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The University of Birmingham is a top ranking British University. Founded in 1900, it was England’s first civic University and was ranked University of the Year 2013–14 by the Times and the Sunday Times.

The original Department of Education was founded in 1894 and became the School of Education in 1947. Ranked in the top 50 Schools of Education in the world today, it has a long-standing reputation as a centre of excellence for teaching and research in a wide range of areas of educational practice and policy, with fields of expertise including disability, inclusion and special needs, education and social justice, and professional education.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues is a unique and leading centre for the examination of how character and virtues impact on individuals and society.

The Centre was founded in 2012 by Professor James Arthur. Based at the University of Birmingham, it has a dedicated team of 30 academics from a range of disciplines: philosophy, psychology, education, theology and sociology.

With its focus on excellence, the Centre has a robust and rigorous research and evidence-based approach that is objective and non-political. It offers world-class research on the importance of developing good character and virtues and the benefits they bring to individuals and society. In undertaking its own innovative research, the Centre also seeks to partner with leading academics from other universities around the world and to develop strong strategic partnerships.

A key conviction underlying the existence of the Centre is that the virtues that make up good character can be learnt and taught. This is increasingly being recognized since they are largely being neglected in schools and in the professions. It is also a key conviction that the more people exhibit good character and virtues, the healthier our society. As such, the Centre undertakes development projects seeking to promote the practical applications of its research evidence.

This report was launched by Dr Michael Mosley, British Television Journalist, Presenter and Producer, on the 4th February 2015 at the British Academy, London.
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THE SENTIMENT WHICH MOST IMMEDIATELY AND DIRECTLY PROMPTS US TO REWARD, IS GRATITUDE.
Adam Smith

*Online Appendices A-O can be found at: [http://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1556/projects/gratitude-britain/an-attitude-for-gratitude](http://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/1556/projects/gratitude-britain/an-attitude-for-gratitude)*
Foreword

Professor Robert C. Roberts

In the ultimate practical interest of sustaining and cultivating the character of UK citizens, the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues at the University of Birmingham has undertaken a suite of studies of the UK population. Among the main questions to which they have sought answers are the following: 1) How do British people understand gratitude and when do they think gratitude is properly experienced? For example, do they think it’s proper to be grateful if the person who bestowed a benefit on us did so merely in the line of duty? Is it proper to be grateful for a benefit — for example, our high IQ or sunny personality — if we think there is no one who bestowed the benefit on us? What if the favour was well intentioned but ill chosen (out of the goodness of her heart and her own love of dogs, Aunt Nancy has just presented me with a frisky, slobbery Labrador pup)? 2) As part of this research question, the researchers have also explored what Britons associate with the concept of gratitude? For example, are the associations all ‘positive’ and ‘happy’, or do some people associate gratitude with unpleasant things like guilt feelings and awkwardness and burdens? 3) Do Britons differ by age group in their answer to such questions as 1) and 2)? 4) Does the population seem more likely than older people to be grateful even when the ‘benefit’ is not valuable to them, and that adults are significantly more likely than adolescents to acknowledge that some dysphoric emotions (feelings of guilt or the burden of indebtedness) can co-occur with gratitude? 5) Do the British think gratitude is ‘at’ on the questions that have been put to it. Even if the studies do not tell us what the actual grammar of gratitude is, or its actual value, they do seem to tell us much about the character of the population whose education in the virtues the Jubilee Centre aims to facilitate. These studies can be treated as we treat an entrance examination: not as telling us whether the answers given are true (or of course some of them may be true), but as giving an idea what the examiners know and do not know, and thus aiding the discernment of how their education may best proceed.

Executive Summary

There is a growing consensus in Britain that virtues such as honesty, self-control, fairness, gratitude and respect, which contribute to good moral character, are part of the solution to many of the challenges facing society today.

Schools and businesses increasingly understand the need to teach pupils and employees to follow basic moral codes based on such virtues. However, until recently, the materials required to deliver this ambition have been missing in Britain.

The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, which forms part of the University of Birmingham, aims to help solve this challenge. As a world-leader in rigorous academic research into character education, the Centre operates on the basis that teaching good moral character is possible and practicable. It is about equipping children and adults with the ability to make the right decisions. The Jubilee Centre works in partnership with schools and professional bodies on projects that promote and strengthen good moral character within the contexts of family, schools, communities and the wider employment scene.

Research from the Centre suggests that children live and learn better with good moral character and businesses operate better when demonstrating moral integrity. Meanwhile, more specifically to this report, evidence from psychological research has shown that an ability to demonstrate the virtue of gratitude can be linked to being social and behave in a morally sound way, and even improve academic attainment.

The Jubilee Centre’s new report, An Attitude for Gratitude, sets out trying to establish the way in which the British public understands, experiences and values gratitude, which was described by Cicero as ‘not only the greatest of the virtues, but the parent of all the others’. The majority of gratitude research has, to date, been conducted in the USA. However, the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues has completed a large scale examination of gratitude in the UK. Over 10,000 people have taken part in the research across a range of demographic variables, including gender, religiously, age and ethnic background, and geographical location (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland).

The report has employed a number of specially-designed survey-based research methods to explore gratitude in the UK. These innovative methods include a new ‘Multi-Component Gratitude Measure’ (MCGM), which has allowed the Centre to test gratitude-related conceptions, behaviours, emotions and attitudes alongside one another – a world first.

A variety of methods were used with primary and secondary school pupils aged between 8 and 18 years old, students and staff from the University of Birmingham and adults from the general public. The research has examined the following topics:

- What gratitude is, and when and why it is experienced
- The value placed on gratitude by British people
- What British people are grateful for
- The kinds of people that tend to be grateful
- Whether the British public believe gratitude can be promoted across a range of contexts, and if so, how, this might be achieved

KEY FINDINGS

Furthering gratitude in Britain

- It is widely accepted that there is a lack of gratitude in Britain. 80% believe there is a lack of gratitude in society.
- 78% of sample (N = 524) would like to see more effort spent on promoting gratitude, particularly in educational and workplace contexts. Currently almost 50% believe there is a lack of gratitude in their workplace and over 60% believe it is lacking in schools.

Findings about gratitude in Britain

- In two independent studies of British university students and US-based college students, it was found that the British tend to associate gratitude with negative features more often than the Americans do. When asked which features they associated with gratitude, 29% of UK students cited obligation, indebtedness in comparison to 9% in the US. In addition, 17% of UK students cited guilt in comparison to 0% of students in the US.
- When comparing gratitude to other important values such as honesty, fairness, kindness, courage, humility and self-control, the British typically place gratitude around the middle in terms of importance.
- The importance afforded to gratitude appears to alter slightly with age with adults deeming gratitude more important than adolescents or children.
- Younger children are more likely to be grateful for benefits that are self-oriented, whereas older children pick out benefits that have an impact beyond the self.
- The Jubilee Centre’s findings show that women report higher levels of gratitude than men. When asked to rank gratitude in terms of its importance, 78% of women ranked it as ‘high priority’ in comparison to 68% of men.
- Christians score higher than Atheists in grateful feeling. When asked to rank gratitude in terms of its importance, 75% of Christians ranked it as ‘high priority’ in comparison to 65% of Atheists. Interestingly, though, there is no difference between these two groups in terms of gratitude-related behaviours.

Summary of Recommendations:

1. As our findings show, the British public would like to see gratitude promoted, particularly in educational and workplace contexts. We recommend this be incorporated where possible into public policy, organisational and corporate initiatives, for instance, well being policies and educational interventions.

2. In educational contexts, gratitude must be explored in a discriminating manner, which allows children to discern when gratitude is appropriate and fitting.

3. We recommend the use of our Multi-Component Gratitude Measure (MCGM) in future explorations of the concept of gratitude.

---

2 Park and Petersen, 2005
3 Grant and Gino, 2010; Algina, Haidt, and Gable, 2008
4 Froh et al, 2008; Froh, Kashdan, Ozminkowski, and Miller, 2009; Froh, Yurewicz, and Kashdan, 2009
1. Purpose of the Report

The subject of gratitude has gained traction in recent years in academic and popular circles. However, limited attention has been devoted to understanding what laypeople understand by the concept of gratitude; the meaning of which tends to have been assumed in the literature. Furthermore, while intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of gratitude have been estilised in this growing body of research, there has been little assessment of the value laypeople place on gratitude themselves, or whether and how they think it might be fostered.

Since September 2012, our Attitude for Gratitude research project has been engaged in examining precisely how gratitude is conceptualised by the British public, what British people are grateful for, the value they place on gratitude, what kinds of people tend to be grateful, and whether and how they think gratitude might be promoted in British society.

