Get to grips with motivation: slipping and gripping movements are biased by approach-avoidance context

Abbreviated Title: Motivational context biases slipping and gripping

Authors:

Sofie Johanna Nilsson*¹, David Meder¹, Kristoffer Hougaard Madsen^{1,2}, Ivan Toni³
and Hartwig Roman Siebner*^{1,4,5}

Author affiliations:

1. Danish Research Centre for Magnetic Resonance, Centre for Functional and Diagnostic Imaging and Research, Copenhagen University Hospital – Amager and Hvidovre, Copenhagen, Denmark
2. DTU Compute, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark,
3. Radboud University Nijmegen, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Centre for Cognitive Neuroimaging, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands
4. Department of Neurology, Copenhagen University Hospital Bispebjerg, Copenhagen, Denmark
5. Institute for Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract

People are better at approaching appetitive cues signalling reward and avoiding aversive cues signalling punishment than vice versa. This action bias has previously been shown in approach-avoidance tasks involving arm movements in response to appetitive or aversive cues. It is not known whether appetitive or aversive stimuli also bias more distal dexterous actions, such as gripping and slipping, in a similar manner. To test this hypothesis, we designed a novel task involving grip force control (gripping and slipping) to probe gripping-related approach and avoidance behaviour. 32 male volunteers, aged 18-40 years, were instructed to either grip (*"approach"*) or slip (*"avoid"*) a grip-force device with their right thumb and index finger at the sight of positive or negative images. In one version of this pincer grip task, participants were responding to graspable objects and in another version of the task they were responding to happy or angry faces. Bayesian repeated measures Analysis of variance revealed extreme evidence for an interaction between response type and cue valence (Bayes factor = 296). Participants were faster to respond in affect-congruent conditions (*"approach appetitive"*, *"avoid aversive"*) than in affect-incongruent conditions (*"approach aversive"*, *"avoid appetitive"*). This bias towards faster response times for affect-congruent conditions was present regardless of whether it was a graspable object or a face signalling valence. Since our results mirror the approach and avoidance effects previously observed for arm movements, we conclude that a tendency favouring affectively congruent cue-response mappings is an inherent feature of motor control and thus also includes precision grip.

Significance statement

People are better at approaching appetitive cues signalling reward and avoiding aversive cues signalling punishment than vice versa. This action bias has previously been shown in approach-avoidance tasks involving whole body or limb movements in response to appetitive or aversive cues. Using a pincer grip task, we show that appetitive or aversive stimuli also bias more distal dexterous skill actions, such as gripping and slipping, and whether this bias is affected by stimulus type. The results provide support the notion that the control of approach and avoidance behaviour is a general principle that is implemented into the control of actions independently of the motor effector or the semantic category.

Introduction

Motivation is an important driving force of motor control (Reeve, 2014). People generally prefer to approach appetitive stimuli and to avoid aversive stimuli (Solarz, 1960; Dickinson & Balleine, 2002; Roelofs et al., 2009a; Krieglmeyer et al., 2010; Volman et al., 2011). A range of Approach Avoidance Tasks (AATs) have been used to study the impact of appetitive and aversive cues on approach and avoidance behaviour (Solarz, 1960; Chen & Bargh, 1999; Heuer et al., 2007). In a joystick version of the AAT, participants are instructed to move a joystick at the sight of appetitive or aversive stimuli (Heuer et al., 2007; Roelofs et al., 2009a). In congruent trials, they are instructed to pull the joystick towards themselves at the sight of appetitive stimuli, and to push the joystick away from themselves as a response to aversive stimuli. In incongruent trials, instructions are reversed. While participants can produce the required response in both congruent and incongruent trials, they show longer reaction times for incongruent trials compared to congruent trials (Roelofs et al., 2009; Tyborowska et al., 2016). The delay in response time for incongruent trials has been attributed to inherent motivational biases. Positive and negative stimulus evaluations elicit automatic Pavlovian response tendencies that compete with the instructed response in incongruent trials (Chen & Bargh, 1999; Roelofs et al., 2009a). Analogous interference effects to the above mentioned ones have indeed been demonstrated when agents were asked to physically walk towards or away from a happy or angry faces (Stins et al., 2011).

If approach and avoidance are hardwired response tendencies, they should generalize across movements and not be limited to whole-limb or whole-body movements. Most studies have used ecologically valid approach and avoidance responses, such as arm flexion vs. extension movements that would also move objects

closer or further in the real world (Roelofs et al., 2009; Volman et al., 2011). Other AATs only required a simple button press vs. refraining from pressing a button (Guitart-Masip et al., 2014) or producing button presses to move a manikin on a computer screen towards or away from aversive or appetitive stimuli (De Houwer et al., 2001). However, it is unclear whether an interference effect also exists for manipulative movements such as manual tasks requiring a pincer grip. Indeed, control of grip force is relevant for approach-avoidance control within peripersonal space, when gripping or slipping an object. .

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that appetitive or aversive stimuli also bias more distal dexterous actions, such as gripping and slipping, in a similar manner as it had been previously shown for whole-limb or whole-body movements. To this end, we designed a novel pincer grip task which involved fine force control with the tip of the thumb and index finger (gripping and slipping) to capture approach and avoidance biases to aversive and appetitive stimuli. We predicted that such inherent bias would result in an incongruency effect with longer response initiation times for incongruent cue-response conditions (approach aversive cues and avoid appetitive cues) compared to congruent cue-response conditions (approach appetitive and avoid aversive cues).

These basic motivational tendencies to approach appetitive and to avoid aversive objects, persons or activities are thought to be coupled to the valence of stimuli via hard-wired, Pavlovian biases (Eder et al., 2013). If so, tightly coupled stimulus-response relationships that are commonly experienced in the environment may be needed to establish these approach-avoidance biases, and they might not generalize to valence-action mappings that are not directly associated in real life. Outside the realm of approach-avoidance behaviour, previous studies have shown an

impact of the motivational context on grip force control. Healthy participants exerted stronger grip forces depending on the prospect of reward (Pessiglione et al., 2007; Klein-Flügge et al., 2016). In addition, the valence-action incongruency effect has been consistently evoked by different categories of action cues, such as pictures of faces, emotional words (Solarz, 1960) and voices (Koch et al., 2020). Hence, one may expect that a tight ecological relatedness between the valent action cue and the triggered action might not be needed to trigger an approach-avoidance bias. To address this question, our novel pincer grip task featured two types of visual action cues. One category was directly related to a gripping-slipping context (e.g. pictures of graspable objects), while the other category was only indirectly related to a gripping-slipping (e.g. pictures of emotional faces). We expected to find that both cue categories would give rise to an approach-avoidance bias rather than a selective approach-avoidance bias for graspable objects.

