
<td>.40 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.97, .84]</td>
<td>[.19, 1.52]</td>
<td>[.02, 1.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06 (.04)</td>
<td>2.65 (.88)</td>
<td>.48 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.13, .01]</td>
<td>[1.13, 4.64]</td>
<td>[-2.12, 2.67]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Alternative moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>-.71 (.41)</td>
<td>-.16 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.01, .05]</td>
<td>[-1.58, .02]</td>
<td>[-1.32, 1.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Average monetary support d</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>74.03 (106.82)</td>
<td>20.36 (54.21)</td>
<td>59.55 (52.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-136.80, 284.87]</td>
<td>[-86.63, 127.35]</td>
<td>[-44.86, 163.96]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>24.51 (47.02)</td>
<td>10.25 (26.05)</td>
<td>12.12 (24.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-68.30, 117.32]</td>
<td>[-41.16, 61.67]</td>
<td>[-35.60, 59.83]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative moderator</td>
<td>-.83 (3.16)</td>
<td>146.45 (101.24)</td>
<td>-133.33 (124.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-7.07, 5.42]</td>
<td>[-53.38, 346.28]</td>
<td>[-378.52, 111.86]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Alternative moderator</td>
<td>-.10 (1.39)</td>
<td>-5.69 (46.10)</td>
<td>105.16 (62.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-2.85, 2.65]</td>
<td>[-96.68, 85.30]</td>
<td>[-17.85, 228.16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013).*

*a, b Logistic regression analysis
b Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1
*c Negative binomial regression analysis
*d Linear regression analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>228.14</td>
<td>444.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support was offered</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of supporters</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average monetary support</td>
<td>95.07</td>
<td>201.74</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived extraversion</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived activation</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived standing for principle</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perceived flexibility</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perceived humility</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived ethicality</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perceived trust</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perceived objectivity</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.13†</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Perceived appropriate emotional display</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Perceived neutral display rules</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14†</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 11. Exploring Alternative Models: Perceived Extraversion and Perceived Activation as Alternative Predictors of Listeners’ Support (Study 1B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alternative predictor</th>
<th>Perceived extraversion</th>
<th>Perceived activation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Support was provided a,b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.02 (1.53)</td>
<td>-2.57 (1.51)</td>
<td>[-5.01, .97]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor</td>
<td>.30 (.30)</td>
<td>.41 (.29)</td>
<td>[-.29, .88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>[-.01, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>.000 (.001)</td>
<td>[-.002, .002]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Number of supporters c</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.36 (1.63)</td>
<td>-1.64 (1.11)</td>
<td>[-3.78, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor</td>
<td>.25 (.23)</td>
<td>.29 (.21)</td>
<td>[-.23, .71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.004 (.004)</td>
<td>.01 (.00)</td>
<td>[-.005, .012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-.001 (.001)</td>
<td>-.001 (.001)</td>
<td>[-.002, .001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: Average monetary support d</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-206.24 (125.80)</td>
<td>-183.69 (119.57)</td>
<td>[-454.54, 42.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor</td>
<td>49.61 (24.77)</td>
<td>44.37 (23.04)</td>
<td>[.73, 98.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>1.46 (.44)</td>
<td>.93 (.43)</td>
<td>[.59, 2.33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative predictor * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-.24 (.08)</td>
<td>-.13 (.08)</td>
<td>[-.41, -.08]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013).*