The project has incorporated a variety of methods to examine these questions, conceptually and empirically, canvassing the opinions of over 10,000 people in the UK. A key issue for our research has been to represent the views of British people across a range of ages, ethnicities and backgrounds that are representative of Britain today. We are strongly committed to the view that researchers should engage with laypeople to avoid superimposing a meaning and value on gratitude that does not reflect the views of the people the research purports to study.

This report provides an account of the many and varied methods we devised to address these questions. Our research makes a significant contribution to both philosophical and psychological examinations of gratitude, as well as practical and educational perspectives on this virtue. We invite readers to discover how our unique combination of methodological approaches elucidates the key research questions.

---

*The term ‘layperson’ is used to refer to persons without professional or specialised knowledge in the subject of gratitude. As such, ‘laypersons’ understandings of gratitude can be compared and contrasted with a growing number of ‘expert’ views on gratitude in the fields of philosophy and (positive) psychology. The English word ‘lay’ derives from the Greek (laikos) which translates as ‘of the people’. Our report canvassed the views of over 10,000 people across a range of cohorts of laypeople, including children in primary schools, adolescents in secondary schools, students and staff from universities and members of the general (lay) public in Britain. It is extremely unlikely that any of the people who took part in our research would have considered themselves to have had specialised knowledge in the subject of gratitude and we are confident that our research represents a major contribution towards elucidating gratitude from a lay (ie, non-expert) perspective.*
2 Background

2.1 GRATITUDE IN PSYCHOLOGY

A groundswell of interest in gratitude has been generated by the rise of positive psychology, a recent branch of psychology emphasizing human strengths, well-being and positive emotions. Gratitude has been variously characterized within this literature as a relatively fleeting positive emotion, an enduring character strength, an adaptive coping mechanism, and a virtue that mitigates against materialism and envy. Gratitude has been advocated as a major means by which subjectively well-being (SWB) can be increased. Research has demonstrated that higher levels of gratitude are associated with increased SWB (Emmons and McCullough, 2003; Seligman and Emmons, 2000; Watkins, 2004), satisfaction with life (Fagley, 2009), improved mental health (Froh et al., 2011) and increased positive and decreased negative affect (Emmons and McCullough, 2003).

A number of interventions to promote gratitude in both clinical and educational contexts have been developed. Many incorporate gratitude-Journaling exercises whereby participants note down daily things for which they are grateful, or which ‘went well’. Gratitude has been shown to strengthen social bonds and promote pro-social behaviour (Grant and Gino, 2010; Algoe, Halil and Gable, 2008). Bartlett and De Steno (2004) found that gratitude fosters ‘upstream reciprocity’. This means that grateful people tend to wish to return benefits, not just to benefactors, but to others more generally. Gratitude may thus be seen as a way of building social bonds, fostering a connection with, and desire to serve, the community (see also Roper, 2016).

2.2 GRATITUDE IN PHILOSOPHY

Attention to gratitude has also been generated as a result of the resurgence of interest in virtue ethics within philosophy. Berger (1975) reimagined a number of key philosophical writings, many attempting a conceptual analysis of gratitude, including Simms (1979), McConnell (1993) and Roberts (2004). Some papers, which we have reviewed critically (Guilford, Morgan and Kristjánsson, 2013), discuss particular conceptual issues involved in gratitude, such as whether gratitude is necessarily ‘supererogatory’ (Card, 1988; Wellman, 1999; Roberts, 2004). Whether gratitude must always be targeted towards a benefactor (McAlister, 2012), and whether gratitude involves an intentionally rendered benefit (Fitzgerald, 1998).

Lively philosophical debate concerning the conceptual contours of gratitude continues, as recent papers by Carr (2013), Waters (2012) and Roberts (2011) attest. However, there is little dialogue between philosophers and psychologists working in this field, and our review brought to light far more divergent uses of the term, both within and between the two disciplines than we had anticipated (see Guilford, et al., 2013). Psychologists and philosophers studying gratitude rarely seem to engage in conversation with each other, working instead with different concepts or sub-concepts of gratitude in their respective disciplines, and both are equally prone to a reliance on ‘top-down’ definitions.

Philosophers have historically been divided in their opinions about the value of gratitude. On the one hand, the first-century Roman philosopher and politician, Cicero, claimed ‘Gratitude is not only the greatest of the virtues, but the parent of all of the others.’ On the other, Aristotle did not regard gratitude as a virtue exhibited by the ‘great minded’ because being the recipient of a benefit placed the individual in an inferior position to the giver (Aristotle, 1865, 1124b10 – 15); yet attempts have been made to reinstate gratitude as an Aristotelian virtue (Kristjánsson, 2013). As noted, the value of gratitude within psychology has tended to ignore its benefits to mental and physical health and its role in strengthening social bonds. There is to date, however, little sense of what value people place on gratitude and, relatedly, whether and how they think it might be promoted, our work has harnessed the views of the people whom we hope will ultimately benefit from our research.

In Australia and the USA, gratitude interventions are finding their way into school curricula, largely under the aegis of ‘positive education’ (see Selman et al., 2009; Waters, 2013). These interventions have been shown to have a positive impact on SWB. We satisfaction, satisfaction with school experience, and even academic attainment (Froh et al., 2006; Froh et al., 2006; Froh, Yunkewicz and Kashdan, 2009).

However, researchers within the Jubilee Centre have raised concerns that such interventions may fail to give young people the opportunity to reflect on when and where gratitude is appropriate, thus promoting an indiscriminate and uncritical ‘attitude of gratitude’ (Morgan, Guildford and Carr, 2015, in press). In addition to the benefits to the individual of cultivating a grateful disposition, gratitude has been shown to strengthen social bonds and promote pro-social behaviour (Grant and Gino, 2010; Algoe, Halil and Gable, 2008). Bartlett and De Steno (2004) found that gratitude fosters ‘upstream reciprocity’. This means that grateful people tend to wish to return benefits, not just to benefactors, but to others more generally. Gratitude may thus be seen as a way of building social bonds, fostering a connection with, and desire to serve, the community (see also Roper, 2016).

The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues

et al.

academic attainment (Froh et al., 2013). Psychologists and philosophers studying gratitude rarely seem to engage in conversation with each other, working instead with different concepts or sub-concepts of gratitude in their respective disciplines, and both are equally prone to a reliance on ‘top-down’ definitions.

In our view, the fundamental problem of existing research on gratitude is that it takes too much for granted; what gratitude is, its status as ‘positive’, its meaning across cultures and its perceived psycho-moral and educational value. Academia and the media both influence society, but we cannot be sure that the view of gratitude presented in these domains really connects with laypeople. There is a risk of imposing a meaning and value on gratitude that does not reflect laypeople’s views, which has implications for measures of gratitude and psychological interventions to promote it, as we have observed (Morgan et al., 2014). In this connection, we are particularly concerned that educational interventions to cultivate gratitude should provide young people’s understanding of gratitude, enabling them to reflect on when gratitude is actually appropriate (Morgan et al., 2015, in press).

As previously indicated, we have created a number of innovative methods in order to address our five major research questions. In the course of answering these questions, we have had cause to reflect on and examine a number of more general issues which make both theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge. Firstly, a major goal of this research has been academic; namely, to advance both social scientific and philosophical discussions of gratitude and seek new ways in which psychology and philosophy can interact constructively in this area. Secondly, as a result of closely examining the conditions under which gratitude is experienced, we have not only been able to elicit specific questions, such as whether we are grateful only for intended benefits, but we have also tried to lay the ground for a more adequate pedagogy of gratitude, which would cultivate in young people a critical literacy around gratitude. Thirdly, by asking the British public about the way they place on gratitude and, relatedly, whether and how they think it might be promoted, our work has harnessed the views of the people whom we hope will ultimately benefit from our research.
In Study 3, participants were presented with a series of fictional characters. Each of these characters demonstrated three features of gratitude. Participants saw 18 character descriptions in total; four descriptions contained gratitude features that were central to the concept (for example, Person A feels appreciative, expresses thanks and feels respected); four contained peripheral gratitude features (Person B feels valued, has received a gift, and is excelled); four contained marginal features (Person C feels motivated, is optimistic, and feels blessed); and four contained remote features (eg. Person L feels secure, is attentive, and feels entitled). After reading the character descriptions, participants answered a series of questions – the key question being ‘How GRATUITOUS is this person?’ The idea here is that fictitious characters demonstrating central features should be deemed to be ‘more grateful than those exhibiting peripheral/remote features. We added another interesting question here: ‘How VIRTUOUS is this person?’ This allowed us to begin examining the link between gratitude and virtue; will more grateful characters also be deemed more virtuous? However, for more details on the method and results of this prototype analysis, see Morgan et al. (2014).

Participants: Two hundred and fifty five students from the University of Birmingham took part: 108 in Study 1; 97 in Study 2; 50 in Study 3.

Methodology and Findings

The Attitude for Gratitude project has employed a number of specially designed and innovative methods to explore gratitude in Britain. For ease of reading, this section will be split into five sub-sections following the research questions listed previously.