Materials and Methods

Participants

32 healthy male participants age 27.1 ± 6.2 (mean $\pm$ onefold standard deviation)) were recruited via the recruiting website “forsoegsperson.dk” to participate in the study. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Written informed consent was obtained prior to participation. One participant was excluded due to technical problems resulting in poor data quality. The data of the remaining 31 participants

were included in the final analysis. The study was approved by the local ethics committee (H-3-2014-109) and the national data protection agency (VD-2014-332).

Experimental procedures

Each participant took part in a single experimental session in which they performed two versions of the ATT. We tested two versions of the AAT, because we wanted to explore whether the stipulated incongruency effect generalizes not only across effectors but also across visual object categories, as it has previously been shown in a study using the joystick AAT together with emotional voices (Koch et al., 2020). The two versions of the AAT were identical in design apart from the type of stimuli (objects or faces) that cued the response. In addition, the AAT version with objects included additional task blocks in which neutral stimuli were presented.

Our experimental paradigm probed gripping-slipping behaviour cued by graspable objects or faces (Figure 1). We created a novel set of graspable stimuli as cues, in addition to face images, that have previously shown to evoke approach and avoidance conflict as represented by arm movements (Tyborowska et al., 2016).

The time line of the experimental procedures is illustrated in Figure 2. In the beginning of each session, written informed consent was obtained and participants then filled out three questionnaires (BIS/BAS (Carver & White, 1994), TCI-R (Cloninger, 1994) subscales Harm avoidance and Persistence). Participants were thereafter seated in front of a computer approximately 71 centimetres away from the screen to get familiarized with the task and subsequently to perform the two versions of the AAT. To familiarize participants with the task, two blocks of each version of the task were administered in a pseudorandomized order prior the experiment. The stimuli shown during practice were different to the ones used for subsequent testing.

Each session ended with an image validation task, in which participants gave valence and arousal ratings on all stimuli in the AAT version with objects. For each image, they were asked the following two questions: “What was your initial reaction to this image?” (Valence; 0 very negative, 50, neutral, 100 very positive, and “How much did this image affect you?” (Arousal; 0: not at all, 100 very much).

Experimental task

Each participant performed both versions of the modified AAT (Figures 1 and 2). In one of the task versions (“AAT-Objects”) stimuli consisted of images of various objects, such as berries or insects and in the other version (“AAT-Faces”) participants were viewing images of angry or happy faces. During the AAT, participants were instructed to respond to images according to their emotional valence (“positive” or “negative” for AAT-Objects, and “happy” or “angry” for AAT- Faces). Motor responses were recorded using a custom-made grip force device allowing participants to either grip or slip a flat plastic block with two pressure sensors on either side at the top of the device, which was held with a pinch grip between thumb and index finger. The device could be held around the handle with the remaining fingers even when entirely slipping the top part (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Graphic representation of the two versions of the modified AAT. In one version, participants viewed happy and angry faces and in the other one they were viewing appetitive or aversive objects. At the sight of the images, they were instructed either to grip or slip a custom-made force device (see inset bottom left). In affect-congruent conditions participants were instructed to grip the device at the sight of happy faces or positive images and to slip the device at the sight of angry faces or negative images. In affect-incongruent conditions instructions were reversed.

Participants held the device in their dominant hand and were instructed to either grip or slip at the sight of different images. In affect-congruent conditions, participants were instructed to grip the device (“approach”) when they saw a happy face or something positive) and to slip completely (“avoid”) at the sight of an angry face or something negative. In affect-incongruent conditions, instructions participants were instead instructed to press (“approach”) at the sight of an angry face or something

negative and to let it go (“avoid”) when a happy face or a positive image was shown (Figure 1). In the initial phase of each trial, participants were instructed to exert a low baseline force (2% of their Maximal Voluntary Contraction (MVC) measured before the start of the experiment). Visual feedback about the applied pressure was provided in the form of a green circle, increasing in size relative to the force exerted (Figure 2). A grey ring indicated how large the green circle had to be in order to apply baseline force (2% MVC). The grey ring’s outer and inner rim was at baseline force $\pm$ 25% of baseline force. Participants were instructed to exert the amount of force required to keep the green circle between inner and outer margin of the grey ring. Once the participant had filled out the circle and kept their force level constant for one second, the circle fill colour changed from green to blue, indicating the start of a trial. A fixation cross appeared briefly for 100 ms, then only the blue circle was shown for another 300 ms followed by the presentation of the face or object cue for 200 ms. Participants had 2 s to respond to the cue. The size of the circle constantly provided online feedback about the exerted force. They were instructed to respond as fast and as accurately as possible. A response was considered valid if the force input deviated more than $\pm$ 30% from baseline force (2% of MVC). If no response was given, participants were prompted by a message on the screen to do so and then had additionally 2 seconds to respond. After a response was given (or after the 4 s had passed), the circle turned green again, indicating that participants had to return to baseline force levels again. After 2-3 s (random uniform distribution), a new trial started.

The task had a blocked design with congruent and incongruent blocks following each other in an alternating order. The type of starting block (congruent or incongruent) was alternated among participants in a counterbalanced order. The AAT

version using faces consisted of 8 congruent and 8 incongruent blocks with 12 trials per block. The AAT version using graspable objects consisted of 8 congruent and 8 incongruent blocks with 12 trials per block, and an additional 4 neutral blocks with 12 trials each. In these four additional blocks, participants were instructed to categorize neutral stimuli (such as a button or a piece of stone) according to colour. A neutral block always followed two congruent and two incongruent blocks. These neutral blocks were included to obtain baseline measurements of grip and slip in a neutral context.

Figure 2. Experimental structure. Prior to performing the two version of the AAT (with Faces or Objects as stimuli) participants filled out questionnaires and received training on the task. The AAT-Faces consisted of 16 blocks, whereof 8 were with affect-congruent instructions (grip positive and slip negative) and 8 were with affect-incongruent instructions (slip positive and grip negative). The AAT-Objects task had

an additional 4 blocks with neutral cues (not depicted here, see methods). Each block in turn consisted of 12 trials, with equally many positive as negative images presented in a pseudorandomized order. Each trial began with participants exerting force at baseline level (2% of MVC). Once baseline level was obtained and participants had held it constant for minimum 1 second, the circle on the screen, giving visual feedback of force input, changed color from green to blue, indicating the start of the trial. Shortly thereafter, stimuli appeared on the screen for 0.2 seconds. Participants were instructed to respond as fast and as accurately as possible according to block instructions.

