

Running Head: APPROACH-AVOIDANCE ASSOCIATIVE NETWORKS

**For Which Side the Bell Tolls:**

**The Laterality of Approach-Avoidance Associative Networks**

Adam K. Fetterman, Scott Ode, and Michael D. Robinson

North Dakota State University

NOTE: Correspondence can be sent to Adam Fetterman, Psychology (NDSU Dept., 2765), PO

Box 6050, Fargo, ND 58108-6050. Internet correspondence can be directed to

Adam.Fetterman@my.ndsu.edu. This publication was made possible by COBRE Grant P20

RR020151 from the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR), a component of the

National Institutes of Health (NIH). Its contents are the sole responsibility of the authors and do

not necessary reflect the official views of NCRR or NIH.

## Abstract

The two hemispheres of the brain appear to play different roles in emotion and/or motivation. A great deal of previous research has examined the valence hypothesis (left hemisphere = positive; right = negative), but an increasing body of work has supported the motivational hypothesis (left hemisphere = approach; right = avoidance) as an alternative. The present investigation ( $N = 117$ ) sought to provide novel support for the latter perspective. Left versus right hemispheres were briefly activated by neutral lateralized auditory primes. Subsequently, participants categorized approach versus avoidance words as quickly and accurately as possible. Performance in the task revealed that approach-related thoughts were more accessible following left-hemispheric activation, whereas avoidance-related thoughts were more accessible following right-hemispheric activation. The present results are the first to examine such lateralized differences in accessible motivational thoughts, which may underlie more “downstream” manifestations of approach and avoidance motivation such as judgments, decision making, and behavior.

**KEYWORDS:** Approach, Avoidance, Motivation, Priming, Laterality

## For Which Side the Bell Tolls:

### The Laterality of Approach-Avoidance Associative Networks

The left and right hemispheres of the brain appear to play differential roles in emotion and/or motivation. Much of this research has focused on what is termed the valence hypothesis (Davidson, 1984). Accordingly to this hypothesis, positive affect is differentially lateralized to the left hemisphere, whereas negative affect is differentially lateralized to the right hemisphere. Early support for this valence hypothesis came from lesion-related research, which suggested that lesions to the left hemisphere render individuals more depressed, whereas lesions to the right hemisphere render individuals more excitable or manic (Robinson & Price, 1982). Some subsequent work found evidence for the idea that individuals with higher levels of left brain activation in resting electroencephalogram (EEG) records reported experiencing higher levels of positive relative to negative emotion (e.g., Tomarken, Davidson, Wheeler, & Doss, 1992). Further, there is also some evidence for the idea that pleasant (e.g., sweet tastes) relative to unpleasant (e.g., bitter tastes) sources of stimulation shift brain activation (again, as assessed in EEG terms) leftward (Davidson, 1992).

Increasingly so, though, results have favored a motivational hypothesis of cerebral asymmetry instead. According to this hypothesis, the left hemisphere differentially specializes in approach motivation, whereas the right hemisphere differentially specializes in avoidance motivation (Harmon-Jones, Gable, & Peterson, 2010). In favor of this idea is the fact that resting EEG asymmetries are better predictors of reactions to motivation-relevant stimuli rather than resting mood states (Davidson, 1999). In addition, Sutton and Davidson (1997) found that EEG asymmetries better predicted individual differences in approach versus avoidance motivation

1  
2  
3  
4 than individual differences in positive versus negative emotional experiences. Perhaps most  
5  
6 compelling, though, are results involving anger. Anger is negatively valenced (Russell & Barrett,  
7  
8 1999) and yet approach-oriented in nature (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009). A series of studies  
9  
10 has shown that leftward asymmetries in the EEG predict higher levels of trait and state anger as  
11  
12 well as aggressive responses to provocations (Harmon-Jones et al., 2010). Moreover, anger  
13  
14 inductions shift the EEG asymmetry leftward (Harmon-Jones, Sigelman, Bohlig, & Harmon-  
15  
16 Jones, 2003), good evidence for the motivational hypothesis.  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 *Asymmetry Manipulations and Their Consequences*

