1   DoPL

2   Ithurburn, Andrew[1] & Moore, Adam[1]

3   [1] The University of Edinburgh

4   Author Note

11   **Methods**

12   Participants were a convenience sample of 111 individuals from Prolific Academic's

13   crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io). Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing

14   service that provides participants access to studies hosted on third party websites.

15   Participants were required to be 18 years of age or older and be able to read and

16   understand English. Participants received £4.00, which is above the current minimum

17   wage pro-rata in the United Kingdom, as compensation for completing the survey. The

18   Psychology Research Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study

19   procedures [ref: $\#\#\#\#$].

20   **Materials**

21   *Demographic Questionnaire.* In a demographic questionnaire administered prior to

22   the main survey, participants were invited to respond to questions about their

23   self-identified demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and ethnic origin.

24   *Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation.* The 18-item Dominance, Prestige,

25   and Leadership scale [DoPL; Suessenbach, Loughnan, Schönbrodt, and Moore (2019)], is

26   used to measure dominance, prestige, and leadership orientation. Each question

27   corresponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is scored across six unique items

28   related to those domains (e.g., "I relish opportunities in which I can lead others" for

29   leadership) rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Internal

30   consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.86$.

31   *Domain Specific Risk-taking Scale* (DOSPERT; Weber, Blais, and Betz (2002)) is a

32   scale assessing individuals' likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors within 5 domain

33   specific risky situations: financial, social, recreational, health and safety, and ethical

34 situations. Each risky situation is then rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 being very

35 unlikely and 5 being very likely). Two additional five-point Likert scales assess risk

36 perception and expected benefits (1 being not at all risky and 5 being extremely risky; 1

37 being no benefits at all and 5 being great benefits) respectively. Example risky situations

38 are "Admitting that your tastes are different from those of a friend" and "Drinking heavily

39 at a social function." Internal consistency reliability for the current samples for the 3

40 sub-domains are $\alpha = 0.85$, $\alpha = 0.90$, $\alpha = 0.92$ respectively.

Procedure

42 Participants were recruited via a study landing page on Prolific's website or via a

43 direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific FAQ, 2018). The study landing page included

44 a brief description of the study including any risks and benefits along with expected

45 compensation for successful completion. Participants accepted participation in the

46 experiment and were directed to the main survey (Qualtrics, Inc; Provo, UT) they were

47 shown a brief message on study consent.

48 Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they answered a series

49 of demographic questions. Once completed, participants completed the Dominance,

50 Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific Risk-taking scale. The two scales

51 were counterbalanced to account for order effects. After completion of the main survey,

52 participants were shown a debriefing statement that briefly mentions the purpose of the

53 experiment along with the contact information of the main researcher (AI). Participants

54 were compensated £4.00 via Prolific Academic.

Data analysis

56 Demographic characteristics were analyzed use lkhds iufhdsiua hfiuds hfiudsa hiuf

57 hdsa fdsiua fiudsa hiuf hdsiua fsdf

58   **Results**

59   **Discussion**

References

Suessenbach, F., Loughnan, S., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Moore, A. B. (2019). The dominance, prestige, and leadership account of social power motives. *European Journal of Personality, 33*(1), 7–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2184

Weber, E. U., Blais, A.-R., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 15*(4), 263–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.414