Experimental stimuli

The stimuli used in the AAT-Faces were collected from different databases (Ekman, 1976; Matsumoto, 1988; Lundqvist et al., 1998; Martinez & Benavente, 1998). The stimuli set consisted of 36 models (18 male) each with a happy and an angry facial expression. The faces were trimmed from hair and non-facial contours, matched for colour and brightness, and presented in grey scale against a black background. The stimuli set used in the AAT-Objects was collected and produced on site. The stimuli set consisted of 40 graspable objects (16 appetitive, 16 aversive and 8 neutral). All stimuli were presented on a computer screen at a visual angle of 6x8 degrees. The experiment was programmed and presented on a PC using Psychopy (version 1.74.00).

Data processing

Force data were recorded with a PicoLog 1216 data logger (Pico Technology) throughout the whole experiment at a sample rate of 500hz and stored for subsequent analysis. All force data analysis was done using Python (Version 2.7). Data from the two different input channels (thumb and index finger) was averaged and the resulting force curve was smoothed using a linear phase Type II finite impulse response (FIR) low-pass filter (200 taps, cut-off frequency 5 Hz). The response window for a given trial was defined as 4 s from 100 ms after stimulus onset. Within the response window, the response initiation time (RIT) was defined as the time of the first peak of the second derivative (acceleration) of the smoothed force curve. We also extracted the magnitude of this first peak (peak response acceleration, PRA) (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Examples of time force curves during a grip and a slip trial. The two upper boxes depict raw force data and the subsequent low pass filtered data, with the point of peak acceleration marked by a yellow cross. The time point of peak acceleration was used to extract our first dependent variable of interest; response initiation time (RIT). Prior to responding participants were pressing the device at a baseline level (2% of MVC). The lower two boxes illustrate the second derivate of the time force curve, force acceleration. Again, the peak acceleration is marked by a yellow cross. Here, the magnitude of peak acceleration was used to extract or second dependent variable of interest: peak response acceleration (PRA).

Responses used in subsequent analyses were defined in two steps relative to the individual baseline force. During the experiment, the on-line force level had to deviate from baseline more than 30% to be considered as “response”. If no such response was detected, participants were prompted to respond and were given additionally two seconds to do so. For off-line analysis, the definition of the type of response (grip or slip) was based on the smoothed force curve. Here, force input during the first 100 ms after stimulus onset (i.e. where no valid response can occur yet) was used as a baseline measure against which subsequent force input during the response window was compared to detect and classify responses. The first deviation exceeding $\pm 30\%$ of baseline force compared to the mean force during the first 100 ms of stimulus presentation was used for classification: An increase in force of $\geq 30\%$ of baseline level was classified as a grip response. If force input decreased more than 30% relative to baseline, it was classified as a slip response.

In addition to grip and slip definition, responses recorded after a response reminder were coded as a “late response”. In trials where participants responded with

more than one type of response, for example if they changed their mind or tried to self-correct, the first response was used for response classification.

Statistical analysis

R Studio (Version 1.0.136) was used for subsequent dataset preparation (removal of outliers and incorrect responses). All descriptive and inferential statistics were made using JASP (Version 0.11.1). We wished to investigate how fast participants initiated a response to differently valenced stimuli, depending on the congruency of required responses. Our behavioural analysis therefore focused on response initiation time (RIT) which was defined as primary variable of interest. For each participant, RIT outliers were defined by a 1.5 interquartile range (IQR). Observations more than 1.5 IQR below quartile 1 and more than 1.5 IQR above quartile 3 were thus not considered for further analysis. Remaining trials with RIT below 150 milliseconds or above 1.2 seconds as well as incorrect responses were excluded from further analysis. In the ATT task using graspable objects, three object stimuli were on average rated opposite to our valence categorization and hence had to be removed from further analysis (see further details below). Using the remaining trials, mean RIT (in milliseconds) was calculated in each participant for each combination of the three experimental factors (Task & Response & Affect).

To examine the effect on RIT of each of the factors Task (Faces, Objects), Response (grip, slip) and Valence (Appetitive, Aversive) we carried out a Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA. Bayes factors are classified according to the scheme of Jeffreys (Jeffreys, 1998; Keyesers et al., 2020) (Bayes Factor (BF) = 1-3: anecdotal evidence, BF = 3-10: moderate evidence, BF = 10-30: strong evidence, BF = 30-100: very strong evidence, BF > 100: extreme evidence). BF_{10} denotes evidence in favour

of a given model against the null model, BF_{01} denotes evidence in favour of the null model. If the interference effect were dependent on the affordance of the stimulus presented, we would expect trials depicting graspable objects to be more sensitive to the gripping and slipping response bias compared to trials depicting faces. This would result in a three-way interaction between type of task stimuli, response and valence.

In a follow-up analysis, we went on to investigate individual responses in order to see if there was a consistent pattern of approach and avoidance tendencies across participants. To this end, we first calculated RIT deltas between the different valence conditions within the same response type, and thereafter plotted slopes between the two resulting deltas: For each participant, we calculated RIT for each of the four conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid appetitive* and *avoid aversive*) for each of the two task versions, respectively (“ATT-Faces” and “AAT-Objects”), as well as for the two task versions combined. For both responses (*approach* and *avoid*), we then subtracted the mean RIT for the negative condition from the positive condition. If our hypotheses regarding incongruent images giving rise to larger RIT were correct, participants would show negative deltas for “*approach appetitive* – *approach aversive*” and positive deltas for “*avoid appetitive* – *avoid aversive*”. We calculated mean valence rating as well as mean RIT for each stimulus and performed a Bayesian correlations pair analysis on the two variables to investigate the relationship between valence ratings and RIT.

To investigate the effect of personality factors obtained from our three questionnaires (BIS/BAS, TCI-R Harm Avoidance and TCI-R Persistence), we included them as covariates in our Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA model. All three BAS subscales (Drive, Fun seeking, Reward sensitivity) were modelled separately. We also included additional exploratory analyses with other dependent

variables in order to explore whether they might reflect different aspects of approach-avoidance behaviour that RIT does not reveal. A second variable of interest was the amplitude of the acceleration (peak response acceleration (PRA) of the response force initiation, as a proxy for “response motivation” (Mazzoni et al., 2007). We added this variable of interest to our analysis in order to disentangle whether these two aspects of force generation (RIT and PRA) are sensitive to different variables affecting approach-avoidance responses, such as stimulus properties and/or trait measures. Furthermore, we tested whether congruency effects would also be apparent in the variability of the two abovementioned dependent variables, because motor variability has been shown to reflect interesting aspects of motor behaviour, such as sincerity of effort (Shechtman, 2000) and sensitivity to punishment (Galea et al., 2013). Two additional variables were therefore analysed in a similar manner: the variance in response speed and response motivation (Var_RIT and Var_PRA). Using Var_RIT and Var_PRA as dependent variables, we wanted to explore whether incongruencies between valence and response might induce a larger variability in these trials compared to congruent trials that elicit automatic responses without cognitive conflict. Finally, we also used error rates as outcome measure since they have been shown to also be affected by congruency (Volman et al., 2011; Bramson et al., 2020) and expected them to be similarly affected by our experimental manipulations. The same repeated measures ANOVAs, including covariates, that were carried out with RIT as dependent variable, were run with these dependent variables.