3.1. RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHAT IS GRATITUDE?

3.1.1 Method 1 – Examining the features and characteristics associated with the concept of gratitude: A prototype analysis

The primary goal of the prototype analysis was to begin examining how laypeople in Britain construe gratitude. Prototype analysis allows for a simple examination of the features and characteristics that are associated with a given concept, in this case gratitude. Features generated by this method should begin to elucidate how gratitude is understood by laypeople. The prototype analysis comprised three distinct studies:

Study 1 asked participants to write down all of the features and characteristics that they believe typically exemplify gratitude along with a score of positive/negative valence (where 1 = very negative and 5 = very positive). The features arising from this study were collated into a list of 63 key gratitude features and presented to participants in Study 2.

In Study 2, a second group of participants rated the central features of these 63 features on a Likert scale from 1 = not at all central to 8 = extremely central. The centrality ratings were subsequently combined with the frequency ratings from Study 1 to create a combined rank of the gratitude features. These combined ranks were then used to create the materials for Study 3.

In Study 3, participants were presented with a series of fictional characters. Each of these characters demonstrated three features of gratitude. Participants saw 18 character descriptions in total; four descriptions contained gratitude features that were central to the concept (for example, Person A feels appreciative, expresses thanks and feels respected); four contained peripheral gratitude features (Person B feels valued, has received a gift, and is excelled); four contained marginal features (Person C feels motivated, is optimistic, and feels blessed); and four contained remote features (eg. Person L feels secure, is attentive, and feels entitled). After reading the character descriptions, participants answered a series of questions – the key question being ‘How GRATUITOUS is this person?’ The idea here is that fictitious characters demonstrating central features should be deemed to be ‘more grateful than those exhibiting peripheral/remote features. We added another interesting question here: ‘How VIRTUOUS is this person?’ This allowed us to begin examining the link between gratitude and virtue; will more grateful characters also be deemed more virtuous? However, for more details on the method and results of this prototype analysis, see Morgan et al. (2014).

Comparisons of centrality scores from Study 2 and frequency scores from Study 1 revealed a significant positive correlation (r = .49, p < .001), demonstrating that features that were frequently named in Study 1 were also deemed central to the concept in Study 2. An examination of centrality scores (in Study 2) and positive/negative valence scores (from Study 1) revealed that more central gratitude features tended to be rated as more positive in valence (r = .59, p < .001). However, this correlation between centrality and positive valence is weaker than that demonstrated in Lambert et al.’s (2009) comparable US study.

3.1.2 Method 2 – Vignette Questionnaire

The ‘vignette questionnaire’ examines various core questions that are frequently reviewed in Section 2 (eg. the intention of the benefactor and the value of the benefaction; see Appendix 1 and Guildford et al., 2013). The questionnaire presents participants with different scenarios (or vignettes) that are systematically manipulated to examine the conceptual controversies.

The vignette questionnaire was designed for use with adults and adolescents. We created four different scenarios that explored gratitude in Section 2 (eg. the intention of the benefactor and the value of the benefaction). We elicited two ‘high gratitude scenarios’ – one featuring a schoolboy who is made to feel appreciated; the other a teacher who is made to feel appreciated. The scenarios were used to examine whether the questionnaire was manageable. Therefore, to test all scenarios and control for order effects, the type and order of the scenarios was counterbalanced across participants.

Each scenario followed a similar format; we began with a baseline question before systematically manipulating the scenario to examine different conceptual controversies (see Figure 1 and Appendix 1). For each conceptual controversy we examined, we asked three types of questions: whether the participants would be grateful if that scenario were to arise; how grateful they would be; and whether they should be grateful. Order of the ‘should/shouldn’t’ questions was also counterbalanced. The adult’s version of this questionnaire was presented online via SurveyGizmo and the adolescents’ version was presented in hard copy.

Analysis: Data from the two high gratitude scenarios (escapes from a lake and fire) and two low gratitude scenarios (nomination for an award at work and being a beneficial coin in a will) were combined. Frequencies, means and standard deviations for all IRE, SHOULD and DISAGREE scores were calculated. Repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA’s) were used to examine differential responding from the baseline to the manipulated scenario. The following descriptive ARE scores refer to answers to ‘how grateful would you be?’ (If this scenario were to arise); SHOULD scores refer to ‘how grateful should you be?’ and DEGREE scores refer to the amount of gratitude that would be experienced.

The mean scores from the low gratitude scenarios showed variations from the baseline, with no differential intentions decreased. ARE and DEGREE scores indicating a reduction in gratitude experience (we return to this issue later). In the high gratitude scenarios, the morality intentions decreased. ARE score of gratitude at baseline was 8.49 (SD = 0.44) and the mean DEGREE of gratitude from 94.71% (SD = 8.49) the highest reported across all conditions (see Graph 1). Therefore, when exploring the issues of cost and supererogation we observed no increase in gratitude (as might have been expected), see Online Appendix A. Perhaps in a life and death situation, so long as a successful rescue is achieved, no greater gratitude would be experienced, despite increasing risk or lack of training. Relatedly, there is strong evidence that laypeople deem gratitude as fitting even when people are ‘just doing their job’; only 1.4% of the sample disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposition that they would be grateful to the lifeguard or firefighter because it is their job to help.

In contrast, the low gratitude scenarios showed differential levels of gratitude, relative to the baseline (see Graph 2). Across all three measures (ARE, SHOULD and DEGREE),
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3.1.3 Method 3 – Gratitude Stories

For children aged 8–11 years, gratitude stories were used instead of a questionnaire. As far as possible, we tried to replicate the same conceptual controversies in four gratitude stories as in the vignette questionnaire. For instance, the latter was followed by similar themes as in the two low gratitude scenarios in the questionnaire. ‘Shooting Hoops’ offers several scenarios that manipulate issues of duty.

At several junctures in the stories, participants answered questions in story workbooks about how they thought the characters in the story would feel. The questions included both open-ended and closed forms; some questions necessitated a Yes/No response, others followed a five-point Likert scale gauging degree of gratitude. Within a one-hour lesson, teachers read through one of the stories with students, pausing at set junctures to answer the questions.

Participants: 270 primary school students, aged 8–11 years, completed one of the workbooks. The six stories were recruited from: West Midlands (N = 90); Derbyshire (N = 33); and Scotland (N = 147).

Analysis: Frequencies were calculated for Likert scale responses and Y/N options. Open-ended questions were coded by the researcher and data eliciting children’s answers.

Findings: In terms of duty, 90%130 (N = 86) of respondents thought a character in the ‘Blue Oasis’ would be grateful to the lifeguard for rescuing her, even though it is her job. Similarly, in ‘Shooting Hoops’, all respondents agreed that they deemed gratitude appropriate in the case of a person ‘doing their duty’ in retrieving a ball they had sent over the fence during a game. Of this sample 93% (N = 40) indicated that they thought the owner of the ball would be ‘quite’ or ‘very’ grateful.

In terms of risk/cost, children read in the ‘Blue Oasis’ that a man had attempted (but failed) a rescue that was eventually achieved by the lifeguard. Of respondents, 65% thought they would be more grateful to the man who tried to save them over the lifeguard who did save them. Thus it seemed that respondents calibrated gratitude according to risk/cost. This finding was underscored in ‘Shooting Hoops’, where all respondents agreed that they would be grateful to a child taking the risk of getting stung by nettles in retrieving a wayward ball in a hedge (Baseline: 94% (N = 89) as opposed to 80%). These findings show that respondents take account of the extra miles, according particular weight to the element of risk/cost as well as duty.

Indeed, in qualitative responses asking why they would be more grateful to the man than the lifeguard, 27% of respondents spontaneously used the term ‘risk’ in their explanation, while 23% said they had identified the man because ‘it was not his job to help.’ Of respondents, 29% indicated that they thought a character who had been nominated for an award with an ulterior motive (namely, a nomination with the aim of subsequently copying the nominee’s spelling test) would still be grateful for it. Comprehension of the ulterior motive was checked with qualitative questions which showed that 70% of respondents understood an ulterior motive was present. In cases where the ulterior motive was recognised as such, only 7% of respondents indicated that the boy in the story would be grateful. Similarly, malicious intentions were explored in a story where a sly boy (Jason) was nominated to be class councillor as a joke by his bullying nominators. Of respondents 88% (N = 81) indicated that Jason would not have been grateful to receive a nomination calculated to embarrass him. Only 8% of respondents believed that Jason would have been either ‘really grateful’ or ‘quite grateful’ to have received the nomination.

