Limitations of Environmental Campaigning Based on Values for Money, Image, and Status

Eight Psychologists Reflect on the Disagreement between the Value Modes and Common Cause Approaches

Tim Kasser, Ph.D., Professor & Chair of Psychology, Knox College, Illinois, USA

Tom Crompton, Ph.D., Change Strategist, WWF-UK

valuesandframes.org

Overview

Since 2009, we have been suggesting that there is a potential danger in those aspects of the Value Modes approach which argue that campaigners should attempt to motivate pro-environmental behaviour by connecting such behaviours to aims like money, image, and status.[1] We have carefully grounded the case that we have advanced in the peer-reviewed scientific literature on values. Because some proponents of Value Modes continue to disagree with us on this point, we wanted to ensure that we have been accurately representing psychological understandings concerning this key difference in our perspectives. This briefing reports the results of a short survey we conducted of eight psychologists who have substantial expertise in these areas. All of these psychologists agreed that individuals who are exposed to messages that propound the importance of money, image and status are more likely to continue to prioritize these values than to decrease how much they care about these values, and that this effect is still likely to occur even if those individuals purchased products and services that successfully expressed these values. Thus, these experts' opinions stand in direct contrast to claims made by the proponents of Value Modes but support the argument we have made based in the empirical psychological literature.

---

[1] See, for example: Crompton and Kasser (2009); Crompton (2010); Crompton and Kasser (2010); Crompton (2011)

Introduction

The Value Modes approach, championed by Chris Rose at Campaign Strategy and Pat Dade at Cultural Dynamics Strategy and Marketing Ltd. (CDSM), is a marketing approach used by some for-profit corporations and not-for-profit civil society organizations in order to communicate to and motivate people. It is based in large part on the classic theoretical statements about psychological needs made by the American psychologist Abraham Maslow and the pioneering work on values conducted by the Israeli Professor Shalom Schwartz, as well as the many other researchers who have extended these bodies of literature.

Of Schwartz's work, Rose writes:

> *"Shalom Schwartz works at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and for 40 years, has conducted in depth and international research on personal and cultural values. Working with more than 50 collaborators Shalom Schwartz has used his 'Schwartz Value Inventory' or 'Schwartz Values Survey' based on over 60,000 people across 64 nations on all continents to map common values that acted as 'guiding principles for one's life'... Schwartz identifies a series of values 'antagonisms' and these have been calibrated by Cultural Dynamics [the owners of Value Modes] against the questions used in the British values survey..."[2]*

Dade comments on the robustness of Schwartz's work:

> *"Google 'schwartz values' and you'll get more than you bargained for! This stuff has been validated out to Yin-Yang!"[3]*

The Value Modes approach advocates segmenting audiences according to three primary groupings, depending upon the values that individuals hold to be most

---

[2] Rose, 2009: 8

[3] CDSM, *undated*: 6

important.[4] As Rose and Dade write: "The Values Modes top line is a three level segmentation into Settlers (security driven in Maslowian terms…), Prospectors (outer directed or esteem driven…) and Pioneers (inner directed…)".[5] Rose and Dade argue that members of each of these segments have different reasons for adopting behaviours. "[Y]ou cannot get a Prospector to adopt behaviours for Pioneer reasons for example (so for instance, campaigners or politicians who are dogmatic about why something is done, will not be so successful as those who allow people to join in a behaviour for different reasons)."[6] In line with this logic, Rose and Dade argue that it is crucial to communicate with Prospectors through appeal to values of social status and financial wealth: "[P]rospectors live in the now, for today, and seek rewards in terms of fashion, status, success, achievement and recognition…"[7]

On the basis of this reasoning, Rose suggests that problems like climate change can be tackled by identifying image, financial, and status-based reasons for adopting pro-environmental behaviours and then marketing such behaviours on the basis of these motivations in promotions and campaigns. "The best example is the work of Global Cool", Rose writes: "motivating the uber-Prospector 'Now People' group to turn down their central heating by following fashion and wearing jumpers, avoiding flying by using Eurostar for hedonistic holidays, incentivizing bus travel with lessons in how to chat up strangers…"[8]

The approach that we have been advocating, now outlined in a number of publications, has been called the Common Cause, or 'frames and values' approach.[9] It finds much in common with the Value Modes approach, as it also draws from the empirical work that Schwartz and others have conducted on values, recognizes

---

[4] A Campaign planner overlays the Values Modes with the values map developed by Shalom Schwartz. See: Rose and Dade, 2009.