Results

Response initiation time

Mean RIT for the four conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) are shown for the two versions of the task (“AAT-Faces” and “AAT-Objects”) in Table 1. Results from our Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA showed that the model with the strongest support for explaining our data was the one including the main effects of Task (objects vs. faces), Response (grip vs. slip), and Valence (appetitive vs. aversive) and the interaction between Response and Valence (Table 2). With a Bayes factor of $BF_{10} = 1.752e+28$, there was extreme support for this model compared to a null-model with only a subject factor (see methods section for Bayes Factor evidence categories). The interaction between response and valence was due to longer RITs for incongruent trials compared to congruent trials (Figure 4). Accordingly, model averaging revealed extreme evidence for the presence of an effect of the factors Task (inclusion Bayes factor $BF_{incl} = \infty$), Response ($BF_{incl} = 53396.70$) and the Valence x Response interaction ($BF_{incl} = 296.42$) and very strong evidence for the factor Valence ($BF_{incl} = 55.58$). All other factors had $BF_{incl} < 1$. In model averaging, the evidence for including a factor into the model is calculated by combining across all models including that factor. The extreme evidence for the presence of an interaction effect between Valence and Response thus confirmed our hypothesis that approach and avoidance biases are reflected in gripping responses. Concerning a three-way interaction between Valence, Response and Task, the evidence is in favour of the null hypothesis that there is no such interaction ($BF_{01} = 4.467$, moderate evidence). In other words, the statistical evidence did not indicate that approach and avoidance biases would be more pronounced for graspable objects

compared to non-graspable faces. Results from investigating individual mean RIT differences between appetitive and aversive stimuli are illustrated in Figure 4. A majority of participants had negative deltas for $RIT_{\text{approach appetitive}} - RIT_{\text{approach aversive}}$ and positive deltas for $RIT_{\text{avoid appetitive}} - RIT_{\text{avoid aversive}}$. In addition, a majority of participants had positive slopes between the two deltas.

Table 1. Mean response initiation times (RIT), peak response acceleration (PRA) and Error rates for each of the four conditions for the two versions of the task.

	AAT -Faces				AAT-Objects			
	Approach appetitive	Approach aversive	Avoid appetitive	Avoid aversive	Approach appetitive	Approach aversive	Avoid appetitive	Avoid aversive
Mean RIT (sec)	0.437	0.46	0.43	0.403	0.517	0.566	0.52	0.499
SD	0.088	0.098	0.097	0.088	0.107	0.122	0.106	0.121
Mean PRA (Newton ²)	51.934	54.404	-8.927	-8.307	44.21	47.309	-7.284	-8.063
SD	40.553	40.664	7.357	4.314	37.234	35.478	2.904	4.005
Error rates (%)	19.5	20.8	12.5	8.2	21.8	32	16	16.2
SD	15.7	25.8	7.4	7.6	17.4	13.8	11.2	11.2

Figure 4. Upper row: Mean Response Initiation Times (RIT) for the two versions of our AAT combined (left) as well as for the two versions of the AAT separately (middle and right). Across versions, participants were faster to initiate an "approach" response to appetitive stimuli and to initiate an "avoid" response to aversive stimuli than vice versa. Error bars denote 95% Bayesian credible interval. Lower row: Individual deltas for response initiation times in the approach appetitive - approach aversive conditions as well as for response initiation times in the avoid appetitive - avoid aversive conditions. Dotted lines connect the two deltas for each individual.

Peak response acceleration

The same Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA was carried out using PRA as dependent variable. Mean PRA for the four conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) are shown for the two versions of the task versions (“AAT-Faces” and “AAT-Objects”) in Table 1. Here, the model with the strongest support only contained the main effect of Response and the covariate BAS Fun seeking (Table 2). With a BF_{10} of 135.03, the evidence for these factors explaining relevant amount of variance in our data can still be considered extreme. However, given that a BF twice as high as another can be considered twice as strong evidence for that model (Keysers et al., 2020), it becomes evident that our explanatory variables are much better at explaining RIT compared to PRA for this dataset ($BF_{10} = 1.752e+28$ vs. $BF_{10} = 135.03$). Model averaging revealed evidence for the presence of an effect of the factors Response ($BF_{incl} = \infty$) and BAS Fun seeking ($BF_{incl} = 17.029$), all other $BF_{incl} < 1$.

To further investigate how BAS Fun seeking affects PRA, we performed explorative Bayesian correlation pairs analyses between BAS Fun seeking scores and mean PRA for each of the conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) in the two different versions of the AAT. For the AAT-faces, the analysis revealed extreme support for negative correlations between BAS Fun seeking and mean PRA in the approach appetitive ($r = -0.621$, $BF_{10} = 168.003$) as well as approach aversive ($r = -0.618$, $BF_{10} = 155.231$) conditions and strong support for a positive correlation in the avoid aversive condition ($r = 0.517$, $BF_{10} = 15.381$). For the AAT-objects, there was moderate evidence for negative correlations between BAS Fun seeking and mean PRA in the approach appetitive ($r = -0.476$, $BF_{10} = 7.406$) and approach aversive ($r = -0.472$, $BF_{10} = 6.942$) conditions and for a

positive correlation in the avoid appetitive condition ($r = 0.465$, $BF_{10} = 6.185$). Remaining correlations were anecdotal ($BF_{10} 1-3$). Note that avoid responses gave rise to a negative acceleration peak. The abovementioned positive correlations can thus be viewed as negative correlations in absolute terms (the higher the BAS Fun Seeking scores, the smaller the absolute amplitude of peak response acceleration). We performed an additional post-hoc Bayesian correlation pairs analysis between BAS Fun seeking scores and measures of maximal hand-grip strength, providing strong evidence for a negative correlation ($r = -0.535$, $BF_{10} = 21.873$).