Mixed emotions were explicitly addressed in ‘St Oscar’s Oscars’ where a boy (Ethan) feels guilty or indebted; and in ‘Shooting Hoops’, where the man who tried to save the boy would nominally be 3rd, if he did not save them. The comparable vignette manipulation, participants were asked whether they would (and should) be more grateful to a passer-by than a firefighter or lifeguard ‘as there is bigger risk involved’. Interestingly, a far greater proportion of adult respondents than adolescent respondents disagreed that they would be more grateful to the person who helped at greater risk; and adolescents were more inclined to nominate Jordan.

3.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT IS THE PERCEIVED VALUE OF GRATITUDE?

In order to examine how valuable gratitude is perceived to be, we developed a ‘Valuable Values Questionnaire’ (VVQ) for use with children and adolescents; and a ‘Valuable Values Activity’ (VVA) for children aged 8–11 years.

Table 1: Percentages of Agreement across Age Groups in Feeling Grateful to a Professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>% Adults Agree/ Strongly Agree (N = 400)</th>
<th>% Adolescents Agree/Strongly Agree (N = 350)</th>
<th>% Children (8–11yrs) Grateful to Lifeguard (N = 86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty A</td>
<td>98.2 (N = 390)</td>
<td>96.0 (N = 325)</td>
<td>Question not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty B</td>
<td>95.8 (N = 390)</td>
<td>89.3 (N = 325)</td>
<td>98.8 YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130 Due to the smaller numbers of participants in the gratitude stories, percentages were rounded up to the nearest whole number.

131 A mixed-design ANOVA conducted on the ARE data in the low gratitude scenarios revealed that adults were significantly more likely than adolescents to acknowledge that mixed emotions (indifferent or guilt) co-occur with gratitude (p < .01). Adults were also significantly less grateful to receive a benefit that was not of any real value to them (eg, a nomination for an unwarranted award) than adolescents (p < .01). Does this latter finding suggest that young people are more likely than adults to endorse the advice ‘It’s the thought that counts’?

These findings begin to illuminate possible generational differences in understanding gratitude. While children and adults agree that gratitude is appropriate where people are ‘simply’ doing their duty, other elements demonstrate differences; for example, children and adolescents appear to esteem benefactor risk in a much more highly than adults.
of these seven values guides behaviour.12

The questionnaire consists of four steps. The first step involves sorting the 24 values into discrete categories, ranging from Extremely Low Priority to Extremely High Priority, depending on how important each individual value is deemed to be. The second step involves deciding how much attention is typically paid to these values. The third step involves ranking a refined set of seven values from most to least important; these seven values are courage, fairness, gratitude, honesty, humility, kindness and self-control. The final step involves deciding how often each of these seven values guides behaviour.7

Alongside these four stages of the questionnaire, we asked participants questions that (1) measured social desirability (ie, responding with the aim of pleasing the investigator/presenting themselves in a good light) (Wramstedt and John, 2007); and (2) assessed personality using a refined scale of the Big Five Model (Stöber, 2001): the five domains of personality are Agreeableness; Conscientiousness; Extraversion; Neuroticism; and Openness. We also asked an open-ended question: Do you think gratitude is an important value? Why/Why not?

Participants: Of the 2194 adults who accessed the online VVQ, 1880 yielded usable responses. Of these respondents, 56% were male and 44% were female. Ages ranged from 19–98 years (mean age, 43 years) and 36% identified themselves as atheist, 45% as Christian. Of those who identified with a religion 31% practised their religion. Of the 456 adolescents aged 11–18 years who completed the VVQ in hard copy (mean age, 13 years), 50% were female; 36% atheist and 33% Christian. Of those who identified with a religion 9% practised their religion.

Limitations: After piloting this questionnaire with adults and receiving their feedback, three sections of the questionnaire were subsequently changed to improve clarity and accessibility. These changes concern Section 1 of the questionnaire (priority), Section 2 (attention), and Section 4 (behaviours). Therefore, whilst the instrument has been improved for future use, we are unable to directly compare adolescent and adults’ answers on Sections 1, 2 and 4 of this questionnaire. Therefore, in the following section we present findings to the four stages of the VVQ for adults and adolescents separately.

Findings: Adult questionnaire: The first section of the questionnaire asked participants to rate the level of priority that they currently give to 24 values (see Table 2). Responses ranged from 1 = low priority to 5 = high priority. The mean priority rating for gratitude was 3.99 (SD = 0.94), N = 1880, making gratitude the eighth most highly prioritised value (see Table 3).

Participants then rated how much attention they typically pay each of the 24 values (1 = under attention; 2 = the right amount of attention; 3 = over attention). The mean attention rating was 1.92 (SD = 0.63, N = 1876). When ordering the 24 values from most attention given to least attention given, gratitude appears 11th (see Online-Appendix E).

Subsequently, participants ranked the subset of seven values (1 = most important to 7 = least important). The mean rank for gratitude was 4.80 (SD = 1.59, N = 1880) and overall gratitude was ranked fourth of the seven values. The rank of importance by mean is as follows: honesty, kindness, fairness, gratitude, courage, self-control and humility.

Participants were further asked to rate how often each of the seven values typically guides his/her behaviour. Each value was assessed using three statements from Peterson and Seligman’s VIA (2004). For example, to assess how much gratitude guides the respondents’ behaviour they were presented with: (1) ‘Counting my blessings’; (2) ‘Acknowledging people are good to me’; and (3) ‘Expressing my thanks to those who care about me’.

Participants rated how often each of these beliefs or tendencies typically guides their behaviour from 1 = seldom guides behaviour to 5 = frequently guides behaviour. The responses to all three statements were added together to form a total score for each of the seven values, ranging from 3 to 15.1 The mean gratitude behaviour rating is 11.02 (SD = 2.44) making gratitude the fourth most likely value to guide behaviour.

Importantly, there were significant correlations15 between all four stages of the questionnaire, indicating a degree of consistency in response patterns (see Online-Appendix E). This is, respondents who professed that they prioritise gratitude,humanly, gave gratitude a high level of attention (r = .25, p < .001), ranked its importance highly (r = .33, p < .001) and indicated that gratitude often guides their behaviour (r = .34, p < .001). Importantly, however, the relationship between these stages was not as strong as we predicted, whilst there was a significant correlation between stages, the strength of this correlation was relatively small (ie, the r score was between 0.1 and 0.4, suggesting only a small to medium relationship between the four stages). This suggests that attitudes of importance do not necessarily map onto grateful behaviours. We return to this issue in Section 3.4.

When comparing responses to our four questionnaire stages across the different groups of participants, we observe several main effects of, and interactions between, our fixed factors, which were: group (male, female), age group (19–30 years; 31–40; 41–50; 51–60; 61–70; >70 years) religion (Christianity; atheism) and practise religion (yes; no).16

Group comparisons for priority of gratitude: There was a significant difference between males’ and females’ ratings regarding priority, with females allocating gratitude a higher priority rating than males (Female Mean (or M) = 4.06, SE = 0.06; Male M = 3.88, SE = 0.04, respectively; F (1, 1476) = 8.78, p < .01). The difference between ratings by Christians and atheists was also significant due to higher priority ratings from Christians (M = 4.04, SE = 0.04; and M = 3.88, SE = 0.06, respectively; F (1, 1476) = 6.42, p < .05). However, when comparing individuals who regularly practise their religion with those that identify with a religion yet do not practise; we see no significant difference in priority ratings (M = 4.12, SE = 0.04; M = 4.03, SE = 0.09 respectively; F (1, 1028) = 0.855, p = 0.384). The analyses also revealed a significant interaction between gender and religion due to a larger difference between Christianity and atheist ratings in males (F (1, 1476) = 5.94, p < .05). – see graph 3.

Graph 3: Mean Gratitude-priority Ratings across Males and Females and Christians and Atheists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Christianity</th>
<th>Atheism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 24 value definitions were provided; limiting ambiguity and ensuring understanding (Park, Peterson and Seligman, 2008).
13 Inspiration for the question comes from the Life Values Inventory (Brown and Crace, 1996).
14 Behaviour scores below the lowest possible value of 2/24 are the biggest possible value of 15 were excluded from analysis.
15 There is debate whether Likert responses should be treated as interval or ordinal data. Interval data allows for parametric testing, whilst ordinal data normally requires non-parametric tests. Our data here requires a MANOVA for which there is no non-parametric alternative. Given this, the questionnaires have been analysed using parametric tests. Importantly, a non-parametric, Spearman’s Rho-correlation yielded almost identical results (see Online-Appendix E).
16 For the rank of gratitude a lower value rather than a higher value indicates higher importance therefore there is a negative relationship between rank and the other three variables.

Christianity and atheism made up 81.2% of our adult sample and 68.7% of the adolescent data. Therefore, we restricted analysis of religion in both data sets to Christianity and atheism.
When rating the level of priority that they currently give to the 24 values (1 = extremely low priority to 7 = extremely high priority), adolescents’ mean priority rating for gratitude was 4.91 (SD = 1.48, N = 448), making gratitude the seventh most highly prioritised value (see Table 3).