[5] Rose and Dade, *undated*: 1

[6] Rose and Dade, *undated*: 2

[7] Rose *et al.*, 2005: 3

[8] Rose, 2010: 4

[9] See, for example, Crompton, 2010

the tensions that exist in people's value systems, and acknowledges the need to tailor different communications to different audiences.

In particular, we have been impressed by the large body of research which demonstrates that people have a lower level of concern about a range of social, humanitarian and environmental issues to the extent they prioritize values such as social status, public image, or wealth (what researchers call the self-enhancing or extrinsic values). Notably, these are the very values emphasized by Prospectors in the Value Modes approach. So far as we know, Dade and Rose do not dispute this evidence base, which includes dozens of studies from several laboratories.[10]

While there are strong parallels between the Value Modes and Common Cause approaches, the Common Cause approach departs markedly from the Value Modes approach in one critical respect. Specifically, in light of the growing evidence showing that appeals to values such as image, status, and money often serve to reinforce the importance that people attach to these self-enhancing, extrinsic values and to undermine their concern about social and environmental problems, the Common Cause approach generally argues against appealing to such values, even if they might successfully motivate particular pro-environmental behaviours. Our rationale is that campaigns that appeal to these values will serve to reinforce them, thereby frustrating the emergence of greater concern about social and environmental issues, as well as motivation to behave in other pro-social and pro-environmental ways. Although we acknowledge that there may be some instances where the costs associated with appeals to these values are outweighed by the opportunities offered through appealing to self-enhancement values, we believe that any such trade-offs must be considered very carefully. Specifically, they must be considered in the light of evidence that, when they are exposed to appeals to extrinsic or self-enhancement values, people's motivation to engage in pro-environmental behaviour and to persist in such behaviour is typically diminished.[11]

---

[10] For a summary of this research, see Crompton, 2010 and Holmes *et al.*, 2011
[11] Crompton and Kasser (2009).

There is not space here to rehearse all of the nuances of this debate, and readers are referred elsewhere for this detail.[12] In brief, according to the evidence that we have presented, every campaign premised upon an appeal to self-enhancement values has the potential to make the rest of the job more difficult because it is likely to activate and encourage these values, and therefore undermine public concern about social and environmental problems. So the more successful the Value Modes strategy is in championing self-enhancement values, the more likely it is to undermine public concern about the social and environmental issues that both we and its proponents are trying to address.

We have argued that this effect will operate at two separate levels, further compounding the problems inherent to building a systemic response to challenges like climate change on the basis of the strategies proposed by Dade and Rose.

Firstly, we argue that campaigns that present pro-environmental behaviours as promoting social status or prestige, though possibly effective in promoting particular target behaviours, may well create collateral damage among those who respond to these campaigns. So, for example, as a result of a campaign highlighting the prestige associated with ownership of a new hybrid car, perhaps an individual will go out and buy such a car. But we argue that such an individual is likely to experience *reduced* motivation to act in other pro-environmental ways, in other areas of their life, because in pursuing the social status associated with the ownership of a hybrid car this person's self-enhancement values are likely to have been activated and encouraged, and these are the very values the research shows are associated with worse environmental attitudes and behaviours.[13] Studies support this viewpoint.