a Logistic regression analysis
b Support was provided: No = 0, Yes = 1
c Negative binomial regression analysis
d Linear regression analysis
Table 12. Exploring Alternative Models: Regression Results of Potential Mediators in the Relationship between Speakers’ Passion, Epistemic Motivation and Listeners’ Support (Study 1B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perceived standing for principle</th>
<th>Perceived flexibility</th>
<th>Perceived humility</th>
<th>Perceived ethicality</th>
<th>Perceived objectivity</th>
<th>Perceived appropriate emotional display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.40 (.13)***</td>
<td>4.43 (.23)***</td>
<td>4.42 (.23)***</td>
<td>4.26 (.18)***</td>
<td>4.03 (.26)***</td>
<td>4.79 (.21)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.17 (.06)**</td>
<td>.03 (.10)</td>
<td>-.03 (.10)</td>
<td>.16 (.08)‡</td>
<td>.22 (.12)†</td>
<td>.17 (.09)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.0009 (.0004)*</td>
<td>-.0004 (.0007)</td>
<td>.0000 (.0007)</td>
<td>.0009 (.0006)</td>
<td>.0014 (.0008)†</td>
<td>.0005 (.0006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>-.0003 (.0002)*</td>
<td>.0001 (.0003)</td>
<td>.0000 (.0003)</td>
<td>-.0003 (.0002)</td>
<td>-.0005 (.0003)</td>
<td>-.0001 (.0003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
**Table 13. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Perceived Standing for Principle, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 1B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 ⁹</th>
<th>Model 2 ⁸</th>
<th>Model 3 ⁸</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support was offered ⁹</td>
<td>Number of supporters</td>
<td>Average monetary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-7.03 (1.98) [−10.91, −3.15]</td>
<td>-2.81 (1.21) [−5.20, −0.41]</td>
<td>-479.38 (166.35) [−807.71, −151.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion</td>
<td>.37 (.24) [−.11, .84]</td>
<td>.26 (.16) [−.06, .58]</td>
<td>11.31 (22.03) [−32.17, 54.78]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived standing for principle</td>
<td>1.23 (.41) [.43, 2.03]</td>
<td>.68 (.25) [.18, 1.18]</td>
<td>115.20 (34.92) [46.29, 184.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td>.37 (.24) [−.11, .84]</td>
<td>.26 (.16) [−.06, .58]</td>
<td>11.31 (22.03) [−32.17, 54.78]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional indirect effect of Speakers’ Passion on Support</td>
<td>⁸</td>
<td>⁸</td>
<td>⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 3K)</td>
<td>.21 (.09) [.06, .44]</td>
<td>.11 (.06) [.03, .24]</td>
<td>19.34 (9.22) [6.30, 45.33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value of moderator (Epistemic motivation = 672.62K)</td>
<td>-.05 (.18) [−.56, .17]</td>
<td>-.03 (.09) [−.31, .08]</td>
<td>-4.86 (15.15) [−47.01, 12.82]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013)*

⁹Logistic regression analysis ⁸ Linear regression analysis ⁸ Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1
Table 14. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2 Pilot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Passionate Clip*</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speaker's passion</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speaker's believability</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Importance of EcoTraction</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Importance of investment</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation of presentation</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.23†</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Speaker's pride</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Speaker's happiness</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Speaker's negative affectivity</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.24†</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Speaker's authentic emotional displays</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Speakers' passion: Low = 0, High = 1.

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 15. Mean Differences among Experimental Clips (Study 2 Pilot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low Passion Clip</th>
<th>High Passion Clip</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s passion</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s believability</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of EcoTraction</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of investment</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of presentation</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s pride</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s happiness</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s negative affectivity</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s authentic emotional displays</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 16. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Passion</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived standing for principle</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support was offered</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average monetary support</td>
<td>200.25</td>
<td>274.67</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Speakers’ passion: Low = 0, High = 1

*b* Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

* $p < .05$  
** $p < .01$  
*** $p < .001$
### Table 17. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Support was offered ( a,b )</th>
<th>Average monetary support ( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.08 (.35)</td>
<td>55.86 (24.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.39, 2.77]</td>
<td>[7.89, 103.84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion ( d )</td>
<td>-.68 (.42)</td>
<td>322.87 (33.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.51, .15]</td>
<td>[256.21, 389.54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation ( e )</td>
<td>-1.54 (.42)</td>
<td>-21.64 (31.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-2.36, -.72]</td>
<td>[-84.16, 40.88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion * Epistemic motivation</td>
<td>.55 (.52)</td>
<td>14.57 (45.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.48, 1.57]</td>
<td>[-75.55, 104.70]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013)