The mean attention rating for gratitude (from 0 = Too little attention to 10 = Too much attention, marked on a 150mm line) was 89.51 (SD = 32.15, N = 449). Gratitude was rated sixth highest of the 24 values (see Online-Appendix F).

When asked to rank the seven values, the mean gratitude rank was 4.5 (SD = 1.71, N = 35817) and overall gratitude was typically small to medium in strength, with the exception of priority and attention which correlated strongly (r = .509, p < .001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value/ Character</th>
<th>Mean priority rating (1–7)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest priority 1</td>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Honour</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Love</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fairness</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Honesty</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hope</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gratitude</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zest</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social Intelligence</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Creativity</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Citizenship</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Control</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Forgiveness</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Courage</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Leadership</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Perspective</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Persistence</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Curiosity</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Humility</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Love of Learning</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Judgement</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Appreciation of Beauty</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Prudence</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest priority 24</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adolescent questionnaire:

When asked to rate how often each of the seven values typically guides/behaves their behaviour, which was assessed using 3 statements (1 = seldom guides behaviour to 7 = frequently guides behaviour), the mean gratitude-behaviour score was 13.56 (SD = 3.8, N = 395). Gratitude was fifth most likely to guide respondents’ behaviour with kindness the most likely value to guide behaviour and humility the least likely (see Online-Appendix F).

There were significant correlations between all four stages of the questionnaires, which indicated a degree of consistency in response patterns. All but one of these correlations were small to medium in strength, with the exception of priority and attention which correlated strongly (r = .506, p < .001).

Group comparisons:

No differences across gender, school, religion or practice religion were observed in any of the four questions. In contrast with the adult data, the overall mean rank of the seven virtues was identical across males and females, Christians and atheists, and individuals who practise their religion and those who do not. The overall order of honesty, fairness, kindness, courage, self-control, gratitude and humility is the same across all group subsets.

Adolescent questionnaire:

When asked to rank the seven values, the mean gratitude rank was 4.5 (SD = 1.71, N = 35817) and overall gratitude was typically ranked sixth (see Table 3).

When asked to rate how often each of the seven values typically guides their behaviour, which was assessed using 3 statements (1 = seldom guides behaviour to 7 = frequently guides behaviour), the mean gratitude-behaviour score was 13.56 (SD = 3.8, N = 395). Gratitude was fifth most likely to guide respondents’ behaviour with kindness the most likely value to guide behaviour and humility the least likely (see Online-Appendix F).

There were significant correlations between all four stages of the questionnaires, which indicated a degree of consistency in response patterns. All but one of these correlations were small to medium in strength, with the exception of priority and attention which correlated strongly (r = .506, p < .001).

Group comparisons:

No differences across gender, school, religion or practice religion were observed in any of the four questions. In contrast with the adult data, the overall mean rank of the seven virtues was identical across males and females, Christians and atheists, and individuals who practise their religion and those who do not. The overall order of honesty, fairness, kindness, courage, self-control, gratitude and humility is the same across all group subsets.
Comparisons of the perceived value of gratitude across generations:

One component of the Valuable Values techniques (questionnaire and activity) is repeated across all three age groups; namely, the ranking of gratitude alongside courage, fairness, honesty, humility, kindness and self-control. This allowed for a comparison of the position of these seven virtues across the three groups; namely, the ranking of gratitude (questionnaire and activity) is repeated across all three age groups: children; adolescents; and adults.

As Table 4 demonstrates, there appears to be a difference in the importance afforded gratitude (in relation to other values) across age. That is, adults rank gratitude higher than both adolescents and primary school students. Adolescents rank gratitude lowest of all three age groups.

Table 4: The Mean Rank of the Seven Values across the Three Age-groups (children; adolescents; and adults).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Primary School Students (aged 8–11 years, N = 248)</th>
<th>Adolescents (aged 11–18 years, N = 358)</th>
<th>Adults (aged 19–88 years, N = 1800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank SD</td>
<td>Value Mean Rank SD</td>
<td>Value Mean Rank SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kindness</td>
<td>2.76 1.59</td>
<td>3.04 1.77</td>
<td>2.41 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Honesty</td>
<td>3.07 2.00</td>
<td>3.18 1.78</td>
<td>2.87 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-control</td>
<td>3.93 1.77</td>
<td>3.21 1.61</td>
<td>2.88 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fairness</td>
<td>3.98 1.67</td>
<td>3.19 1.98</td>
<td>4.80 1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gratitude</td>
<td>4.00 2.05</td>
<td>4.47 1.98</td>
<td>4.88 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Courage</td>
<td>4.56 1.76</td>
<td>4.50 1.71</td>
<td>5.03 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Humility</td>
<td>5.36 1.62</td>
<td>5.61 1.81</td>
<td>5.14 1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the scales in the VQ were altered for the adolescent version, the same 24 values appear in each of the versions, allowing for some comparison across adults and adolescents. Examination of priority, attention and behaviour ratings of gratitude revealed a similar pattern for adolescents and adults (see Table 3). Interestingly, there were far more group differences when examining the adult data (e.g., gender differences, prejudice relatedness/difficulties); there appeared to be more conformity across different participant groups in the adolescent data.

Data from the Jubilee Centre’s Character Education in UK Schools research project demonstrated that secondary school students rated gratitude as their top characteristic strength of the 24 tested in the VIA-Youth (56 items) (see Arthur et al., 2015, in press). This does not map onto the results here, when asked importance/priority of gratitude, attention and behaviour gratitude did not emerge in first place (however, the number of students sampled was significantly smaller here). This is particularly striking in response to the behaviour section of our questionnaire, where the three gratitude statements were taken from the original VIA (Peterson and Seligman, 2004). This could suggest that the context in which these questions are presented and the way that they are framed may have an impact upon responses.

To analyse the qualitative question of the VQ, we sampled 20% of adult (N = 439) and 20% of adolescent responses (N = 92) ‘Do you think gratitude is an important value? Why/Why not?’ 65% of adolescents and 82% of adults explicitly indicated that they considered gratitude an important value, while 24% of adolescents and 4% of adults did not deem gratitude important28. Reasons why gratitude was considered important were coded (see Online Appendix K). The most common reason given in responses, across both groups, was that gratitude is important because it signals appreciation of others/not taking others for granted (21% of adolescents; 36% of adults). The second most common response for both groups was that gratitude is important because it helps people to be aware of the benefits they enjoy/not take benefits for granted (15% of adolescents; 16% of adults). 3.3.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT ARE PEOPLE GRATEFUL FOR?

3.3.3.1 Method 6 – Thank You Letters and Films

To explore what people in the UK are grateful for, children (and a small number of adults) were invited to reflect on their gratitude and composed thank you letters or thank you films.

Participants: We collected 596 thank you letters at three public engagement events. Two hundred and twenty-three films (101 from primary schools; 81 secondary) were collected as part of the Thank You Film Awards Competition (see 3.1.2 and 3.1.3), supererogatory behaviour requirement (questionnaire and activity) is repeated across all three age groups; namely, the ranking of gratitude (questionnaire and activity) is repeated across all three age groups; namely, the ranking of gratitude (questionnaire and activity) is repeated across all three age groups: children; adolescents; and adults.

Table 4: The Mean Rank of the Seven Values across the Three Age-groups (children; adolescents; and adults).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Primary School Students (aged 8–11 years, N = 248)</th>
<th>Adolescents (aged 11–18 years, N = 358)</th>
<th>Adults (aged 19–88 years, N = 1800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank SD</td>
<td>Value Mean Rank SD</td>
<td>Value Mean Rank SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kindness</td>
<td>2.76 1.59</td>
<td>3.04 1.77</td>
<td>2.41 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Honesty</td>
<td>3.07 2.00</td>
<td>3.18 1.78</td>
<td>2.87 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-control</td>
<td>3.93 1.77</td>
<td>3.21 1.61</td>
<td>2.88 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fairness</td>
<td>3.98 1.67</td>
<td>3.19 1.98</td>
<td>4.80 1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gratitude</td>
<td>4.00 2.05</td>
<td>4.47 1.98</td>
<td>4.88 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Courage</td>
<td>4.56 1.76</td>
<td>4.50 1.71</td>
<td>5.03 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Humility</td>
<td>5.36 1.62</td>
<td>5.61 1.81</td>
<td>5.14 1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the scales in the VQ were altered for the adolescent version, the same 24 values appear in each of the versions, allowing for some comparison across adults and adolescents. Examination of priority, attention and behaviour ratings of gratitude revealed a similar pattern for adolescents and adults (see Table 3). Interestingly, there were far more group differences when examining the adult data (e.g., gender differences, prejudice relatedness/difficulties); there appeared to be more conformity across different participant groups in the adolescent data.