Variance of Response Initiation Time and Peak Response Acceleration

Similar Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA were performed with variance of RIT as well as variance of PRA as dependent variables. The model with strongest support (extreme evidence $BF_{10} = 3.861e+9$) to explain the Var_RIT data had Task as its only explanatory factor ($BF_{incl} = 2.471e+9$, all other $BF_{incl} < 1$). The model with strongest support ($BF_{10} = 503.32$) to explain the Var_PRA data contained the factors Task, Response and BAS Fun seeking ($BF_{incl} = 2.42$, 19.29 and 2.84 , respectively, all other $BF_{incl} < 1$). (Table 2). To further investigate how BAS Fun seeking affects Var_PRA, we performed explorative Bayesian correlation pairs analyses, identical to the ones mentioned above, between BAS Fun seeking scores and mean Var_PRA for each of the conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) in the two different versions of the AAT. For the AAT-faces, the analysis revealed extreme support for negative correlations between BAS Fun seeking and mean Var_PRA in the approach appetitive ($r = -0.601$, $BF_{10} = 107.642$) and strong support for a negative correlation in the approach aversive condition ($r = -0.499$, $BF_{10} = 11.022$). Remaining correlations were not supported ($BF_{10} < 1$).

Error rates

Another Bayesian repeated measures ANOVA was carried out using error rates as dependent variable and with scores on all questionnaires as covariates. Mean error rates for the four conditions (*approach appetitive*, *approach aversive*, *avoid aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) are shown for the two versions of the task versions (“AAT-Faces” and “AAT-Objects”) in Table 1. The model with the strongest support for explaining our data ($BF_{10} = 1.004e+11$) was the one including the factors Task, Response, Valence, the covariate TCI-R Persistence as well as the interaction terms Task*Valence and Response*Valence (see table 2). Model averaging revealed extreme evidence for an effect of the factors Task and Response ($BF_{incl} = 654.579$ and $4.573e+8$, respectively), whereas it only was anecdotal for Valence ($BF_{incl} = 1.996$), moderate for the two interaction terms ($BF_{incl} = 2.993$ and 5.535 , respectively) and not supported for TCI-R Persistence ($BF_{incl} = 0.726$). The interaction between response and valence was due to more errors committed in incongruent trials (mean 16.4% (7.1)) compared to congruent trials (mean 20.3% (8.8)). The main effect of Task was due to more errors committed in AAT-Faces trials (mean 15.2% (8.4)) compared to AAT-Objects (mean 21.5% (9.7)). The interaction effect between Task and Valence was reflected in the fact that in AAT-Faces, participants made more errors in response to appetitive images (mean 15.9% (9.2)) compared to aversive images (mean 14.5% (8.3)) whereas in AAT-Objects they made more errors in response to aversive stimuli (mean 24.1% (9.6)) compared to appetitive images (mean 18.9% (12.1)). Follow-up exploratory analysis revealed a negative correlation between scores on TCI-R and error rates for all conditions across both tasks. The only correlation that gained support (anecdotal, $BF_{10} 1-3$) was the one between error rates in AAT Faces for the condition *avoid appetitive* (see 1 in supplementary information).

Valence and arousal stimuli ratings

Mean valence and arousal ratings (0-100) were calculated for each category of object stimuli; aversive, neutral and appetitive. On average, aversely categorized images were perceived as negative (mean rating 21.3 (20.8)) and appetitively categorized images were perceived as positive (mean rating 77.2 (23.5)). Neutrally categorized images were rated as slightly positive (mean rating 55.5 (20.6)). Mean arousal ratings for aversive images were 50.8 (29.6), appetitive images 58.7 (25.6) and for neutral images 34.5 (24.7). Three images, however, were rated opposite to initial valence categorization and trials including these images were therefore removed from all further analysis. To allow further analysis of valence and arousal rating, mean ratings for both appetitive and aversive images were converted to a 0-50 scale, ranging from neutral (0) to very positive/very negative (50) for appetitive and aversive images, respectively. To investigate the effect of valence ratings on RIT we performed a Bayesian correlations pair analysis between valence and RIT. The analysis revealed anecdotal evidence in favour of the absence of a correlation between the variables ($r = -0.226$, $BF_{01} = 2.240$) and valence ratings were therefore not considered further in subsequent analysis.

Table 2. Model winners and BF_{incl} for the different factors included in the winning model for each of the five outcome variables: response initiation times (RIT), peak response acceleration (PRA), variance of RIT (Var_RIT), variance of PRA (Var_PRA) and error rates.

Dependent variable	Best model	BF_{10} best model	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
RIT	Task + Response + Valence + Response*Valence	$1.752e+28$	Task BF_{incl} (infinity)	Response BF_{incl} 53396.699	Valence BF_{incl} 55.582	Response *Valence BF_{incl} 269.42	-	-
PRA	Response + BAS Fun seeking	>100	Response BF_{incl} (infinity)	BAS Fun seeking BF_{incl} 17.029	-	-	-	-
Var_RIT	Task	$3.861e+9$	Task BF_{incl} 2.471e +9	-	-	-	-	-
Var_PRA	Task + Response + BAS Fun seeking +	503.319	Task BF_{incl} 2.415	Response BF_{incl} 19.287	BAS Fun seeking BF_{incl} 2.838	-	-	-
Error rates	Task + Response + Valence + TCI-R Persistence + Task*Valence + Response*Valence	$1.004e+11$	Task BF_{incl} 654.579	Response BF_{incl} 4.537e +8	Valence BF_{incl} 1.996	TCI-R Persistence BF_{incl} 0.726	Task*Valence BF_{incl} 2.993	Response*Valence BF_{incl} 5.535

Psychophysiological measures

Average BIS score for the participant was 16.1 (2.7), and for the BAS subscales the average score was 9.6 (2.5) for Drive, 7.6 (1.8) for Fun seeking and 9.0 (2.5) for Reward Responsiveness. For TCI-R Persistence average score was 114.71 (14.1) and for TCI-R Harm Avoidance average score was 84.7 (13.7) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Questionnaire scores.