22

23  
24 The studies reviewed above measured rather than manipulated cortical asymmetry (or  
25  
26 treated it as a dependent measure: Davidson, 1992). In this context, manipulations of asymmetry  
27  
28 may have a high degree of value. Fortunately, there is considerable support for the idea that  
29  
30 rightward manipulations of the body activate the left hemisphere and leftward manipulations of  
31  
32 the body activate the right hemisphere (Kinsbourne & Hicks, 1978). Therefore, causal support  
33  
34 for either the valence or motivational hypothesis can be obtained by manipulating such  
35  
36 lateralized inputs (Bryden, 1982; Ehrlichman, 1984; Malamed & Larsen, 1977).  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Studies using such manipulations have primarily sought to test the valence hypothesis,  
42  
43 but several results appear to implicate the motivational hypothesis in addition or instead. Drake  
44  
45 (1987) found that people were more optimistic concerning the future when relevant events (e.g.,  
46  
47 traveling to Europe) were presented to the left relative to right hemisphere in auditory terms.  
48  
49 Optimism is not only positive, but is thought to result from higher levels of approach motivation  
50  
51 (Carver & Scheier, 1998). Bassel and Schiff (2001) found that tactile stimulation to the right arm  
52  
53 (which would activate the left hemisphere) relative to the left arm led to greater persistence on  
54  
55 unsolvable puzzles. This might be interpreted in terms of positive expectations of performance,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 but persistence is perhaps a better marker of approach motivation in the achievement realm  
5  
6 (Elliot, Maier, Moller, Friedman, & Meinhardt, 2007). Finally, there is evidence that activation  
7  
8 of the left (right) hemisphere results in faster finger flexion (extension) movements (Maxwell &  
9  
10 Davidson, 2007; Schiff & Bassel, 1996). It is difficult to view these results in terms of the  
11  
12 valence hypotheses, but movements are also complex indicators of approach and avoidance  
13  
14 motivation, in that several studies have shown that the same movements appear to be  
15  
16 conceptualized as approach- or avoidance-related in different conditions (Eder & Rothermund,  
17  
18 2008; Bonezzi, Brendl, & De Angelis, 2011; Seibt, Neumann, Nussinson, & Strack, 2008).  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24       Accordingly, one purpose of the present experiment was to provide more definitive  
25  
26 evidence for the motivational hypothesis in the realm of manipulations of asymmetry. A second  
27  
28 purpose was to extend our understanding of the consequences of asymmetry manipulations. In  
29  
30 relation to both goals, we focused on cognitive accessibility processes, which have not – to our  
31  
32 knowledge – been investigated in prior studies of the present type. The importance of this line of  
33  
34 investigation is that several prominent social cognitive theories contend that people’s  
35  
36 motivations follow from their accessible (presumably more activated) motivation-related  
37  
38 thoughts, with supporting evidence (Gollwitzer & Bargh, 2005; Kruglanski et al., 2002). For  
39  
40 example, primes of achievement motivation result in behaviors consistent with higher levels of  
41  
42 achievement motivation (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Ferguson, Hassin, & Bargh, 2008).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49       Accessibility is conceptually defined in terms of the ease with which stimuli can be  
50  
51 recognized as examples of their categories (Bruner, 1957; Higgins, 1996). The best way of  
52  
53 *assessing* accessibility, we maintain, is to ask individuals to categorize stimuli as quickly as  
54  
55 possible, with accessibility defined in terms of a faster speed of categorization (Robinson, 2004).  
56  
57  
58 This method of assessing accessibility has yielded many dividends in previous studies (e.g.,  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Robinson & Compton, 2008; Robinson & Neighbors, 2006). To examine the motivational  
5  
6 hypothesis in the present investigation, then, each trial began with a lateral auditory prime  
7  
8 designed to activate one hemisphere or the other. Subsequently, participants categorized an  
9  
10 action word as approach-related (e.g., approach, pursue) or avoidance-related (e.g., avoid,  
11  
12 retreat) in nature. Approach categorizations should be faster following left-hemisphere activation  
13  
14 and avoidance categorizations should be faster following right-hemisphere activation, results that  
15  
16 would significantly extend prior work the motivational hypothesis of cerebral asymmetry.  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 Method