Data from the Jubilee Centre’s Character Education in UK Schools research project demonstrated that secondary school students rated gratitude as their top characteristic strength of the 24 tested in the VIA-Youth (56 items) (see Arthur et al., 2015, in press). This does not map onto the results here, when asked importance/priority of gratitude, attention and behaviour gratitude did not emerge in first place (however, the number of students sampled was significantly smaller here). This is particularly striking in response to the behaviour section of our questionnaire, where the three gratitude statements were taken from the original VIA (Peterson and Seligman, 2004). This could suggest that the context in which these questions are presented and the way that they are framed may have an impact upon responses.

To analyse the qualitative question of the VQ, we sampled 20% of adult (N = 439) and 20% of adolescent responses (N = 92) ‘Do you think gratitude is an important value? Why/Why not?’ 65% of adolescents and 82% of adults explicitly indicated that they considered gratitude an important value, while 24% of adolescents and 4% of adults did not deem gratitude important28. Reasons why gratitude was considered important were coded (see Online Appendix K). The most common reason given in responses, across both groups, was that gratitude is important because it signals appreciation of others/not taking others for granted (21% of adolescents; 36% of adults). The second most common response for both groups was that gratitude is important because it helps people to be aware of the benefits they enjoy/not take benefits for granted (15% of adolescents; 16% of adults).

Another interesting finding concerns benefits. Whilst primary school students tended to reflect on benefits which were self-oriented, secondary school students were more likely to be grateful for benefits that went beyond their own personal job (teachers, nurses, soldiers, police officers and fire-fighters), yet actions of these individuals were often portrayed as being above the expected level of duty.

Another interesting finding concerns benefits. Whilst primary school students tended to reflect on benefits which were self-oriented, secondary school students were more likely to be grateful for benefits that went beyond their own personal job (teachers, nurses, soldiers, police officers and fire-fighters), yet actions of these individuals were often portrayed as being above the expected level of duty.

The problem with this measure, however, is that all six items tap only one dimension or component of gratitude; namely, grateful feeling. Similarly, the GRAT has a limited scope; whilst tapping into more dimensions than the GOQI (with items focusing on grateful feeling, evaluations of abundance or lack thereof, and supportive dispositions), there are components of gratitude that remain unexamined. Neither of these measures, nor the Appreciation Scale, offer a measure of conceptual understanding of gratitude or, simultaneously tap into cognition, emotions, attitudes and behaviours pertaining to gratitude. Thus, in our view, none of these scales offer a comprehensive measure of gratitude.

The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues
The Behaviour Component: items measure the amount of gratitude-related behaviours that respondents engage in. For instance, (1) notice the people who are kind to me; (2) remind myself of the benefits I have received. This stage contains 13 items.

Participants:

Pilot of the MCGM

Five hundred and thirty-two participants accessed the online survey; complete usable responses totalled 477. 68% of respondents were White British; 42% Christian; 37% (mean age 38 years); 85% of respondents were female; ages ranged from 18–88 years. The second step involved entering the four components of our measure. This process allowed us to examine whether the MCGM can account for (variance in) the three outcome measures above and beyond what the GQ6, GRAT and Appreciation scale (combined) are capable of measuring; that is, can our own measure of gratitude add anything new that is not already covered by existing scales?

To test the incremental validity of our measure, we conducted a hierarchical multiple regression on three outcome variables that measure well-being: SWL, SH, and the positive affect component of the PANAS. When examining each of these variables, the regression consisted of three steps. First, we entered the Big Five domains of personality, which previous research has demonstrated accounts for a large amount of variance in such measures of well-being (McCaughan et al., 2002; Wood, Joseph and Maltby, 2006). The second step involved entering the three existing measures of gratitude/appreciation into the regression (i.e., the GQ6, the GRAT, and the Appreciation Scale). The final step involved entering the four components of our MCGM. This process allowed us to examine whether the MCGM can account for (variance in) the three outcome measures above and beyond what the GQ6, GRAT and Appreciation scale (combined) are capable of measuring; that is, can our own measure of gratitude add anything new that is not already covered by existing scales?

Predicting Satisfaction with Life (SWL); Subjective Happiness (SH); and Positive Affect in the PANAS. When entering a composite score for Conceptual ARE items from the MCGM, Conceptual DEGREE items, the Emotion component, the Attitude component, and the Behaviour component, the MCGM accounted for: an additional 2.2% of the variance in SWL above the Big Five and existing gratitude/appreciation measures (p < .001); an additional 1.6% of variance in SH above the Big Five and existing measures (p < .001); and an additional 1.3% of variance in the PANAS above the Big Five and existing measures (p < .001; see Online-Appendix N). In explanation, the MCGM predicts variance in all three outcome measures examined here that cannot be explained by the three existing measures of gratitude/appreciation combined. Simply put, our measure is offering something new, rather than merely replicating the effects of the GQ6, GRAT or Appreciation Scale.

(2) What kinds of people tend to be grateful?

A MANOVA was used to examine whether the MCGM can account for (variance in) the three outcome measures above and beyond what the GQ6, GRAT and Appreciation scale (combined) are capable of measuring; that is, can our own measure of gratitude add anything new that is not already covered by existing scales?
examined were gender (male; female), age-group (18–30 years; 31–40; 41–50; 51–60; 61–70; and > 70 years), religion (Christian; atheist); the practice of religion (individuals who do believe their religion regularly and those that do not), relationship status (married; single), participants who have dependants and those that do not, and employment type (the three main groups were comprised of intermediate managerial positions; (supervisory or clinical) and junior managerial, administrative or professional; and pensioners). The dependent variables included all four components of the MCGM; the three existing gratitude/ appreciation scales; and the three well-being variables (SH, SWL, PANAS).23

Gender: Females scored significantly higher in self-reported ratings of gratitude. That is, females rated themselves more highly on the emotion (p < .05), attitude (p < .001) and behaviour components (p < .001) of the MCGM, and on the GOQ (p < .01), GRAT (p < .01) and Appreciation Scales (p < .01). (See Online-Appendix O for means, standard errors and confidence intervals for all group comparisons in the MANOVA)

Age: When examining differences across age groups, we see that over 70 years old scored significantly higher on the Appreciation Scale compared to all other age groups (18–30 years, p < .05; 31–40 years, p < .05; 41–50 years, p < .01; 51–60 years, p < .01 and 61–70 years, p < .05). However, there were no age-related differences in any other dependent variable tested.

Employment Type: In terms of employment type, pensioners scored significantly higher than individuals currently working at the level of intermediate managers (p < .01) and at the level of junior managerial/administrative/ professional (p < .001) on the GRAT score. Relatedly, pensioners rated themselves significantly higher than the other two groups in terms of satisfaction with life (p < .05, p < .001 respectively) and subjective happiness (p < .001 for both comparisons).

Christianity/atheism: Compared to self-professed atheists, individuals who identify themselves as Christian report significantly higher ratings of gratitude/appreciation on the emotion stage of the MCGM (p < .001); the GOQ (p < .01); the GRAT scale (p < .05) and the Appreciation Scales (p < .01). Interestingly, there was no significant difference between these two groups in terms of attitudes and behaviours relating to gratitude (as measured by the attitude and behavioural stages of the MCGM). Christians, however, also reported higher levels of satisfaction with life and subjective happiness than their atheist counterparts.

Single/married and dependants Yes/No: There were no differences between these participant groups across any of the dependent variables.

3.5 RESEARCH QUESTION 5: HOW MIGHT GRATITUDE BE PROMOTED?

3.5.1 Method 6 – Promoting Gratitude Questionnaire

There are four sections to this questionnaire. The first section examines the contexts in which gratitude is deemed most important. Participants are presented with a variety of different contexts/people and a list of seven values (gratitude, courage, fairness, honesty, humility, kindness and self-control). For each question, participants must choose the three values that are most important. Each question asks ‘in my opinion it is most important for [ ] to have’ where the missing elements are ‘partner’, ‘child’, ‘parent’, ‘friend’, ‘workplace’, ‘community’, ‘society’.

The following sections posed a variety of questions which were answered using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree). The questions posed were:

(A) Whether and where gratitude should be promoted (eg. ‘I believe that more effort should be spent on promoting gratitude’, ‘Schools are not the right places to promote gratitude’), I believe that gratitude should be promoted at home’ (or ‘at school’), in the workplace’, ‘in public policy’;)

(B) How gratitude should be promoted (eg. ‘I believe that a good way to promote gratitude is through educational interventions’ or ‘through media’, ‘through policy and government’).

(C) Where there is a perceived lack of gratitude (eg. ‘There is a lack of gratitude in schools’ or ‘in my workplace’; ‘in my community’).