	BIS	BAS Drive	BAS Fun seeking	BAS Reward responsiveness	TCI-R Persistence	TCI-R Harm avoidance
Mean	16.134	9.804	7.632	9.065	114.71	84.742
Std. Deviation	2.655	2.495	1.76	2.502	14.117	13.709
Minimum	11	5	5	5	92	50
Maximum	22	16	12	17	144	112

Discussion

We found that appetitive and aversive stimuli bias grip force control of distal fingers during gripping and slipping in the same way as previously described for whole-body or whole-limb movements. The results confirmed our hypothesis that there is an inherent response bias with longer response initiation times for incongruent conditions (*approach aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) compared to congruent conditions (*approach appetitive* and *avoid aversive*). Participants were consistently faster to approach appetitive stimuli than aversive stimuli and they were faster to avoid aversive stimuli than appetitive stimuli. This was reflected by the extreme evidence for a model including the interaction between response and valence, and the same pattern also clearly emerged on an individual level. In addition, most participants were slower in both incongruent conditions (*approach aversive* and *avoid appetitive*) compared to the congruent conditions (*approach positive* and *avoid aversive*) regardless of the type of grip response (gripping or slipping). A similar pattern emerged for error rates, as participants committed more errors in the incongruent conditions compared to congruent conditions. Extending previous work on approach-avoidance behaviour in humans, the results show for the first time that approach-avoidance biases not only movements of the entire arm or body that can span larger physical distances, but are also present when humans control the force level exerted with their fingertips during a pincer grip. Our finding thus supports the notion that the valence-bias of approach and avoidance behaviour generalizes across motor effectors.

For the other remaining dependent variables that we used to explore whether they would reveal additional aspects of approach-avoidance behaviour (peak response acceleration and variance of response initiation times and of peak response

acceleration), the interaction between Valence and Response did not have an inclusion $BF > 1$. It therefore seems that response initiation, but not the vigour of the response (reflected by force acceleration), nor the variability of responses, is sensitive to the approach-avoidance context. Our task instructions, however, may explain the lack of support for an interaction effect on the above-mentioned variables. Participants in our study were instructed to respond as fast and as accurately according to task instructions as possible. We can therefore not rule out that an effect may have been revealed if, for example, instructions instead had been to press as hard as possible at stimulus onset.

Since responses were cued by pictures depicting graspable objects or faces, we were able to test whether the individual expression of the approach-avoidance bias during gripping and slipping differed depending on cue category. Analogue coding of force control has been shown to exist across physical stimulus properties: A strong stimulus intensity across different physical dimensions (loud, bright, etc.) have been shown to be more compatible with stronger force responses and low intensities have found to be more compatible with weaker responses, while the opposite mapping elicits an incongruency effect with longer reaction times (Mattes et al., 2002). Furthermore, emotional words (Solarz, 1960) and affective vocalisations have been shown to bias distal arm movements in a similar manner that emotional faces do (Koch et al., 2020). This led us to expect that grip responses should similarly be more compatible with approach responses and slip with avoid responses for graspable objects and face stimuli, even though the latter are not closely related to grasping behaviour. This hypothesis was confirmed by the fact that the interaction between Response and Valence was present in both tasks (see Table 2 and 3 in supplementary information). Given the higher ecological validity of the AAT-objects task compared

to the AAT-face task, one might have expected that the incongruency effect would be more pronounced for graspable objects. Yet, we found no evidence for a three-way interaction between Response, Valence and Task but rather moderate evidence for the absence of such an effect. It thus appears that approach and avoidance behaviour is robustly expressed during grasping and slipping movements and generalizes across visual stimulus categories. This finding lends further support to the notion of a supramodal mechanism controlling approach-avoidance behaviour. Not only does the control of emotionally valent action tendencies generalize across movements as discussed above, but it also generalizes across semantic cue categories. It could, however, be argued that faces and objects share physical properties in that faces are somehow “graspable” and the facial emotion may trigger or suppress tendencies to approach and touch the other person.

Grip-slip responses also differed according to the type of cue and response. Participants were generally faster to initiate a response to faces compared to objects. This is most likely related to difficulty levels: the facial emotional expressions depicted in our study were un-ambiguous, whereas our set of graspable objects varied in terms of how difficult they were to recognize. Participants were also faster to initiate an avoidance response compared to an approach response. This may be explained by the design of our grip force device. Even during avoid conditions, in which participants were instructed to slip, they never lost hold of the device completely but still held the handle in a light power grip. This might have modulated the perceived “risk” of dropping a positive stimulus and the “benefit” of getting rid of a negative one and this main effect of valence on RIT might be different, if a slip response entailed slipping the device entirely.

We also explored whether personality measures related to approach and avoidance

behaviour would be related to the strength of the incongruency effect on response initiation times in our task: Firstly, we investigated if scores on personality traits related to avoidance responses (BIS scale and TCI-R dimension harm-avoidance) would be correlated positively with response speed during avoid responses to negative stimuli. This was not supported by the data as the inclusion BF for these two measures was inconclusive with weak evidence for the absence of an effect of both measures (see Table 4, supplementary information). Then, we went on to investigate personality traits associated with approach tendencies and expected high scores on the BAS scales and the TCI-R dimension persistence to be related to faster approach responses to positive stimuli. This idea was not supported for our main measure of interest; there was again weak evidence for the absence of an effect of all BAS subscales as well as the TCI-R dimension persistence (see Table 4, supplementary information). There was, however, an association between the BAS Fun seeking scale for both peak response acceleration and the variability in peak response acceleration. Follow-up analysis showed a consistent pattern: the higher participants scored on BAS Fun seeking, the smaller, and less variable, their mean amplitudes on peak response acceleration. Since no similar effect of BAS Fun seeking scores were seen on RITs, this indicates that people scoring high on BAS Fun seeking scores initiated a response equally fast as people with low BAS Fun seeking scores, but that the response was given less vigorously and less variably. To further elucidate the relationship between BAS Fun seeking and force measures, our exploratory correlations pair analysis showed support for a negative correlation between BAS Fun seeking and the maximum voluntary contraction force that they were able to exert, indicating that people high in BAS Fun seeking were either weaker, or at least more economic in terms of their energy usage during testing. Grip strength measures have

previously shown to be predictive of mortality, recovery and complications (Bohannon, 2008). Moreover hand-grip strength has been shown to be related to personality variables such as sensation seeking (Fink et al., 2010) as well as perceived formidability (Kerry & Murray, 2018). Those previous studies do not, however, provide any intuitive explanation for our finding. It does show, however, that additional variables allowed us to explain more aspects of approach and avoidance behaviour that we would not be able to with RIT only as dependent variable.