Secondly, for every individual who buys a hybrid car as a result of a campaign seeking to highlight the social status associated with such a purchase, there will

[12] See, for example, Crompton and Kasser, 2009; Crompton, 2010; Dade, *undated*; Rose, 2010

[13] For the purposes of exploring this example, in this paper, we ignore the important debate about whether hybrid cars can in fact represent any useful response to environmental challenges!

be very many other people who are exposed to this same campaign but who do not buy a hybrid car as a result. So for every additional hybrid car that is sold as a result of a campaign, perhaps several thousand people see the campaign but do not buy the vehicle. We must therefore ask: what is the effect of such a campaign on these individuals? We argue that exposure to these campaigns is likely to reinforce the importance that individuals place on self-enhancement values.

Despite the extensive evidence that appeals to self-enhancement values are likely to have such effects, the proponents of Value Modes continue to disagree with us on this point. For instance, Rose writes:

> "In Common Cause, Tom Crompton and others argue a form of moral hazard, in other words although this values-matching [the Value Modes approach] might work, it will have a perverse effect of reinforcing a bad behaviour because of its motivation, even if it's a good one in terms of outcomes… This argument is fundamentally flawed…"[14]

Rather, Rose and Dade claim that adopting a pro-environmental behaviour in pursuit of values for image, money, and status is likely to help meet an "unmet need" and therefore lead individuals to develop other needs, such that they will eventually come to place greater importance on the kinds of values that the research shows do indeed promote positive social and environmental behaviours and attitudes. Dade writes:

> "[S]atisfying people's needs, in Maslow terms, acts as a means of fulfilling a needs set and thereby saps or lessens the strength of that value set to influence behaviour"[15];

and,

---

[14] Rose, 2010: 5

[15] Dade, *undated*: 3-4

> *"Common Cause contends that satisfying a need somehow strengthens it. This is contrary to the data that we have captured over the last 40 years from across the world."*[16]

Rose concurs, writing:

> *"...once the underlying dominant unmet need is met, a new one takes its place... So, if Prospectors meet that need by getting enough stuff and following sufficient fashion etc, they do not stay Prospectors but develop other needs – i.e., they become Pioneers"*[17]

An attempt to test the competing perspectives

We have presented the empirical evidence for our claims elsewhere;[18] this evidence continues to accrue, with new studies offering further corroboration for the Common Cause approach.[19]

Nonetheless, given how adamant the Value Modes researchers have been that there are data and theoretical propositions which support their viewpoint, we were concerned that other researchers with expertise in this area might disagree with us on these crucial points. As such, we formulated two scenarios that we felt reflected this key point of difference between the Value Modes and the Common Cause perspectives. We then contacted ten psychologists with expertise in the areas of values, motivation, needs, and ecological sustainability and asked them to explain how they believed that people would respond in these scenarios; eight of the psychologists responded. Appendix 1 lists the people who completed our brief survey, and Appendix 2 presents a sample of the letter we used in approaching them.

---

[16] Dade, *undated*: 4

[17] Rose, 2010: 5-6

[18] Kasser and Crompton, 2010; Crompton, 2010

[19] See, for example, Sheldon *et al.*, 2011

Next, we present the two questions that we posed and the responses that the psychologists provided. The responses to these questions are reproduced in full, although we have corrected some minor typographical errors.

Question 1:

Imagine a person who cares a lot about status, image, money, and achievement, and who is frequently presented in his/her social surround with messages that suggest the importance of these aims in life. Over time, do you think that this person is (i) more likely to continue to think that these aims are important as a result of being presented with these messages, or (ii) more likely to reject these aims in life as a result of being presented with these messages?

All of our respondents agreed that in their view this individual would be more likely to continue to think that these aims are important as a result of being presented with these messages.

Dr. Anat Bardi wrote: "*In terms of the Schwartz (1992) value theory, this would mean that this person values power (status, image, money) and achievement, or more broadly, this person values self-enhancement, i.e., he/she values promoting his/her own interests even at the expense of others. If this person is presented with messages that support these values, in psychological terms it means that these values are constantly primed and strengthened. According to research on value priming (e.g., Maio, 2010) and my model of value change (Bardi & Goodwin, 2011), as these values are primed repeatedly, they are likely to be strengthened. This is likely to happen through an automatic route as well as an effortful route of cognitive processing. Through the automatic route, priming values strengthens links between environmental cues and these values in the way that information is stored in our memory (i.e., our schemas). This serves to strengthen these values automatically, even without awareness on the part of the person. In addition, through the effortful route, messages that strengthen existing values provide people with further proof that the values are indeed important and worth pursuing.*

Hence, through effortful cognitive processing of the person actively thinking about these values and their importance, these values are strengthened and the environmental cues provide evidence and reasons for the importance of these values."