Participants: Of the 554 participants who accessed this online survey, 549 completed and usable responses. Of these respondents, 54% were female. Ages of respondents ranged from 18–83 years (mean age 49 years) and 93% of respondents were White-British; 56% Christian and 22% atheist. Of those who identified with a religion 29% practised their religion. For employment, 28% of respondents were self-employed, 15% were in managerial positions; 27% were in supervisory, clerical

Table 6: The Pattern of Responses across Likert Scale Questions on the Promotion of Gratitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Home</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Workplace</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good way of promoting gratitude is through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Interventions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Media</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programmes</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Influence</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Participants’ Responses to why they currently believe there is a lack of gratitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Home</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Home</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Community</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 51% of our sample are Christians; 23% Atheists; combined they account for 75% of our sample. Thus these two groups were compared to examine the effect of religion.
24 The three well-being variables were included as outcome variables in the incremental validity test and as dependent variables in the MANOVA; this is because we view gratitude as enhancing well-being and well-being as enhancing gratitude, see Watkins (2004: 185).
25 Correlation between GOQ and (1) Job-related affective well-being Scale, or JAWS (Van Kray et al., 2000) r = .35 p < .01; (2) Job-related affective Well-being Scale, or JAWS (Van Kray et al., 2000): r = .35 p < .01; JAWS:Attitude component: r = .19, p < .01; Behaviour component: r = .29, p < .01. Correlation between JAWS and Emotion component of MCGM: r = .28, p < .01; JASS:Attitude component: r = .18, p < .01; Behaviour component: r = .20, p < .01.

The context for promoting gratitude that most respondents agreed with was at home and in schools; 88% and 87% overall agreement respectively, suggesting that respondents do not believe that promotion of gratitude is solely driven to family influence or the home environment. Similarly, when offered a variety of methods for promoting gratitude, educational interventions were advocated by 74% of respondents. We were also interested in canvassing novel ideas from participants as to how gratitude might be effectively promoted. The most commonly suggested method (other than those identified in Table 6) was the idea of ‘... can turn into vices not only through under- reemphasised, however, that we do not indiscriminate gratitude as emotional virtues carefull consideration of whether gratitude carefull consideration of whether gratitude is due: it would be unhelpful and potentially dangerous to ask students to feel indiscriminate gratitude as emotional virtues... turn into vices not only through under- reemphasised, however, that we do not indiscriminate gratitude as emotional virtues... turn into vices not only through under- reemphasised, however, that we do not indiscriminate gratitude as emotional virtues... turn into vices not only through under- reemphasised, however, that we do not indiscriminate gratitude as emotional virtues...
However, almost a fifth of respondents reported a lack of gratitude in either themselves or their homes, which is a relatively high figure given the obvious social desirability element at play here. This is supported by a small but significant negative correlation between respondents’ GQ6 score and their responses to questions on a lack of gratitude in themselves (r = -.266; p < .001) and a lack of gratitude in their home (r = -.277, p < .001).

Perhaps most striking of the responses is the fact that 16.9% of respondents agreed (to some extent) that a lack of gratitude in society is ‘not their problem’ (0.4% strongly agree; 5.6% agree; 10.9% agree somewhat) indicating that almost one fifth of individuals did not view themselves as having a role in society’s overall level of, or expression of, gratitude or, at the very least, perceived their own gratitude experience as distinct from that of society as a whole.

**Limitations:**
There is likely to be a strong social desirability effect present in this questionnaire; even though almost 20% of questions were negatively worded, the overall premise of the questionnaire is likely to be apparent to participants and their responses may well have been skewed accordingly.

### 3.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All studies received full ethical approval from the University of Birmingham’s Ethics Committee. We carefully adhered to the ethical guidelines set out by the University, ensuring that participants were fully informed about the purpose of the research and had the opportunity to withdraw at any point. Where respondents were under the age of 18 we sought informed consent from parents/caregivers. All participants were deblindled on the aims of the research and offered contact details of the researchers involved.

### 3.7 OVERALL FINDINGS

- The prototype analysis of gratitude demonstrated that participants in our British sample associated gratitude with more negative features in comparison to a US sample; examples that were unique to British respondents include guilt, awkwardness and embarrassment. Participants decribed character descriptions of more grateful individuals to also be more virtuous, confirming a link between gratitude and virtue.

- The vignette questionnaires confirmed various modifers of gratitude that have been suggested in the literature; for example, greater effort in bestowing a benefit increases gratitude experience whilst the presence of non-benevolent intentions, such as ulterior motives and malicious intentions, decreases gratitude experience. Significantly, however, non-benevolent intentions do not always disqualify gratitude. When comparing adult and adolescent responses to our vignette questionnaires, we see some similarities but also striking discrepancies; for example, adolescents were more likely to be grateful for a benefit that was not of value to them and adults were more likely to acknowledge that mixed emotions (positive and negative) co-occur in experiences of gratitude.

Primary school students aged 8–11 years were able to successfully navigate through several conceptual controversies surrounding gratitude by participating in our gratitude stories. They were able to recognise the presence of non-benevolent intentions and the negative emotions that might accompany gratitude (examples include confusion and awkwardness). This suggests that our four gratitude stories could be effective tools for exploring the nuances of gratitude experience and aiding children to decipher important conceptual and intensity variables.

- When comparing gratitude to other important values, such as honesty, fairness, kindness, courage, humility and self-control, gratitude is typically placed around the middle in terms of importance. The importance afforded to gratitude, however, appears to alter slightly with age, with adults deeming gratitude more important than adolescents or children (aged 8–11 years).

DOES GRATITUDE CAUSE HAPPINESS, OR DOES HAPPINESS CAUSE GRATITUDE? I PROPOSE THAT THE ANSWER TO BOTH QUESTIONS IS YES.

Philip Watkins
The current report offers a much-needed contribution to empirically informed, interdisciplinary work in the field of gratitude research. Our approach has brought philosophy and empirical investigation together in one, allowing meaningful cross-fertilisation to take place. Furthermore, we brought lay people (i.e. theubi public) to the spotlight to enable the views of ‘experts’ to be compared with those of people. For the most part, this latter domain has previously been either ignored or taken for granted.

To revert to the five research questions listed in Section 1, these studies shed light on the first question on British conceptual understandings of gratitude: the prototype analysis; the vignette questionnaire; and the gratitude stories.

The prototype analysis (Morgan et al., 2014) showed that participants in our UK sample associated gratitude with more negative features than an earlier study conducted in the USA had revealed (Lambert et al., 2009). British respondents uniquely associated gratitude with awkwardness, embarrassment, embarrassment and guilt. This finding offers an important challenge to the predominant view within psychology that gratitude is an unalloyed ‘positively valenced’ emotion or trait. Secondly, our findings call into question the view that gratitude is the greatest (and parent) of all virtues ascribed to it (e.g. the workplace). Similarly, the gratitude stories illuminated the scant substantiation of this claim that laypeople’s views offer the moral foundation (Cronbach’s α = 0.89) to develop in school. For instance, Froh and Bono (Ike Cliro) seem to esteem gratitude as a ‘master virtue’. However, our British sample does not concur with that estimation. Calls for gratitude to be valued as a ‘wonder drug’ seem, at least in the British context, to be somewhat overstated.

Our VVQ and VVA illuminated the scant existing knowledge of the valuable people place on gratitude, relative to other values. We believe academics and educators should locate their advocacy of gratitude against these findings, last they exaggerate the role of gratitude in character building in a way that both jars with the experience of laypeople, and which neglects the development of other values deemed essential to good character. The VQ shed light on the reasons laypeople gave as to why gratitude was considered an important attribute. There was no suggestion in any responses, that gratitude would generally get people to behave better, improve grades or avoid risky behaviour, although a number of respondents identified its role in fostering happiness and positivity.

To examine what kinds of people tend to be grateful, we developed the Multi-Component Gratitude Measure (MCGM) and compared responses to this questionnaire across a number of demographic variables. The development of the MCGM offers a vital addition to assessing gratitude in the field, and is perhaps, from an academic perspective, the most significant contribution of this research project. The MCGM incorporates a means of examining respondents’ conceptual understanding of gratitude, whilst also tapping grateful emotion, attitude towards gratitude and behaviours associated with gratitude. In recent years psychological research has highlighted the benefits of gratitude to mental and physical health, locating its value instrumentally. Gratitude has been seen by philosophers as an important value to develop in school. For instance, Froh et al., (2011) linked gratitude with educational attainment. Froh and Bono (2014) has recently likened gratitude to a ‘wonder drug’ that ‘would get kids to behave better, improve their grades, feel happier, and avoid risky behaviour’. The point to be emphasised in this context is that Froh and Bono (Ike Cliro) seem to esteem gratitude as a ‘master virtue’. However, our British sample does not concur with that estimation. Calls for gratitude to be valued as a ‘wonder drug’ seem, at least in the British context, to be somewhat overstated.