Methodological Considerations

Despite robust interaction effects, some methodological aspects of the task are worth mentioning. First, the error rates found in our study were considerably higher than similar studies using a joystick. Prior to data collection, extensive piloting of the task was performed in order to establish force levels that were tenable throughout the experiment without leading to fatigue. For future studies, it might still be possible to adjust baseline force levels in order to improve performance. Second, our task demanded complex multisensory integration of the proprioceptive and the visual feedback of the produced force. Most grip force actions in real life, however, usually only involve proprioception and it is unclear how this additional complexity might have affected performance. Finally, the expanding and shrinking circle may also have produced a visual approach (zooming in) when gripping or avoidance (zooming out) experience when slipping. In the “zooming” version of the AAT (Rinck & Becker, 2007), stimuli expanded when participants pulled the joystick towards themselves, and diminished in size when they pushed it away from themselves, thus providing an ecologically valid visual effect of approaching and avoiding. Although the stimuli in the present study remained constant in size, the expansion and shrinkage of the

underlying circle may have induced a similar approach or avoid experience: A “zooming in” experience caused by gripping should thereby have enhanced the “approach” context and a “zooming out” experience caused by slipping should have enhanced the “avoidance” context. Some caution regarding the generalizability across face stimuli is therefore warranted, because the incongruency effect may have been indirectly affected by the visual experience of the circle, rather than by the emotional faces (which one would usually not grip or slip) themselves.

In conclusion, we showed that the system controlling emotional approach and avoidance tendencies generalizes both across effectors and semantic categories. We did, however, not find any clear effects of psychological measures on the incongruence effect. Future studies should therefore use a wider spectrum of stimulus categories such as landscape to explicitly test approach and avoidance representations in non-graspable stimuli. It would also be interesting to use functional brain mapping to elucidate the neural mechanisms behind such a supramodal control mechanism at the brain network level. Previous studies using emotional faces and forearm movements have found the anterior prefrontal cortex (aPFC) to play an important role in the control of approach and avoidance behaviour (Volman et al., 2011; Tyborowska et al., 2016; Volman et al., 2016; Kaldewaij et al., 2019; Bramson et al., 2020; Bramson et al., 2020b). The aPFC may therefore also be engaged in adjusting the control of force during grip force to the approach-avoidance context.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Patricija Bautrenaite for assistance with data collection.

Author Contributions

All authors designed research; SN developed the stimuli for AAT-Objects and HS and DM revised them; SN, DM and KHM developed the code; SN performed research; SN and DM analysed data; KHM, IT and HS discussed and revised the analyses. SN and DM wrote the paper; SN and DM prepared the figures; all authors reviewed and approved the figures and the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

Hartwig R. Siebner has received honoraria as speaker from Sanofi Genzyme, Denmark and Novartis, Denmark, as consultant from Sanofi Genzyme, Denmark, Lundbeck AS, Denmark and Lophora Aps, Denmark and as senior editor (NeuroImage) and editor-in-chief (Neuroimage-Clinical) from Elsevier Publishers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. He has received royalties as book editor from Springer Publishers, Stuttgart, Germany and Gyldendal Publishers, Copenhagen, Denmark. Furthermore, he has a leadership role in the Danish Parkinson Association and the Danish Society for Medical Magnetic Resonance.

Funding sources

The work was funded by Lundbeckfonden (R170-2014-1387).

Supplementary material

Table 1. Follow-up exploratory analysis revealed a negative correlation between scores on TCI-R and error rates for all conditions across both tasks. The only correlation that gained support (anecdotal, BF_{10} 1-3) was the one between error rates in AAT Faces for the condition *avoid positive*.

Bayesian Pearson Correlation

	r	BF₁₀
TCI-R_Persistence - er_ob_ap_pos	-0.111	0.264
TCI-R_Persistence - er_ob_ap_neg	-0.299	0.797
TCI-R_Persistence - er_ob_av_pos	-0.293	0.760
TCI-R_Persistence - er_ob_av_neg	-0.183	0.356
TCI-R_Persistence - er_face_ap_pos	-0.115	0.268
TCI-R_Persistence - er_face_ap_neg	-0.239	0.498
TCI-R_Persistence - er_face_av_pos	-0.397	2.304
TCI-R_Persistence - er_face_av_neg	-0.199	0.387

Table 2. Model winner and BF inclusion for each of the factors in the models for AAT-Faces explaining RIT

AAT-Faces

Model winner		BF₁₀
Response + Valence + TCI-R Harm avoidance + BIS + BAS Reward responsiveness + Response * Valence		2.833e +6
Factor	BF_{incl}	
Response	57094.830	
Valence	67.189	
TCI-R_Persistence	0.105	
TCI-R Harm avoidance	8.671	
BIS	9.353	
BAS Drive	0.092	
BAS Fun seeking	0.097	
BAS Reward responsiveness	7.591	
Response * Valence	336.761	

Table 3. Model winner and BF inclusion for each of the factors in the models for AAT-Objects explaining RIT.

AAT- Objects

Model winner

	BF₁₀
Response + Valence + Response * Valence	9403.283

Analysis of Effects AAT-Objects

Effects	BF_{incl}
Response	4873.372
Valence	134.655
TCI-R_Persistence	1.018
TCI-R Harm avoidance	0.776
BIS	0.876
BAS Drive	0.777
BAS Fun seeking	0.739
BAS Reward responsiveness	0.776
Response * Valence	519.047

Table 4. BF inclusion for each of the factors in the models explaining RIT.

Effects	BF_{incl}
Task	∞
Response	53396.699
Valence	55.582
BAS Drive	0.680
BAS Fun seeking	0.667
BAS Reward responsiveness	0.661
TCI-R_Persistence	0.966
TCI-R Harm avoidance	0.840
BIS	0.662
Task * Response	0.437
Valence * Task	0.788
Valence * Response	269.420
Valence * Task * Response	0.224

References

- Bohannon, R. W. (2008). Hand-Grip Dynamometry Predicts Future Outcomes in Aging Adults: *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*, 31(1), 3–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1519/00139143-200831010-00002>
- Bramson, B., den Ouden, H. E., Toni, I., & Roelofs, K. (2020). Improving emotional-action control by targeting long-range phase-amplitude neuronal coupling. *ELife*, 9, e59600. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.59600>
- Bramson, B., Folloni, D., Verhagen, L., Hartogsveld, B., Mars, R. B., Toni, I., & Roelofs, K. (2020b). Human Lateral Frontal Pole Contributes to Control over Emotional Approach–Avoidance Actions. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 40(14), 2925–2934. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2048-19.2020>
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 319.
- Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). Consequences of Automatic Evaluation: Immediate Behavioral Predispositions to Approach or Avoid the Stimulus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(2), 215–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167299025002007>
- Cloninger, C. R. (Ed.). (1994). *The temperament and character inventory (TCI): A guide to its development and use* (1st ed). Center for Psychobiology of Personality, Washington University.
- De Houwer, J., Crombez, G., Baeyens, F., & Hermans, D. (2001). On the generality of the affective Simon effect. *Cognition & Emotion*, 15(2), 189–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930125883>