\( a \) Logistic regression analysis

\( b \) Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1

\( c \) Linear regression analysis

\( d \) Speakers’ passion: Low = 0, High = 1

\( e \) Epistemic motivation: Low = 0, High = 1
### Table 18. The Effects of Speakers’ Passion, Perceived Standing for Principle, and Epistemic Motivation on Listeners’ Support: Results of Moderated-Mediation Analyses (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived standing for principle a</td>
<td>Support was offered a,b</td>
<td>Average monetary support c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.70 (.10)</td>
<td>-2.93 (.78)</td>
<td>9.84 (89.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5.50, 5.90]</td>
<td>[-4.47, -1.40]</td>
<td>[-166.63, 186.31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers’ passion d</td>
<td>-.07 (.13)</td>
<td>-.08 (.25)</td>
<td>-35.88 (28.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.33, .19]</td>
<td>[-.57, .40]</td>
<td>[-91.75, 19.99]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic motivation e</td>
<td>.00 (.14)</td>
<td>.73 (.14)</td>
<td>37.43 (15.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.28, .28]</td>
<td>[.45, 1.00]</td>
<td>[7.31, 67.55]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented, standard errors are presented in parentheses, 95% CIs are presented in brackets. 95% CIs were calculated using the bias-corrected bootstrapped estimate with 1000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013)

*a* Linear regression analysis  
*b* Support was offered: No = 0, Yes = 1  
*c* Logistic regression analysis  
*d* Speakers’ passion: Low = 0, High = 1  
*e* Epistemic motivation: Low = 0, High = 1
Figure 1. Theoretical Model
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Figure 2. Support was Offered as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation

![Graph showing the relationship between Speakers' Passion and Probability of Support offered, with Epistemic Motivation as a variable. The graph indicates a negative correlation between Passion and Probability of Support, with the probability decreasing as passion increases. The graph shows two lines, one for Low Epistemic Motivation and one for High Epistemic Motivation, both indicating a decrease in Probability of Support with increasing Passion.]
Figure 3. Number of Supporters as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation
Figure 4. Average Monetary Support as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation
Figure 5. Perceived Standing for Principle as a Function of Speakers’ Passion and Epistemic Motivation
Figure 6. Alternative Model: Speakers’ Passion, Epistemic Motivation, Perceived Standing for Principle and Listeners’ Support
Appendix A. Raters’ Training Manual (Study 1A)

Research Assistance Manual Guide

Dragons’ Den Study

Overview

This research centers on the behaviours of people who pitch their ideas. We are interested in learning how pitchers’ presentations and expressions relate to listeners’ decisions to support the idea. To that end, this study involves coding of video clips from the show Dragons’ Den.

As an RA on this project, your job will be to code the clips based on a coding scheme that will be detailed in this manual. Following the guidelines for research involving this type of methodology, you will be one of several RAs who will code the clips. Each of us will code the clips independently, and the experimenter will compare the codes. The idea behind this is to make sure that we do not miss anything important and that there is overall agreement between raters (experimenter and RAs) on what was seen in the clips.

Coding for this study will be done in two separate phases. This manual describes both phases, but you will first only receive the first part which describes phase 1.

We will start by going over the coding sheets and code 1 video together, we will then discuss our coding and clarify any questions that you may have. Then, we will each code 5 videos separately and after that we will meet to compare and discuss any additional questions and deal with any problems that may arise. If needed, we will repeat that final step.
**The Clips**
The clips you will code were randomly selected from the 8 seasons of *Dragons’ Den* Canada. The show centers on aspiring entrepreneurs (speaker) who pitch their business concepts and products to a panel of five Canadian business moguls (‘dragons’) in order to convince them to invest in their ideas and products. The clips are in an FLV format (Flash Video) and range in length between 30 seconds and 12 minutes. Each clip depicts an interaction between an entrepreneur (or several entrepreneurs from the same company) and the panel.

There are several pitches in each episode. In order to keep track of different clips, each file is named after the season, episode, and pitch number based on the format: S0_E__.___. where ‘S’ denotes ‘season,’ ‘E’ denotes ‘episode,’ and the number after the period (.) represents the pitch number. For example, a pitch that aired in season 1, episode 2, and was the 6th pitch in that episode is labeled as S01E02.06.

When you code the clips, it is important to pay attention to the clip’s name, as will be described later.

**The Dragons**
Each season the entrepreneurs present their ideas to a panel of five dragons; these dragons stay for the entire duration of the season, with some dragons staying on the show throughout all 8 seasons, and some staying on for a shorter duration.