Professor Edward Deci wrote: *"I believe that the person is likely to continue to value the outcomes of status, image, money, and achievement in a context where they are advocated. People often look to others for verification of their beliefs and values and finding affirmation in messages from others will help strengthen the person's own values and goals."*

Dr. Thomas Doherty wrote: *"This person is unlikely to reject the extrinsic aims unless they have been exposed to messages and role models of pro-social and pro-environmental goals and values, ideally in a culturally and developmentally appropriate form and timing."*

Professor Douglas Kenrick wrote: *"(i) more likely to continue, status isn't something that satiates, people move up, then socially compare with a new group. I suspect individual differences may moderate, however."*

Professor Greg Maio wrote: *"More likely to continue to accept."*

Professor Richard Ryan wrote: *"There is considerable evidence that exposure to materialistic messages increases materialism, such as the fact that more exposure to TV is assoc[iated] with increased materialism. There is also increasing evidence that priming extrinsic values decreases pro-social sentiments (e.g., Vohs and Baumeister). If so, then such messages are priming or activating motives antithetical to pro-social actions and sentiments."*

Professor Mark Schaller wrote: *"Given all the research showing how susceptible people are to drawing automatic inferences from the perceptual signals available to them in their local environments (e.g., Bargh's stuff), and all the other research*

showing that people tacitly assume that whatever is common/normative is also good, I think the most likely response is (i)."

Professor Shalom Schwartz wrote: *"Social communications in line with the person's values are likely to reinforce those values. The materialist values mentioned here express a motivation to promote one's personal interests. Social norms in many societies are critical of such values, so that people who hold them and want to act on them may feel some pressure to restrain themselves. Consequently, communications that legitimize these values are likely to make it easier for them to ignore the social norms and to express their materialist values in practice."*

Question 2:

Imagine a person who cares a lot about status, image, money, and achievement. This person is frequently presented in his/her social surround with messages suggesting that these goals can be met through the acquisition of material possessions which convey those characteristics to other people. For example, a house, a car, certain types of clothes or electronics, etc., can lead the person to feel like s/he has the right image, has high status, etc. Imagine that the person does actually acquire those kinds of possessions, in response to those messages. Over time, as this person acquires these possessions, is this person (i) more likely to continue to think that these aims for status, image, etc., are important or (ii) more likely to reject these aims in life?

All our respondents answered that they considered (i) to be the most likely outcome. None offered any support to Rose and Dade's assertion that acquisition of these possessions would "meet unmet needs" and thereby diminish the importance that this hypothetical individual placed on self-enhancement values.

Dr. Bardi wrote: *"In terms of the Schwartz (1992) value theory, this would mean that this person values power (status, image, money) and achievement, or more broadly, this person values self-enhancement, i.e., he/she values promoting his/her own interests even at the expense of others. Messages portraying that self-enhancement values can be fulfilled by material possessions serve to instantiate these values. According to research (Maio et al., 2009), this instantiation of values through linking them to specific behaviours increases the chances of the person acting according to these values, i.e., purchasing these products. As the person purchases these products, which create a feeling of value fulfilment, over time, according to the suggestion made by Bardi and Goodwin (2011), these values are likely to be strengthened even more. This is because people tend to look at how they behave and justify their behaviours with values. Hence, successful behaviour according to values is likely to strengthen these values."*

Professor Deci wrote: *"Empirical evidence indicates that people tend to attain the goals and values they believe to be important, and interestingly, attaining the values of status, image, and money does not make the person happier but surprisingly seems to make the person less happy. It is likely that this is because those goals and values do not become less important when attained but instead they require even more attainment."*