22  
23 *Participants and General Procedures.* Participants were 117 (72 female) undergraduates  
24  
25 from North Dakota State University seeking course credit. They completed an E-Prime program  
26  
27 in groups of 6 or less on personal computers while wearing headphones capable of presenting  
28  
29 lateralized auditory input. Instructions stated that they should listen to sounds and then categorize  
30  
31 words as quickly and accurately as possible and that these were two independent tasks.  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 *Manipulation.* Lateralized sounds have been shown to activate the contralateral  
37  
38 hemisphere in EEG paradigms (Kinsbourne & Hicks, 1978) and to shift attention in a manner  
39  
40 favoring the activated hemisphere (Malamed & Larsen, 1977). Accordingly, lateralized sounds  
41  
42 were used as hemispheric primes in the present investigation. Specifically, we presented the  
43  
44 Windows XP Ringout tone to either the left or right ear prior to each categorization effort in a  
45  
46 within-subject cognitive design. We chose this tone because we deemed it affectively neutral in  
47  
48 that it was lacking in semantic content, not loud, and relatively mundane.  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 *Dependent Task.* The dependent task asked individuals to as quickly and accurately as  
54  
55 possible categorize verbs consistent with approach-related actions (stimuli = advance, approach,  
56  
57 proceed, pursue, & seek) versus avoidance-related actions (stimuli = avoid, escape, evade,  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 retreat, & withdrawal). The words were drawn from a thesaurus and were face-valid. It was  
5  
6 deemed best to repeat these words rather than including marginal exemplars (e.g., “investigate”  
7  
8 for approach), which would be associated with lower accuracy rates and effortful decision  
9  
10 processes not suited to examine the accessibility construct (Higgins, 1996; Robinson, 2004). The  
11  
12 approach and avoidance words did not significantly differ in their number of letters,  $t = 0.22$ ,  $p >$   
13  
14  $.80$ , or word frequency – i.e., the frequency of the word’s usage in typical English language texts  
15  
16 (Kucera & Francis, 1967),  $t = 1.23$ ,  $p > .25$ .  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Word stimuli were assigned to trials at random, capitalized, and presented in a white 18  
22  
23 point Arial font against a black background. Participants used a button box, associated with low  
24  
25 millisecond error, to make their categorizations. It was deemed best to use a constant set of  
26  
27 response mappings for the task, thereby mitigating response factors in the interpretation of the  
28  
29 results. Avoidance words were to be categorized by pressing the 1 key of the response box using  
30  
31 the left hand pointer finger, whereas approach words were to be categorized by pressing the 5  
32  
33 key of the response box using the right hand pointer finger.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 *Trial Procedures.* Each trial began with a 250 ms blank screen. Then, the Windows XP  
39  
40 Ringout tone was presented for 500 ms, lateralized to either the left or right ear. Following  
41  
42 offset, there was a brief 100 ms delay before the trial-specific word was presented. To facilitate  
43  
44 accurate responding, a 1000 ms visual error message followed incorrect responses. There were  
45  
46 120 total trials. The task took approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete.  
47  
48  
49

50 *Data Preparation.* In the computation of reaction time means, we used standard  
51  
52 procedures. Inaccurate responses were dropped (Ratcliff, 1993). Millisecond values were then  
53  
54 log-transformed to reduce positive skew and log-transformed times lesser or greater than 2.5 *SDs*  
55  
56 from the grand latency mean were replaced with such 2.5 *SD* values (Robinson, 2007a).  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Accuracy rates were not outside acceptable skew values and did not require transformation. We  
5  
6 then averaged (log-transformed) reaction time values and accuracy rates as a function of the 2  
7  
8 (auditory side) by 2 (word type) repeated measures design. Although raw millisecond values  
9  
10 were not analyzed, they will be reported in understanding the nature of significant effects.  
11  
12