You will need to become familiar with the different dragons because you will code each dragon’s behaviour independently for each clip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dragon’s Picture</th>
<th>Kevin O’Leary</th>
<th>Jim Treliving</th>
<th>Robert Herjavec</th>
<th>Arlene Dickinson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dragon’s Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasons</strong></td>
<td>All seasons (1-8)</td>
<td>All seasons (1-8)</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dragon’s Picture</th>
<th>Jennifer Wood</th>
<th>Laurence Lewin</th>
<th>Brett Wilson</th>
<th>Bruce Croxon</th>
<th>David Chilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dragon’s Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasons</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coding Scheme & Coding Tools**
 Coding the clips will be done on your computer, by using two programs: VLC Media Player and Video Segment Player. VLC is a free program that can be downloaded from [here](#). Video Segment Player is a
program that was developed for this research specifically. You will use each program for different parts of the coding scheme, as will be described below.

**Part 1: Coding Every 5 Seconds**

**Video Segment Player**

Video Segment Player is a program that was developed for this research specifically. I will send you the relevant files separately. For Video Segment Player to run properly on your computer, you may be asked to update or install .NET (a computer language and environment used by programmers). Your computer will prompt you in case you will need to do so. This is very safe, and will not result in any problems to your computer.

The program Video Segment Player uses the VLC platform, which means that you will also need to install VLC for this phase. Video Segment Player was created to automatically pause the clip every 5 seconds. It is fairly simple and easy to use. See the descriptions below:

1. Once you open the program, or when a video that has been playing in the program has been put on ‘pause’ you can click on the ‘open video’ button to choose the next video you would like to play.
2. Once a video has been opened, the file’s name will appear at the top center of the screen. Similar to other programs that show you the file’s name, you cannot change the text that appears there.
However, unlike other in programs, you can select the text and copy it. This would be helpful, and will save time and mistakes, when you will enter the clip’s name into the coding sheets.

3. The default in this program is to pause automatically every 5 seconds (5000 milliseconds). Theoretically you can change the amount of time the program can play the clip before pausing, but you should NOT do so, unless otherwise instructed by the experimenter. It is important to keep the same time-frame for all clips and for all raters.

4. Once a video is loaded into the program, you will see how much time has passed from the beginning of the video and how long the video is. In the snapshot you see above, the clip was manually stopped after 2 seconds, and the clips’ overall duration is 5 minutes and 58 seconds.

5. You can playback the previous segment by clicking on the ‘prev segment’ icon. This is very helpful when you want to review sections of the clip that you have already seen. It is advised to click this icon in order to go back to previous sections in the clip because it moves in the 5-seconds segments that you will be coding in. By using this icon you will be able to make sure that you are coding the exact same 5-seconds segments.

6. You can also replay the current segment over-and-over again in case you want to revisit what you have just observed. This is a useful tool in 5-seconds segments that are packed with a lot of information.

7. Similar to the previous two options, the ‘next segment’ icons allows you to move forward in the video using the 5-seconds segments. This may be useful in situations where you had to stop coding in the middle of a clip and are reloading it. Instead of trying to find the exact second to restart from, you can click on this icon until you reach the relevant segment in the video.

8. Just as the name suggests, this icon will restart the video and will play it from the beginning.

**Expressions Coding Sheet**

You will not code everything we are interested in this study using the Video Segment Player and the 5-seconds timeframe. Rather, you will code the speaker’s and dragons’ expressions every 5 seconds. You will code all other variables during Phase 2, while using the VLC Media player (see later).

Although you will use the same coding sheet to code the speaker and dragons’ expressions, we want you to first play the video and only code the speaker’s expressions up until the point indicated on your observation sheets. Once you finish coding the speaker’s expressions, you will replay the clip in Video Segment Player and code each of the dragons’ expressions.

While playing the video, pay close attention to the facial expressions, hand gestures, body movements, and tone of voice of the individuals on the screen. The program should stop every 5 seconds and you will need to code what have happened in those 5 seconds on the Expressions Coding Sheet. You will need to circle or check the relevant boxes. If needed, watch the segment again to make sure that you have not missed anything.

Here is a snapshot of what the Expressions Coding Sheet looks like:
As you can see, it includes several components: A (at the top) and B (which repeats itself, below A).

**Component A**

At the top of each page you will see a few questions that relate to the overall clip. You should code the answers to these questions on whichever page is easiest for you.

A1. Indicates which group of raters is in charge of coding this clip. You will be randomly assigned to a group.