Dr. Doherty wrote: *"The person is likely to continue to think that these aims for status, image, etc., are important. As above, they are unlikely to reject these aims in life and focus on pro-social and pro-environmental values and goals unless they have been exposed to models of pro-social and pro-environmental goals and values, again ideally in a culturally and developmentally appropriate form and timing."*

Professor Kenrick wrote: *"More likely to continue again; no evidence I've seen that attaining status satiates (though I admit I haven't looked at actual research literature on this!)"*

Professor Maio wrote: *"The person will continue to embrace these aims. After some ultra-high level of acquisition, the person may begin to acknowledge that these acquisitions are not the only things in life. This acknowledgement, however, would not be the same thing as rejecting the self-enhancement values. Emotionally and behaviorally, the attachment to them should remain strong in most cases. The openness to other values may simply emerge out of recognition that the self-enhancement values can only get a person so far. It is likely that a considerable amount of psychological conflict and hypocrisy could arise if this openness leads to an increased overt commitment to self-transcendent concerns."*

Professor Ryan wrote: *"there is no evidence for a satiation effect. There is no evidence that people become more pro-social when basic material needs are satisfied. This is an assumption that appears to be based on Maslow's hierarchy, a model which itself is not empirically supported."*

Professor Schaller wrote: *"Given all the research that shows that people justify their choices by evaluating them positively (e.g., cognitive dissonance work), and other research that shows that people infer their own traits/attitudes from their behaviors/context (e.g., self-perception work), I think the most likely response is (i)."*

Professor Schwartz wrote: *"People with strong materialist values who successfully acquire many materialist possessions may increase the importance they accord to these aims or, at the very least, accord them the same level of importance. What is quite certain, however, is that they will not reject these aims. Nor will they become more open to appeals for pro-social action or develop pro-social values instead. Acquiring such possessions is not a matter of satisfying basic survival needs that might free people to consider other motivations. Rather, it is liable to reinforce self-enhancing values and motivations which typically come at the expense of other-enhancing values and motivations."*

Conclusion and a challenge

Over the last two years, we have attempted to engage the Value Modes proponents in a number of ways in order to understand the similarities and differences between our perspectives. We have presented findings from dozens of peer-reviewed empirical studies which support our viewpoint, but when we have asked to see the studies which the Value Modes proponents claim support their perspective, we have been told that those are not publicly available. We have invited the Value Modes researchers to collaborate on a research project we are undertaking, but they declined. We have repeatedly asked them to direct us to specific places in the work of Schwartz and Maslow that support the Value Modes interpretation of those psychologists' work, but have yet to receive a response.

All of the psychologists we surveyed have published peer-reviewed empirical research and/or theoretical papers directly relevant to the debate between our perspective and that of Value Modes. All of the psychologists agreed that: a) individuals frequently presented with messages encouraging the values of status, money, and image would be more likely to continue to think that those values are important; and b) even if individuals obtained possessions which conveyed status and the right image, they would be more likely to continue to think that those values were important. Thus, yet again, we could find no support for the Value Modes claim that selling people environmental products and behaviours on the basis of appeals to money, image and status would eventually help them to "graduate" to more pro-social and pro-environmental values and behaviours. Instead, in line with the empirical and theoretical literature, these psychologists agreed that such appeals are likely to support those very values known to be associated with worse environmental (and social) behaviours.

We recognise, of course, that there are limitations to this survey. Our letter introducing the scenarios could have biased our respondents' answers, and some of the respondents are psychologists who we already knew or with whom we have collaborated in the past. We nonetheless trust that these individuals, many of

whom are used to public disagreements, would honestly share their opinions if they felt that our perspective was misinformed.

Despite its weaknesses, we believe that this survey, in combination with the other evidence we have presented elsewhere, should be sufficient to shift the burden of proof onto the proponents of the Value Modes approach. If we – and each of the psychologists who responded to our survey – are mistaken in our approach, then now is the time for Rose, Dade, and others who support the Value Modes perspective to highlight the theoretical statements that psychologists have made which support their viewpoint and to present empirical research that substantiates their position and that can be examined straightaway by all those who are interested in this debate.