## 13 14 Results

### 15 16 *Results Involving Reaction Time*

17  
18 We hypothesized that approach words would be categorized more quickly following  
19  
20 right-ear auditory primes and that avoidance words would be categorized more quickly following  
21  
22 left-ear auditory primes. To examine this hypothesis, a repeated-measures ANOVA was  
23  
24 performed with log-transformed reaction times as the dependent variable. The main effect for  
25  
26 Auditory Side was not significant,  $F < 1$ . Thus, it was not the case that right-lateralized sounds  
27  
28 facilitated response times in general. On the other hand, there was a significant main effect for  
29  
30 Word Type,  $F(1, 116) = 5.03, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .04$ , such that approach words were generally  
31  
32 categorized more quickly ( $M = 663$  ms) than avoidance words ( $M = 672$  ms). This main effect  
33  
34 for word type appears consistent with the idea that individuals typically adopt an approach-  
35  
36 related orientation to the environment (Cacioppo, Gardner, & Berntson, 1999).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Of more importance, the hypothesized Auditory Side by Word Type interaction was  
44  
45 significant,  $F(1, 116) = 21.10, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .15$ . For illustrative purposes, millisecond means for  
46  
47 the interaction are graphically displayed in Figure 1. To further understand the nature of the  
48  
49 interaction, we performed two follow-up one-way repeated-measures ANOVAs to test priming  
50  
51 effects for each motivation type separately considered. Approach words were categorized more  
52  
53 quickly following right than left ear auditory primes,  $F(1, 116) = 12.00, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .09$ .  
54  
55  
56  
57 Conversely, avoidance words were categorized more quickly following left than right auditory  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 primes,  $F(1, 116) = 9.88, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .08$ . Such results provide novel support for the idea that  
5  
6 approach and avoidance motivation are lateralized, importantly extending such effects to the  
7  
8 burgeoning social cognitive literature examining accessibility processes in basic categorization  
9  
10 tasks (Fazio & Olson, 2003).  
11  
12

### 13 *Results Involving Accuracy Rates*

14  
15 Accuracy rates were examined to rule out speed-accuracy tradeoffs in responding.  
16  
17 Additionally, though, we deemed it possible that categorization accuracy, too, would support our  
18  
19 interactive predictions. In a repeated-measures ANOVA parallel to that above, there was no main  
20  
21 effect for Auditory Side,  $F < 1$ . In addition, the main effect for Word Type was not significant,  $p$   
22  
23  $> .10$ . On the other hand, a significant Auditory Side by Word Type interaction was found,  $F(1,$   
24  
25  $116) = 7.51, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ . Two follow-up repeated-measures ANOVAs, one for each word  
26  
27 type, were performed. Approach words were categorized more accurately following right ear ( $M$   
28  
29  $= 95.01\%$ ) than left ear ( $M = 93.45\%$ ) auditory stimulation, a marginally significant effect,  $F(1,$   
30  
31  $116) = 3.22, p < .10, \eta_p^2 = .03$ . By contrast, avoidance words were categorized more accurately  
32  
33 following left ear ( $M = 93.87\%$ ) than right ear ( $M = 92.36\%$ ) auditory stimulation, a significant  
34  
35 effect,  $F(1, 116) = 5.00, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .04$ . Accordingly, accuracy rates too suggested that  
36  
37 priming the left (right) hemisphere facilitates the categorization of approach (avoidance) action  
38  
39 words and associated motivational states.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 Discussion

49  
50 The present work sought to make two unique contributions. First, prior manipulation  
51  
52 work – in which one hemisphere versus the other is activated through lateral priming  
53  
54 manipulations – has largely focused on the valence hypothesis. Instead, we focused on the  
55  
56 motivational hypothesis. Second, no prior work has examined whether cognitive accessibility  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 processes, as can be assessed in reaction time paradigms (Robinson, 2004), systematically differ  
5  
6 as the motivational hypothesis might contend. In fact, we found that approach-related words  
7  
8 were categorized more quickly when the left hemisphere was primed, whereas avoidance-related  
9  
10 words were categorized more quickly when the right hemisphere was primed. In sum, the results  
11  
12 both support the motivational hypothesis and extend it to the novel realm of accessible thoughts  
13  
14 related to approach versus avoidance.  
15  
16  
17