Our Thank You Films and Thank You Letters served to illuminate the question: ‘What are British people grateful for (and/or to whom are they grateful)?’ Content analysis of the films and letters revealed that there is not easy to dissociate to whom are grateful from what are they grateful for. The main theme emerging in 24% of submissions in the TFYA was family, and it will be appreciated that it is impossible to tease out whether this was ‘grateful to’ or ‘grateful for’. The same consideration applies to family, friends and parent(s) which constituted the top three themes in the letters. Interestingly, of the top ten most frequently named themes in the letters, only two concerned material benefits (food and toys/belongings), suggesting that non-material benefits predominated in this largely child sample.

To illuminate our research question about the value British people place on gratitude, we developed the Valuable Values Activity Questionnaire and Valuable Values Activity. While Cicero’s now famous contention that gratitude is the greatest of all virtues (relative to honesty, kindness and fairness), gratitude is the greatest (and parent) of all virtues finds little support here, gratitude clearly has a place among values. In comparison with courage, fairness, honesty, humility, kindness and self-control, gratitude tended to be ranked at position four or six of seven respectively, with its importance increasing with age. This may be a result of increased values of gratitude experienced by adults or a greater appreciation for the context where gratitude is important (for example, the workplace). Similarly, the importance of gratitude may increase in line with the number of instances of being a benefactor rather than beneficiary (which in turn may increase with age).

In summary, our research to date has stimulated reflection on gratitude in a variety of domains and across interdisciplinary. We are confident that our contribution to this field will make a considerable impact. Within our research we have collected data from over 10,000 members of the British public across a range of demographic variables and geographical locations to represent the views of laypeople across Britain (see Appendix 2 for full breakdown across all methods). We have been guided by the principle that the matter of conceptualising and evaluating gratitude should not be left to experts, by philosophers or psychologists. In answering our research questions, we have developed a range of methods of understanding what gratitude is, evaluating its importance in twenty-first century Britain and measuring it as accurately and as comprehensively as possible. 

**‘GRATITUDE IS ‘THE MORAL MEMORY OF MANKIND’.’**

Georg Simmel
It is one of the guiding principles of the Jubilee Centre that the findings of our research be used to inform practice. To this end, we make four recommendations consequent on our research. First, our findings show that the British public would like to see gratitude promoted in the workplace and in schools. In an educational context, this needs to be undertaken in a discriminating manner, which allows children to discern when gratitude is appropriate and fitting. In primary schools, our gratitude stories have not only shed light on the way in which children aged 8–11 years understand gratitude, but they can also be used as tools for teaching children about what we have called elsewhere ‘the grammar of gratitude’ (Morgan et al., 2015, in press), enabling children to find their way through the complexities that surround this concept, such as how feelings of indebtedness and ulterior motives impact on gratitude experience. The vignette questionnaire can be used to spark similar discussion in secondary schools and possibly with adults.

Second, we suggest that our findings regarding gratitude in the workplace be shared with organisational psychologists who are in a position to help bring about the changes British people would like to see in their places of work. The ultimate aim would be to stimulate changes in the corporate landscape and instigate initiatives to enhance workplace well-being (with gratitude featuring as a key theme).

Thirdly, we recommend the use of our multi-component gratitude measure (MCGMM). This is the first measure to incorporate a conceptual component alongside three other dimensions of gratitude (emotional, attitudinal and behavioral). The measure has been shown to be psychometrically robust and offers a more nuanced way of tapping different aspects of gratitude than is offered by any other measure currently in use.

Finally, our findings from the prototype analysis indicate that the conceptual contours of gratitude may take slightly different forms cross-culturally and, with this in mind, we are in the process of replicating our research (using the prototype, vignette and story methods) in collaboration with the Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne, Australia. We encourage other academics to pursue cross-cultural research on gratitude to further map its cross-cultural contours.

TO HAVE THE VIRTUE OF GRATITUDE IS TO BE DISPOSED, AS ARISTOTLE MIGHT HAVE SAID, NOT JUST TO BE GRATEFUL, BUT TO BE GRATEFUL IN THE RIGHT WAY, TO THE RIGHT PEOPLE, FOR THE RIGHT THINGS.’

Robert C. Roberts
Appendices

Appendix 1: Table of Manipulations in Vignette Questionnaire.
Examples are shown for a rescue from a lake (high gratitude condition) and a nomination for an award (low gratitude scenario)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High gratitude scenarios</th>
<th>Low gratitude scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You get into difficulties swimming in a lake. You cannot make it back to the shore and you are in real danger. A person on the shore sees you struggling and dives in and rescues you.</td>
<td>You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as there is a bigger risk involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ You are grateful to this person for their help.</td>
<td>■ You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ You do not get on with this colleague and you know she only nominated you because she knew it would be to your advantage.</td>
<td>■ You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ You feel thankful that your colleague nominated you but you also feel uncomfortable now that you are indebted to her.</td>
<td>■ You are grateful to this person for their help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ultrior Motive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Duty</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A colleague nominates you for an award at work... You will receive recognition of your hard work and a voucher. The colleague has nominated you because she wants you to repay the favour by helping her with her own workload.</td>
<td>You get into difficulties swimming in a lake... A life by doing so as she is not a very good swimmer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as there is a bigger risk involved.</td>
<td>You are grateful to this person for their help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.</td>
<td>You do not get on with this colleague and you know she only nominated you because she knew it would be to your advantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ You feel thankful that your colleague nominated you but you also feel uncomfortable now that you are indebted to her.</td>
<td>■ You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Non-realised benefit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-realised benefit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A colleague nominates you for an award at work... In the end you do not win the award.</td>
<td>A colleague nominates you for an award at work... You do not get on with this colleague and you know that she only nominated you because she knew it would embarrass you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not get on with this colleague and you know that she only nominated you because she knew it would embarrass you.</td>
<td>You do not want to win this award and would rather that you had not been nominated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Malicious intent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Value of benefit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A colleague nominates you for an award at work... You feel thankful that your colleague nominated you but you also feel uncomfortable now that you are indebted to her.</td>
<td>A colleague nominates you for an award at work... You do not want to win this award and would rather that you had not been nominated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table of Manipulations in Vignette Questionnaire.**

- **High gratitude scenarios** (Rescue from lake/life)
  - **Baseline**
    - You get into difficulties swimming in a lake. You cannot make it back to the shore and you are in real danger. A person on the shore sees you struggling and dives in and rescues you.
    - If you are grateful to this person for their help:
      - Strongly agree
      - Strongly disagree
    - Please indicate the degrees of gratitude you feel:
      - Not at all grateful
      - Most grateful you could feel
  - **Cost (Risk) to benefactor**
    - You get into difficulties swimming in a lake...
    - You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as there is a bigger risk involved.
    - You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.
  - **Duty**
    - You get into difficulties swimming in a lake...
    - A life by doing so as she is not a very good swimmer.
  - **Non-realised benefit**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - In the end you do not win the award.
  - **Malicious intent**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - You do not get on with this colleague and you know that she only nominated you because she knew it would embarrass you.
  - **Value of benefit**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - You do not want to win this award and would rather that you had not been nominated.

- **Low gratitude scenarios** (Nomination for award/beneficiary of will)
  - **Baseline**
    - You are/should be more grateful to this person than the lifeguard as it was not her job to help you.
  - **Ultrior Motive**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work... You will receive recognition of your hard work and a voucher. The colleague has nominated you because she wants you to repay the favour by helping her with her own workload.
  - **Duty**
    - You get into difficulties swimming in a lake...
    - A life by doing so as she is not a very good swimmer.
  - **Non-realised benefit**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - In the end you do not win the award.
  - **Malicious intent**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - You do not get on with this colleague and you know that she only nominated you because she knew it would embarrass you.
  - **Value of benefit**
    - A colleague nominates you for an award at work...
    - You do not want to win this award and would rather that you had not been nominated.
### Questionnaire/Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire/Method</th>
<th>Total % of Sample</th>
<th>Estimates of UK population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Grantitude</td>
<td>8757 3%</td>
<td>8757 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Questionnaire Numbers</td>
<td>2584 2%</td>
<td>2584 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMC Pilot Numbers</td>
<td>87% 2%</td>
<td>87% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media/Mobile phone usage</td>
<td>1811 3%</td>
<td>1811 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+PureFilms (cross-counting)</td>
<td>565 1%</td>
<td>565 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.5% 0%</td>
<td>98.5% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tables

#### Table 1: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. participants</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of primary school</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>18–88yrs</td>
<td>18–83yrs</td>
<td>18–83yrs</td>
<td>18–73yrs</td>
<td>3–88yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-British</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-British Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-British Pakistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-British Bangladeshi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Asian and White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comparable estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>562</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4: Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comparable estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5: Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comparable estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 6: Geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comparable estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>714</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- Total number of people asked this question: 3510
- No comparable estimates
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