We are confident that the proponents of Value Modes agree with us that humans cannot afford to waste time on strategies which fail to meet, in a proportional and systemic way, the serious environmental and social problems that the world faces. As such, we hope that they either rise to our challenge or that they revise their approach to bring it into line with the empirical and theoretical literature.

valuesandframes.org

Psychologists who responded to our brief survey

Dr. Anat Bardi, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. Bardi studied for her Ph.D. under Professor Shalom Schwartz (see below) and has continued to publish important papers in this tradition.

Professor Edward L. Deci and Professor Richard M. Ryan, Department of Clinical and Social Psychology, University of Rochester, USA. Deci & Ryan are the founders of self-determination theory, the most widely-known and empirically supported contemporary need-based theory of motivation and well-being; Ryan is also Editor-in-Chief of the peer-reviewed scientific journal *Motivation and Emotion*.

Dr. Thomas Doherty, Associate Coordinator of Ecopsychology Studies at the Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling, USA. Doherty was a member of the American Psychological Association's Climate Change Task Force and is also Editor-in-Chief of the peer-reviewed scientific journal *Ecopsychology*.

Professor Douglas Kenrick, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, USA, and Professor Mark Schaller, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Canada. Kenrick and Schaller recently collaborated on a paper concerning Maslow's hierarchy of needs in a high-profile psychology journal (*Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2010).

Professor Greg Maio, Department of Psychology, University of Cardiff, UK. Maio has published extensively on the psychological connections between values and behaviour.

Professor Shalom Schwartz, Department of Psychology, Hebrew University, Israel, where he is Leon and Clara Sznajderman Professor Emeritus of Psychology. For 40 years, Schwartz has conducted in-depth research on personal and cultural values. His research has influenced many fields, including organizational behaviour, marketing, political psychology and developmental psychology.

Sample Letter sent to Psychologists

Dear Dr. Kenrick

I am writing to you because of your expertise in the area of psychological needs, having seen that you recently published a paper in *Perspectives in Psychological Science* on the pyramid of needs.

I'd like to give you a little background about why I am writing and then am hoping you might have the time to reply to two questions.

I have been working for the last two years with a group of NGOs in the UK to apply the results of recent research on cultural values to social and environmental campaigning. This work is gaining traction, as some large NGOs in the UK (e.g., WWF, Oxfam) are beginning the process of re-thinking their campaign strategies and communications in the light of an understanding of Shalom Schwartz's work on values and work my colleagues and I have conducted on values and goals. If you are interested, you can read more about the application of this research to NGO activities in the Common Cause report (www.wwf.org.uk/commoncause), to which I contributed.

One thrust of this work has been to argue that there are potential problems with NGO campaigns that attempt to motivate pro-social and pro-environmental behavior through appeal to social status, image, or financial success (a strategy employed by a great deal of 'green marketing'). We have been arguing that the research suggests that such values are typically opposed to the emergence of pro-social and pro-environmental concern (e.g., Schwartz, 1992; Grouzet et al., 2005) and that, to the extent that these goals and values are held to be important, they are likely to suppress the values that typically support pro-social and pro-environmental concerns (e.g., Maio et al., 2009).

Our arguments have been challenged by a group of campaign consultants who accept the Schwartz model, but who argue that the best way to encourage certain people to prioritize the values and goals associated with pro-social and pro-environmental behaviors and attitudes is to 'satisfy' (their word) values and goals concerning status, image, and money. Their arguments draw heavily upon their interpretation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, as they believe that this theory suggests that providing the means to fulfill a desire for material objects and social

status is the best way of encouraging people to 'graduate' to more pro-social and pro-environmental goals and values. Notably, the campaign consultants are not applying these arguments to the case of truly poor people who do not have enough to eat or suitable shelter; instead, they are arguing that this is the case for individuals in the economically developed world whose basic physical needs are met but who care a good deal about status, image, and the attainment of material possessions which convey those aims.