A2. The name of the clip you are coding, in the format S__E__. __.

A3. To keep things organized, I added the total number of sheets you use to code one clip. There are 9 squares (3 rows and 3 columns) on each page, and each represents a 5-seconds segment (in the above snapshot you only see the top row – 3 first blocks – of a page). This means that you will need 1 page to code 45 seconds, and 5 pages to code 3 minutes and 9 seconds. The clips’ duration ranges between 30 seconds and 12 minutes (although the pitch stops before the end of the clip, so you will not code the whole 12 minutes), which means that you will have somewhere between 2 and 40 sheets for each clip.

A4. Did the dragons take the presentation/pitch seriously?
   - Did the dragons mock the speaker?
   - Did the dragons allow the speaker to present his/her idea, or did they cut him/her off?
   – if the answer to these questions is YES, indicate so and check box A3.

A5. When (in minutes and seconds) did the dragons ask the first question?
A6. In some clips, the show’s host uses voice-over (VO) to describe things the producers decided to cut from the footage the audience sees. Sometimes, it is just a short sentence. Other times, it is a long monolog that carries for the majority of the clip. Please indicate if the VO masks all / more than half / less than half / none of the pitch.

A7. This part indicates the time in the clip when you need to stop coding the emotional expressions of the speaker and the dragons. In the example above, you can see that the coders need to stop coding at 03:09 minutes (i.e., segment 38). Stop coding the emotional expressions of the presenter and dragons based on the time indicated in A6 for each of the clips.

**Component B**

Each page has 9 blocks on it, with the same coding scheme in each. Each block is dedicated to a single 5-seconds segment.

B1. There is an indication at the top of each block for which segment it is. The one presented here is segment 42, which covers the 5000 milliseconds between 03:25 and 03:29 (inclusive). For a quicker coding, the sheets include the time of the clip you will code in each segment (indicated in A7). Make sure to check what area A7 says and stop coding the expressions after you reached the time in the clip.

B2. Coding the speakers’ and dragons’ expressions on the same sheets will help save a lot of paper and also help to keep track of everything. However, this means that you need to keep track of whose
behaviour you are coding. The quickest and easiest way to keep track is to use different pen-colors for each individual. At the B2 space, you should write the name of the person in the relevant pen-color.

**B3.** Check one of these boxes if the VO covered the speech, or if speaker couldn’t talk because he/she listened to the dragons. In such cases, you will not be able to code for the speaker’s voice (last option in **B5**, see below) but will be able to code for the speaker’s face, hands, and body gestures.

**B4.** Speaker is not seen on screen, and you cannot code for the speaker’s face, hands, and body gestures. However, you may still be able to code the speaker’s vocal expressions.

**B5.** Check the boxes that describe the speaker/dragon showed on screen. It is very possible that you will check more than one, since each describes a different type of expression.

**B5a.** Examples of *energetic body movements*

Although it is hard to see *movement* in a series of stills-photos, look at the series of pictures below, which displays the body movement of the speaker during 1.5 seconds. Notice the movement of the shoulders and hands. In the clip, you can see she is moving very quickly, and energetically.
**B5b.** Examples of *rich body language*

People use their entire body to talk: face, hands, arms, etc. It is a bit similar to B5a, since the above example also includes a rich body language. But this also differs from the above, since it does *not* state that the posture or body expression involves *movement* or *high energy*.
**B5c.** Examples of *animated facial expression*

People ‘talk’ with their eyes, eyebrows, and display expressions with their whole face

**B5d.** Examples of *person using gestures*
B5e. Examples of *face lighting up*

B6. If you notice the person displaying any of the following specific emotions, check the relevant box in the appropriate segment: tense, anxious, annoyed, angry, or sad.

B7. Check the boxes that describe the speaker/dragon emotion that was explicitly mentioned by any of the people on the show. For example, if a presenter said ‘I am very nervous, sorry’ write the word ‘nervous’ (or check the box ‘anxious’) in B7. Make sure to write that the person this emotion refers to is the presenter. If one of the dragons said to the presenter ‘it is clear you are very passionate about the product’ than check the box that says ‘passionate’ and indicate that the person the emotion refers to is the presenter (that is, don’t write WHO said the emotion, in this case the dragon, but rather write who expressed this emotion). It is very possible that you will check more than one, since each describes a different type of expression.
Part 2: Coding the Overall Clip
The rest of the coding will be done for the overall clip, without stopping it at specific, predetermined, times. It is fine if you find that you need to pause the clip in order to note a few things while watching it.