- Dickinson, A., & Balleine, B. (2002). The Role of Learning in the Operation of Motivational Systems. In *Stevens' Handbook of Experimental Psychology*. American Cancer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471214426.pas0312>
- Eder, A. B., Elliot, A. J., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Approach and Avoidance Motivation: Issues and Advances. *Emotion Review*, 5(3), 227–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073913477990>
- Ekman, P. (1976). Pictures of facial affect. *Consulting Psychologists Press*.
- Ekman, P., & Keltner, D. (1997). Universal facial expressions of emotion. *Segerstrale U, P. Molnar P, Eds. Nonverbal Communication: Where Nature Meets Culture*, 27–46.
- Fink, B., Hamdaoui, A., Wenig, F., & Neave, N. (2010). Hand-grip strength and sensation seeking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(7), 789–793. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.06.032>
- Galea, J. M., Ruge, D., Buijink, A., Bestmann, S., & Rothwell, J. C. (2013). Punishment-Induced Behavioral and Neurophysiological Variability Reveals Dopamine-Dependent Selection of Kinematic Movement Parameters. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(9), 3981–3988. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1294-12.2013>
- Guitart-Masip, M., Economides, M., Huys, Q. J. M., Frank, M. J., Chowdhury, R., Duzel, E., Dayan, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2014). Differential, but not opponent, effects of l-DOPA and citalopram on action learning with reward and punishment. *Psychopharmacology*, 231(5), 955–966. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-013-3313-4>
- Heuer, K., Rinck, M., & Becker, E. S. (2007). Avoidance of emotional facial expressions in social anxiety: The Approach–Avoidance Task. *Behaviour*

- Research and Therapy*, 45(12), 2990–3001.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2007.08.010>
- Jeffreys, H. (1998). *The Theory of Probability*. OUP Oxford.
- Kaldewaij, R., Koch, S. B. J., Zhang, W., Hashemi, M. M., Klumpers, F., & Roelofs, K. (2019). Frontal Control Over Automatic Emotional Action Tendencies Predicts Acute Stress Responsivity. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 4(11), 975–983.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2019.06.011>
- Kerry, N., & Murray, D. R. (2018). Strong personalities: Investigating the relationships between grip strength, self-perceived formidability, and Big Five personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 131, 216–221.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.05.003>
- Keyesers, C., Gazzola, V., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2020). Using Bayes factor hypothesis testing in neuroscience to establish evidence of absence. *Nature Neuroscience*, 23(7), 788–799. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0660-4>
- Klein-Flügge, M. C., Kennerley, S. W., Friston, K., & Bestmann, S. (2016). *Neural signatures of value comparison in human cingulate cortex during decisions requiring an effort-reward trade-off* [Preprint]. Neuroscience.
<https://doi.org/10.1101/064105>
- Koch, S. B. J., Galli, A., Volman, I., Kaldewaij, R., Toni, I., & Roelofs, K. (2020). Neural Control of Emotional Actions in Response to Affective Vocalizations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 32(5), 977–988.
https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01523
- Krieglmeyer, R., Deutsch, R., De Houwer, J., & De Raedt, R. (2010). Being Moved: Valence Activates Approach-Avoidance Behavior Independently of

- Evaluation and Approach-Avoidance Intentions. *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 607–613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610365131>
- Lundqvist, D., Flykt, A., & Öhman, A. (1998). The Karolinska directed emotional faces (KDEF). *CD ROM from Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Psychology Section, Karolinska Institutet*, 91(630), 2–2.
- Martinez, A., & Benavente, R. (1998). *The AR Face Database: CVC Technical Report*, 24.
- Matsumoto, D. (1988). Japanese and Caucasian facial expressions of emotion (JACFEE) and neutral faces (JACNeuF). *Intercultural and Emotion Research Laboratory, Department of Psychology*.
- Mattes, S., Leuthold, H., & Ulrich, R. (2002). Stimulus-response compatibility in intensity-force relations. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 55(4), 1175–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724980244000152>
- Mazzoni, P., Hristova, A., & Krakauer, J. W. (2007). Why Don't We Move Faster? Parkinson's Disease, Movement Vigor, and Implicit Motivation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 27(27), 7105–7116. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0264-07.2007>
- Pessiglione, M., Schmidt, L., Draganski, B., Kalisch, R., Lau, H., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2007). How the Brain Translates Money into Force: A Neuroimaging Study of Subliminal Motivation. *Science*, 316(5826), 904–906. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140459>
- Reeve, J. (2014). *Understanding motivation and emotion*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Rinck, M., & Becker, E. S. (2007). Approach and avoidance in fear of spiders. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(2), 105–120.

- Roelofs, K., Minelli, A., Mars, R. B., van Peer, J., & Toni, I. (2009). On the neural control of social emotional behavior. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 4(1), 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsn036>
- Shechtman, O. (2000). Using the Coefficient of Variation to Detect Sincerity of Effort of Grip Strength. *Journal of Hand Therapy*, 13(1), 25–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1130\(00\)80049-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1130(00)80049-6)
- Solarz, A. K. (1960). Latency of instrumental responses as a function of compatibility with the meaning of eliciting verbal signs. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59(4), 239.
- Stins, J. F., Roelofs, K., Villan, J., Kooijman, K., Hageraars, M. A., & Beek, P. J. (2011). Walk to me when I smile, step back when I'm angry: Emotional faces modulate whole-body approach–avoidance behaviors. *Experimental Brain Research*, 212(4), 603–611. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2767-z>
- Tyborowska, A., Volman, I., Smeekens, S., Toni, I., & Roelofs, K. (2016). Testosterone during Puberty Shifts Emotional Control from Pulvinar to Anterior Prefrontal Cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 36(23), 6156–6164. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3874-15.2016>
- Volman, I., Roelofs, K., Koch, S., Verhagen, L., & Toni, I. (2011). Anterior Prefrontal Cortex Inhibition Impairs Control over Social Emotional Actions. *Current Biology*, 21(20), 1766–1770. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.08.050>
- Volman, I., Toni, I., Verhagen, L., & Roelofs, K. (2011b). Endogenous Testosterone Modulates Prefrontal-Amygdala Connectivity during Social Emotional Behavior. *Cerebral Cortex*, 21(10), 2282–2290. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr001>

Volman, I., von Borries, A. K. L., Bulten, B. H., Verkes, R. J., Toni, I., & Roelofs, K.
(2016). Testosterone Modulates Altered Prefrontal Control of Emotional
Actions in Psychopathic Offenders. *Eneuro*, 3(1), ENEURO.0107-15.2016.
<https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0107-15.2016>