I am concerned that, in advising these NGOs, I am accurately reflecting the understanding of the psychology community on this point, as this is becoming an increasingly important debate amongst a wide range of NGOs in the UK. As such, I'd be very grateful if you would take the time to briefly answer the two questions that I pose below (just a few sentences on each would be wonderful). We may well want to make your reflections public, in the course of pursuing this debate further, and if you are amenable to that possibility, I would be grateful if you could formulate your replies in light of this expectation.

Question 1:

Imagine a person who cares a lot about status, image, money, and achievement, and who is frequently presented in his/her social surround with messages that suggest the importance of these aims in life. Over time, do you think that this person is (i) more likely to continue to think that these aims are important as a result of being presented with these messages, or (ii) more likely to reject these aims in life as a result of being presented with these messages? Why?

Question 2:

Imagine a person who cares a lot about status, image, money, and achievement. This person is frequently presented in his/her social surround with messages suggesting that these goals can be met through the acquisition of material possessions that convey those characteristics to other people. For example, a house, a car, certain types of clothes or electronics, etc., can lead the person to feel like s/he has the right image, has high status, etc. Imagine that the person does actually acquire those kinds of possessions, in response to those messages. Over time, as this person acquires these possessions, is this person (i) more likely to continue to think that these aims for status, image, etc., are important or (ii) more likely to reject these aims in life and focus on pro-social and pro-environmental values and goals? Why?

I sincerely appreciate you taking the time to read thus far, and I look forward to hearing your replies to my questions. Please do let me know if there is any other information you require in order to help me in this endeavor.

Best wishes,

Tim Kasser, Ph.D.
Professor & Chair of Psychology
Knox College, Galesburg, IL, USA

References

CDSM (*undated*) Managing Talented People: Managing a Resource, or Managing a Process of Resourcefulness? Available at: http://bit.ly/eSTXDg (accessed on 15 August, 2011).

Crompton, T. and Kasser, T. (2009) *Meeting Environmental Challenges: The Role of Human Identity*. WWF-UK: Godalming, UK.

Crompton, T. (2010) *Common Cause: The Case for Working with our Cultural Values*. COIN, CPRE, FOE, Oxfam, WWF-UK: Godalming, UK.

Crompton, T. and Kasser, T. (2010) Human Identity: A Missing Link in Environmental Campaigning, *Environment*, 52, 23-33.

Crompton, T. (2011) Finding Cultural Values that can Transform the Climate Change Debate, *Solutions*, 2, 56-63.

Dade, P. (*undated*) An Open Letter from Pat Dade, Founding Director of Cultural Dynamics Strategy & Marketing Ltd.

Holmes, T., Blackmore, E., Hawkins, R. and Wakeford, T. (2011) *The Common Cause Handbook*, PIRC: Machynlleth, Wales. Available at: valuesandframes.org (Accessed 15 August, 2011).

Rose, C. (2009) VBCOP – A Unifying Campaign Strategy Model. Available at: http://bit.ly/nRUqNQ (accessed 15 August, 2011).

Rose, C. (2010) Campaign Strategy Newsletter 66, 'Change Outcomes Issue'. Available at: http://bit.ly/94qTgS (accessed on 15 August, 2011).

Rose, C. and Dade, P. (2009) *International Values Outline Campaign Planner*. Available at: http://bit.ly/vqxGK (accessed on 15 August, 2011).

Rose, C. and Dade, P. (*undated*) Using Values Modes. Available at: http://bit.ly/fa7SMG (accessed on 15 August, 2011).

Rose, C., Dade, P., Gallie, N. and Scott, J. (2005) Climate Change Communications – Dipping a toe into public motivation. Available at: http://bit.ly/mVKtOF (accessed on 15 August, 2011).

Sheldon, K.M., Nichols, C.P. and Kasser, T. (2011) Americans recommend smaller ecological footprints when reminded of intrinsic American values of self-expression, family and generosity. *Ecopsychology*, 3, 97-104.