VLC Media Player
In order to keep the uniformity between the people that code the clips, we will all use the same player to play the video in a regular manner: VLC Media Player. VLC is a free program and can be downloaded from here. This program supports almost all (if not all) video files, and should play the FLV files we use in this study without any problems.

Observation Sheet
There are several variables that you should code while, or after you finished watching the video.

A. While Watching

1. **Dragon Support**: code this variable for each dragon that was on the panel separately. For each clip, you will code the information for ONLY FIVE dragons. This is a binary variable that indicates whether or not the dragon decided to make an offer and support the speaker. Type 1 for Yes, and 0 for No.

2. **Dragon $ Investments (Inv)**: code this variable for each dragon that was on the panel separately. Code the amount of money each dragon OFFERED the speaker as part of a deal. Type only the number; do not type the dollar sign or the symbol CAD. In some cases the dragons compete with each other trying to make a deal, which means that the total amount suggested by the dragons may differ from the final amount that is part of the deal. Type 0 (zero Dollars) when a dragon decided not to invest.

3. **Dragon % share**: code this variable for each dragon that was on the panel separately. The dragons not only offer money, they also negotiate the share size (percent of the company) they will receive in exchange of their investment. Type only the number; do not type the % sign.

4. **Received Support?**: did the speaker get an actual offer that he/she can consider? If the speaker has at least one deal to consider, this means that the speaker did get the dragons’ support. Type 1 for Yes, and 0 for No [NOTE: code 0/1 based on the potential to make a deal, not based on whether the speaker accepted or rejected the offer]

5. **Deal made?**: did the speaker accept the dragons’ offer? Was a deal actually made? Type 1 for Yes, and 0 for No

6. **Total $ Inv. Deal**: what was the total amount invested as part of the deal between the speaker and the dragon(s)? Type only the number; do not type the dollar sign or the symbol CAD. Type 0 (zero) when no deal was made and therefore the actual investment offered equals zero.

7. **# Dragons Deal**: how many dragons were part of the deal that was made? This number should range between 0-5. Type 0 (zero) when no deal was made and therefore the actual number of investing dragons equals zero.
B. After Watching

1. **Speaker's Gender**: is the main speaker a female or male? Code gender using 1 for Female and 0 for Male.
2. **# of Presenters**: how many presenters (entrepreneurs) stand in front of the dragons? Don’t confuse presenters with assistants, models or background people. Many clips will only have 1 presenter, but many others will have more than one. Code this variable using a number.

**Overall Presentation**:

- a. Presentation had content had substance
- b. Presentation was thoughtful and in-depth
- c. Presentation was coherent and logical
- d. Presenter cited facts to support arguments
- e. Presenter articulated the relationship between business plan and broader context

You should rate the overall presentation style of the pitcher / speaker at the end of the video, after observing it without pausing the video. Rate each of the five questions on a 1-7 scale, where 1 = to a small extent and 7 = to a large extent. Don’t use fractions (like 3.5 or 1.5), only rounded numbers.
Example of Coders' Observation Sheet (Study IA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 3: 00:00-00:14</th>
<th>Segment 2: 00:05-00:09</th>
<th>Segment 1: 00:00-00:04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time pitch stopped: 03:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Q asked by panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragons did NOT take presentation seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters Group 1: CIP 501020.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>#1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global Expressions**
- The person talked with varied tone and pitch
- The person's face/lip was/are visible on the talker
- The person used gestures
- The person showed animated facial expression
- The person had hand gestures/body movements
- The person had confident body movements
- The person talked with varied tone and pitch
- The person's face/lip was/are visible on the talker
- The person used gestures
- The person showed animated facial expression
- The person had hand gestures/body movements
- The person had confident body movements

**Speaker of camera**
- didn't have a chance to talk
- listened to dragons
- voice over masked speech
- voice over masked speech

**Did QM presentations**
- All/Most than half/Less than half

**Raters did not take presentation seriously**
Appendix C. Screenshots of Actor (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Passion</th>
<th>High Passion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Low Passion" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="High Passion" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Actor’s Message on EcoTraction (Study 2)

I have a product called EcoTraction, and I am looking for an investment in my company.