### 18 *Theoretical Considerations*

19  
20  
21       Accessibility perspectives of social cognition are typically straightforward from a  
22  
23 semantic content perspective (Higgins & Bargh, 1987). For example, the activation of hostile  
24  
25 thoughts typically results in hostile feelings and behaviors (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). The  
26  
27 present results are novel to this literature in the sense that primes were neutral, constant across  
28  
29 hemispheres, and yet it was found that such primes activated approach-related thoughts when  
30  
31 presented to the left hemisphere, but avoidance-related thoughts when presented to the right  
32  
33 hemisphere. Such findings contribute to a small but growing body of work suggesting that there  
34  
35 are significant bodily inputs to accessible thoughts that are not well-captured by traditional,  
36  
37 content-based theories of social cognitive priming (Landau, Meier, & Keefer, 2010; Niedenthal,  
38  
39 Barsalou, Winkielman, Krauth-Gruber & Ric, 2005).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46       Accessible thoughts are thought to guide subsequent behavior and decision making  
47  
48 (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). Further, several prominent theories of motivation adopt an  
49  
50 accessibility perspective (Gollwitzer & Bargh, 2005; Ferguson et al., 2008; Kruglanski et al.,  
51  
52 2002). Along these lines, and of direct relevance to the present findings, previous studies of ours  
53  
54 have shown that reaction time tasks designed to assess the accessibility of approach and  
55  
56 avoidance information possess considerable value in predicting individual differences in  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 extraversion (Robinson, Moeller, Ode, 2010), neuroticism (Robinson, Ode, Moeller, & Goetz,  
5  
6 2007), self-regulation (Robinson, 2007b), emotion regulation (Tamir, Robinson, & Soldberg,  
7  
8 2006), and numerous outcomes purported to follow from approach or avoidance motivation  
9  
10 (Robinson, Meier, Tamir, Wilkowski, & Ode, 2009). These considerations suggest, but do not  
11  
12 demonstrate, that the present interactive tendencies might mediate some of the other presumably  
13  
14 more downstream effects of lateral stimulation such as optimism (Drake, 1987) or task  
15  
16 persistence (Bassel & Schiff, 2001).  
17  
18  
19  
20

21           Finally, motivation is typically conceptualized in terms of long-term efforts to achieve  
22  
23 relevant outcomes (McClelland, 1987). The present priming effects suggest a greater degree of  
24  
25 malleability to approach and avoidance motivation than captured by such long-term perspectives.  
26  
27 Indeed, we found pronounced and rapid trial-to-trial variations in the accessibility of approach  
28  
29 versus avoidance thoughts. Further, although approach and avoidance motivation are viewed as  
30  
31 largely independent on the basis of trait literatures (e.g., Elliot & Thrash, 2002), state levels of  
32  
33 approach and avoidance motivation may be more inversely related (Cacioppo et al., 1999). Our  
34  
35 results support this point in that lateralized primes resulted in a cross-over interaction in the  
36  
37 accessibility of approach versus avoidance thoughts.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

#### 43 *Additional Considerations*

44  
45           There are multiple opportunities to replicate the present results in more brain-based  
46  
47 terms. First, it may be useful to determine whether lesions to the right (relative to the left)  
48  
49 hemisphere are predictive of accessibility favoring approach-related thoughts (Robinson & Price,  
50  
51 1982). Second, we suggest that resting EEG asymmetry favoring the left hemisphere may predict  
52  
53 faster categorizations of approach relative to avoidance stimuli (Davidson, 1999). Third, it might  
54  
55 be useful to examine whether repeated practice in categorizing stimuli as approach-related  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 (versus avoidance-related) would shift cerebral asymmetry in a leftward direction, much as  
5  
6  
7 triggers of approach motivation (e.g., a pleasant taste) have done so in previous EEG studies  
8  
9 (Davidson, 1992; Harmon-Jones et al., 2003).

10  
11       Murphy, Nimmo-Smith, and Lawrence (2003) found that EEG evidence for the left  
12  
13 hemisphere's role in approach-motivated emotions was quite a bit more consistent than the right  
14  
15 hemisphere's role in avoidance-motivated emotions. Our findings might be viewed as supporting  
16  
17 this asymmetry in motivational asymmetry. Specifically, following left-hemisphere activation,  
18  
19 people categorized approach-related stimuli faster than avoidance-related stimuli (see Figure 1).  
20  
21 On the other hand, following right-hemisphere activation, accessibility for approach and  
22  
23 avoidance thoughts was roughly equal (again, see Figure 1). However, this component of the  
24  
25 interaction should probably be interpreted in the context of a main effect for word type which  
26  
27 would tend to work against the idea that the right hemisphere is more accessible for avoidance-  
28  
29 than approach-related thoughts. Regardless, future manipulation studies of the present type  
30  
31 should be mindful of such potential asymmetries in asymmetry.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38       In addition, a role for asymmetry in emotion and/or motivation has received much better  
39  
40 support in EEG studies than in fMRI studies (Herrington et al., 2010). This is likely so because  
41  
42 asymmetries in approach-avoidance motivation rely on large-scale cortical networks of the EEG  
43  
44 type rather than quite localized activity of the fMRI type (Harmon-Jones et al., 2010). Given the  
45  
46 present results, and the results of prior asymmetry manipulation studies (Bryden, 1982;  
47  
48 Ehrlichman, 1984; Malamed & Larsen, 1977), it is probably safe to say that large-scale  
49  
50 asymmetric cortical networks were involved.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55       We do not wish to suggest that the left hemisphere possesses no capacities for avoidance  
56  
57 and that the right hemisphere possesses no capacities for approach. Instead, we emphasize the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 *relative* nature of specialization in approach versus avoidance motivation of the two  
5  
6 hemispheres, as others do (e.g., Maxwell & Davidson, 2007; Schiff & Bassel, 1996). In these  
7  
8 terms, at least, we showed that the accessibility of approach-related thoughts was left-lateralized,  
9  
10 whereas the accessibility of avoidance-related thoughts was right-lateralized. This division of  
11  
12 motivational labor is likely functional in supporting potentially rapid shifts in approach-  
13  
14 avoidance motivation in a manner that would be more difficult to accomplish without this  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 division of labor (Davidson, 1999; Harmon-Jones et al., 2010).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*,  
8  
9 53, 27-51.
- 10  
11 Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American*  
12  
13 *Psychologist*, 54, 462-479.
- 14  
15  
16 Bassel, C., & Schiff, B. B. (2001). Unilateral vibrotactile stimulation induces emotional biases in  
17  
18 cognition and performance. *Neuropsychologia*, 39, 282-287.
- 19  
20  
21 Bonezzi, A., Brendl, C., & De Angelis, M. (2011). Stuck in the middle: The psychophysics of  
22  
23 goal pursuit. *Psychological Science*, 22, 607-612.
- 24  
25  
26 Bruner, J. (1957). On perceptual readiness. *Psychological Review*, 64, 123-152.
- 27  
28  
29 Bryden, M. P. (1982). *Laterality: Functional asymmetry in the intact brain*. New York:  
30  
31 Academic Press.
- 32  
33  
34 Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. L., & Berntson, G. G. (1999). The affect system has parallel and  
35  
36 integrative processing components: Form follows function. *Journal of Personality and*  
37  
38 *Social Psychology*, 76, 839-855.
- 39  
40  
41 Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: Evidence and  
42  
43 implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 183-204.
- 44  
45  
46 Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York:  
47  
48 Cambridge University Press.
- 49  
50  
51 Davidson, R. J. (1984). Hemispheric asymmetry and emotion. In: K. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.),  
52  