I decided to look for eco-friendly alternative to road salt. EcoTraction is basically an all-natural volcanic mineral. It’s a highly porous, naturally occurring stone that basically absorbs the thin layer of water on the surface of ice, imbeds itself almost like Velcro, creating a sand-paper effect. So rather than actually melting the ice, it creates a safe traction zone so that you don’t slip and fall.

This rock is so safe that fish can actually swim in a tank full of EcoTraction. The product is so safe, that plants can grow in 100% EcoTraction. EcoTraction is better than sand because you need to mix in 5 to 10 percent salt with sand to prevent it from freezing in the winter. Sand is also very mucky and it also tends to clog up the roots on grass when it gets on your grass.

My company has a unique geological deposit and there’s only one particular supply that has these characteristics that we have identified to provide particular traction. My company has the exclusive rights for this supply for all on North America.

The government is absolutely interested. In fact, the company arranged for pilot studies with Parks Canada for all their eco sensitive roadways and areas, such as Banff National Park which is currently trying to go salt free.

I’ve sold the product to gas stations, I’ve sold it to pet shops, I’ve sold it to Starbucks – they are taking it all across Canada, 400 locations. I also have Pharmasave, a drug store chain – again, 400 locations across the country.

EcoTraction retails for about 15 dollars, 2 bucks more than a bag of salt. The company’s sales were 5 thousand the first year, 25 thousand the second year and we’re on track to sell almost half a million by the end of this year.
Appendix E. Measures & Items Used To Validate Materials (Study 2 Pilot)

Speakers’ Passion

The speaker had energetic body movements
The speaker had rich body language
The speaker showed animated facial expression
The speaker used a lot of gestures
The speaker face lit up when she talked
The speaker talked with varied tone and pitch

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (to a small extent) to 7 (to a large extent)

Believability
Adapted from:

The speaker was believable
The speaker was credible
The speaker was authentic

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)

Perceived Importance
Of EcoTraction

How important is EcoTraction to the speaker?
How much does the speaker personally care about EcoTraction?
How much does EcoTraction mean to the speaker?
How important is EcoTraction for the speaker, compared to other issues?

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much)

Of the Investment

How concerned was the speaker with getting an investment for EcoTraction? How much does getting an investment for EcoTraction mattered to the speaker? How important was getting an investment for EcoTraction to the speaker? Was getting an investment for EcoTraction at the top of the speaker’s priorities list?

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much)

**Presentation Evaluation**


The overall quality of the presentation
The quality of the information presented
The speaker’s knowledge of the subject
The organization of the presentation
The quality of the speaker’s presentation skills

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent)

**Emotions**

* ratings on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)

**Pride**


accomplished
achieving
confident
fulfilled
productive
self-worth
successful

Self-developed
proud to present to investors
proud of the product EcoTraction

**Happiness**

happy
cheerful
delighted
glad
pleased
warmhearted

### Negative Affect


afraid
ashamed
distressed
guilty
hostile
irritable
jittery
nervous
scared
upset

### Authenticity of Emotional Displays


*The speaker seems to be faking how she feels*

* The speaker is probably pretending or putting on an act during the pitch

The speaker seems to genuinely express her emotions

The speaker’s emotions are probably sincere

*The emotions the speaker is showing are probably not real*

*The speaker appears to be displaying emotions that she does not really feel inside*
Appendix F. Instructions for Participants (Study 2)

In this study, we are interested in how people imagine themselves in new roles and how they think and act in those new roles.

We would like you to imagine you are a head of an investment company and that you are interested in investing in a new business. You have 5 years of experience in the field and your company is well known.

You have watched many people pitch their business ideas and products in hope for your investment in their company. Through your many years of experience, entrepreneurs and business owners asked you for a wide range of investments, from very small requests to very large requests. The average investment request people tend to make is approximately $228,000.

Next, you will watch a short video clip in which an entrepreneur will pitch a new product, asking for your help and for your investment. While watching the video, visualize and imagine yourself as an investor, the head of an investment company, focusing on how you would feel and think in the situation. After you will watch the video, you will answer a short survey regarding your impressions of the speaker and the pitch.