53 *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 320-365). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- 54  
55  
56 Davidson, R. J. (1992). Emotion and affective style: Hemispheric substrates. *Psychological*  
57  
58 *Science*, 3, 39-43.
- 59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Davidson, R. J. (1999). Neuropsychological perspectives on affective styles and their cognitive  
5 consequences. In: T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and*  
6  
7 *emotion* (pp. 103-123). New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.  
8  
9
- 10  
11 Drake, R. A. (1987). Conceptions of own versus others' outcomes: Manipulation by monoaural  
12 attentional orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *17*, 373-375.  
13  
14
- 15  
16 Eder, A. B., & Rothermund, K. (2008). When do motor behaviors (mis)match affective stimuli?  
17 An evaluative coding view of approach and avoidance reactions. *Journal of Experimental*  
18 *Psychology: General*, *137*, 262-281.  
19  
20  
21  
22
- 23  
24 Ehrlichman, H. (1984). Methodological issues in lateral eye movement research. *Current Status*  
25 *of lateral eye movement research*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American  
26 Psychological Association, Toronto.  
27  
28  
29
- 30  
31 Elliot, A., Maier, M., Moller, A., Friedman, R., & Meinhardt, J. (2007). Color and psychological  
32 functioning: The effect of red on performance attainment. *Journal of Experimental*  
33 *Psychology: General*, *136*, 154-168.  
34  
35  
36  
37
- 38  
39 Elliot, A. J. & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach  
40 and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
41 *82*, 804-818.  
42  
43  
44
- 45  
46 Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their  
47 meaning and uses. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 297-327.  
48  
49
- 50  
51 Ferguson, M., Hassin, R., & Bargh, J. (2008). Implicit motivation: Past, present, and future. In: J.  
52 Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation science* (pp. 150-166). New  
53 York: Guilford Press.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Gollwitzer, P. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2005). Automaticity in goal pursuit. In: A. J. Elliot & C. S.  
5  
6 Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 624-646). New York:  
7  
8 Guilford Publications.  
9
- 10  
11 Harmon-Jones, E., Gable, P. A., & Peterson, C. K. (2010). The role of asymmetric frontal  
12  
13 cortical activity in emotion-related phenomena: A review and update. *Biological*  
14  
15 *Psychology, 84*, 451-462.  
16  
17
- 18  
19 Harmon-Jones, E., Sigelman, J. D., Bohlig, A., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2003). Anger, coping, and  
20  
21 frontal cortical activity: The effect of coping potential on anger-induced left frontal  
22  
23 activity. *Cognition and Emotion, 17*, 1-24.  
24  
25
- 26  
27 Herrington, J. D., Heller, W., Mohanty, A., Engels, A. S., Banich, M. T., Webb, A. G., et al.  
28  
29 (2010). Localization of asymmetric brain function in emotion and depression.  
30  
31 *Psychophysiology, 47*, 442-454.  
32
- 33  
34 Higgins, E. T. (1996). Knowledge activation: Accessibility, applicability, and salience. In: E. T.  
35  
36 Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*  
37  
38 (pp. 133-168). New York: Guilford.  
39
- 40  
41 Higgins, E., & Bargh, J. A. (1987). Social cognition and social perception. *Annual Review of*  
42  
43 *Psychology, 38*, 369-425.  
44
- 45  
46 Kinsbourne, M., & Hicks, R. E. (1978). Functional cerebral space: A model for overflow,  
47  
48 transfer and interference effects in human performance: A tutorial review. In: J. Requin  
49  
50 (Ed.), *Attention and Performance VII* (pp. 345-362). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.  
51
- 52  
53 Kruglanski, A. W., Shah, J. Y., Fishbach, A., Friedman, R., Chun, W., & Sleeth-Keppler, D.  
54  
55 (2002). A theory of goal systems. In: M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social*  
56  
57 *psychology, Vol. 34* (pp. 331-378). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 Kucera, H., & Francis, W. N. (1967). *Computational analysis of present-day American English*.  
5  
6 Providence, RI: Brown University Press.

7  
8  
9 Landau, M. J., Meier, B. P., & Keefer, L. A. (2010). A metaphor-enriched social cognition.  
10  
11 *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 1045-1067.

12  
13  
14 Malamed, E., & Larsen, B. (1977). Regional cerebral blood flow during voluntary conjugate eye  
15  
16 movements in man. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*, 56(Suppl. 64), 530-531.

17  
18  
19 Maxwell, J. S., & Davidson, R. J. (2007). Emotion as motion: Asymmetries in approach and  
20  
21 avoidant actions. *Psychological Science*, 18, 1113-1119.

22  
23  
24 McClelland, D. (1987). *Human motivation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Murphy, F. C., Nimmo-Smith, I., & Lawrence, A. D. (2003). Functional neuroanatomy of  
emotions: A meta-analysis. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 3, 207-233.

Niedenthal, P. M., Barsalou, L. W., Winkielman, P., Krauth-Gruber, S., & Ric, F. (2005).  
Embodiment in attitudes, social perception, and emotion. *Personality and Social  
Psychology Review*, 9, 184-211.

Ratcliff, R. (1993). Methods for dealing with reaction time outliers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114,  
510-532.

Robinson, M. D. (2004). Personality as performance: Categorization tendencies and their  
correlates. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 127-129.

Robinson, M. D. (2007a). Lives lived in milliseconds: Using cognitive methods in personality  
research. In: R. W. Robins, R. C. Fraley, & R. Krueger (eds.), *Handbook of research  
methods in personality psychology* (pp. 345-359). New York: Guilford Press.

Robinson, M. D. (2007b). Gassing, braking, and self-regulating: Error self-regulation, well-  
being, and goal-related processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 1-16.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Robinson, M. D., & Compton, R. J. (2008). The happy mind in action: The cognitive basis of  
5  
6 subjective well-being. In: M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-*  
7  
8 *being* (pp. 220-238). New York: Guilford Press.  
9
- 10  
11 Robinson, M. D., Meier, B. P., Tamir, M., Wilkowski, B. M., & Ode, S. (2009). Behavioral  
12  
13 facilitation: A cognitive model of individual differences in approach motivation.  
14  
15 *Emotion, 9*, 70-82.  
16  
17
- 18  
19 Robinson, M. D., Moeller, S. K., & Ode, S. (2010). Extraversion and reward-related processing:  
20  
21 Probing incentive motivation in affective priming tasks. *Emotion, 10*, 615-626.  
22  
23
- 24 Robinson, M. D., & Neighbors, C. (2006). Catching the mind in action: Implicit methods in  
25  
26 personality research and assessment. In: M. Eid & E. Diener (eds.), *Handbook of*  
27  
28 *multimethod measurement in psychology* (pp. 115-125). Washington, DC: American  
29  
30 Psychology Association.  
31  
32
- 33 Robinson, M. D., Ode, S., Moeller, S. K., & Goetz, P. W. (2007). Neuroticism and affective  
34  
35 priming: Evidence for a neuroticism-linked negative schema. *Personality and Individual*  
36  
37 *Differences, 42*, 1221-1231.  
38  
39
- 40 Robinson, R. G., & Price, T. R. (1982). Post-stroke depressive disorders: A follow-up study of  
41  
42 103 patients. *Stroke, 13*, 635-641.  
43  
44
- 45 Russell, J., & Barrett, L. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things  
46  
47 called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*  
48  
49 *76*, 805-819.  
50  
51
- 52 Schiff, B. B., & Bassel, C. (1996). Effects of asymmetrical hemispheric activation on approach  
53  
54 and withdrawal responses. *Neuropsychology, 10*, 557-564.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Seibt, B., Neumann, R., Nussinson, R., & Strack, F. (2008). Movement direction or change in  
5 distance? Self- and object-related approach-avoidance motions. *Journal of Experimental*  
6  
7  
8  
9 *Social Psychology, 44*, 713-720.

10  
11 Sutton, S. K., & Davidson, R. J. (1997). Prefrontal brain asymmetry: A biological substrate of  
12 the behavioral approach and inhibition systems. *Psychological Science, 8*, 204-210.

13  
14 Tamir, M., Robinson, M. D., & Solberg, E. (2006). You may worry, but can you recognize  
15 threats when you see them?; Neuroticism, threat identifications, and negative affect.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 *Journal of Personality, 74*, 1481-1506.

22  
23 Tomarken, A. J., Davidson, R. J., Wheeler, R. E., & Doss, R. C. (1992). Individual differences in  
24 anterior brain asymmetry and fundamental dimensions of emotion. *Journal of Personality*  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 1

*Categorization Speed as a Function of Word Type and Lateral Auditory Side*

